



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 13

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

18 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, this is just a small statement on Buchans. I was made aware yesterday, March 17, by Sean Power, Mayor of Buchans, that there were several minor earthquake-like events near Buchans last week that were felt by a number of residents of the town.

This appears to be similar to three small events that occurred in January and March, 1985, which measured between magnitude 2.5 and 3 on the Richter scale. At that time, these events were interpreted by seismic experts as probable rockbursts in the abandoned underground mine workings.

Today, I have asked officials of my department to investigate the latest events. I understand from discussions with personnel in the Mineral Lands and Mines Division, who have already consulted with the mine manager in Buchans and with officials of the Occupational Health and Safety Division of the Department of Labour, that none of the underground mine workings are a hazard to the town. For the most part, they are somewhat distant from the town and are quite deep. My officials will be doing a more detailed assessment of the plans of the old mine workings to determine which might

be likely to have rock bursts.

Also in order to more specifically pinpoint where the activity is taking place, my officials have consulted with geophysicists at Memorial University and the Geological Survey of Canada in Ottawa concerning the possibility of setting up temporary portable seismometers. I expect that within the next few weeks, if snow conditions permit, we will be doing this, which will allow us to accurately tell the people of Buchans where the probable rockbursts are occurring underground.

I see no cause for concern about this in Buchans as it is very unlikely that any such activity will affect the town.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the minister would be rising in his place today to tell us that his meetings with the Tech Corporation, out of Vancouver, were successful, because I know of 165 miners in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who are readily available to burst some rocks.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to this statement, we look forward to this investigation. The minister told me, prior to the House opening, that he has no real serious concerns and that they will be monitoring it, using the facilities at Memorial and specialists from outside the Province. We look forward to the results of this particular investigation and we will certainly be eagerly looking

forward to the minister's report with respect to Tech Corporation and getting our miners back to work in Daniel's Harbour.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader, in the absence of the Premier, whether he agrees with the statement of the federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Siddon, when he said, "We cannot enforce this closure throughout the area" - where the French are overfishing - "because a large part of it is the disputed zone claimed by France." Does the Government House Leader, who has some background in international law, agree that the Government of Canada is not entitled to enforce the laws of Canada in the area of the economic zone which it believes to be relating to Canada, and under the laws of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it is the Government of the Province's view that the federal government could be, and should be much more aggressive in excluding overfishing by foreign vessels within the 200 mile EEZ. I think it is the government's opinion that the federal government's interpretation or application of international law

is influenced by factors of various nature, and I imagine a lot of linkage. But it is the view of the Government of Newfoundland that the most vital Canadian interest in that area is the maintenance of the fishing stock, the elimination of overfishing, and that Canada does have, if it wished to exercise it, a legal right to exclude overfishing. I am aware that there are contrary arguments as well, but it is the position of the Government of Newfoundland that the federal government should take firm action to exclude overfishing within that 200 mile EEZ.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I know the Government House Leader must be familiar with the Channel Islands case which would indicate that in that it would be a relatively small portion of that 200 mile area which would, under that case, be found as under French law because of it pertaining to the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Would the minister agree that the Government of Canada, in at least 75 per cent of this area, should be treating it as the exclusive economic fishing zone of Canada, and should be vigorously enforcing the Fisheries conservation laws of Canada through the use of the Fisheries enforcement vessels that are available to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly this government is of the opinion that the federal government should take all legitimate action to protect the fishery resource within the 200 mile EEZ, and that the Government of Canada is entitled to do so and should do so.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs on the same subject. Now that the federal government has finally decided to close East Coast ports to the French fishing fleet, ports that they are not using anyway and have no need to use, and are now prepared to kick the French fleet from a fishing area where they have no need to fish because their quotas are already used up, is the minister able now to tell the House if he is prepared to demand of his counterpart in the federal government that more meaningful, more effective action be taken against the French fleet to force them to put an end to the wholesale slaughter, the wholesale demolition - call it what you want - of the stocks in the so-called disputed area?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, the Premier now

exercises the Intergovernmental Affairs Office, not I, but obviously I will answer on his behalf. I just wanted to make that clarification.

Certainly it has long been the position of the Government of Newfoundland that the Government of Canada should take much more forthright, definite and earlier steps in protecting the fishery resource. As a matter of fact, this afternoon the Premier is appearing before the Senate Committee of the Whole on the Canada - France fishing agreement, and will be making some of these points in a very explicit and forceful manner. And, indeed, I have a copy of it here, but as a courtesy to the Upper Chamber I will table it at 4:00 o'clock. I think that is the time it will be made public there in Ottawa - you know, 2:30 in Ottawa, 4:00 o'clock here - and it will be available for all hon. members. But certainly it is very definitely the view of the Government of Newfoundland that the federal authority should be much more definitive and aggressive in the protection of the fishery resource of the 200 mile EEZ, not to mention other areas, the Nose and Tail, but we are talking about the 200 mile EEZ.

I would go on to say that it may well be, in the final analysis, what the Government of Newfoundland has urged for some time, that there be a constitutional amendment whereby coastal provinces share in the exercise of jurisdiction. I am not talking about a veto but talking about sharing in the exercise, because it is only with respect to the fishery resource that the adjacent province has no constitutional jurisdiction. But

this obviously is a constitutional and a longer-term solution. In the interim, it is certainly essential that the federal government be much more definitive and act expeditiously in protecting this resource.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder can the minister be a little more specific? For example, you know what has got to be done in the long term, constitutional changes, yes. But in the interim, for example, can the minister tell the House if the Premier will be recommending, or demanding, maybe, of his federal counterparts that other action be taken apart from closing the port - like I said, kicking the fleet out of an area where they have no desire to be at this time - such as, for example, economic and cultural sanctions, and withdrawing the Ambassador, for example, to Paris? Will the Premier be making any specific recommendations or demands of the Government of Canada in that respect?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman will remember, some weeks ago the Premier did in a specific instance, of course, recommend the calling back of the Canadian Ambassador to France for

consultation, and a range of other issues. But it is consistently the position of the Government of Newfoundland that Canada should use the whole range of mechanisms at its disposal. Internationally, Canada, the federal government, has a wide range of mechanisms in dealing with international matters. Merely closing the ports is certainly not all of that range. That range includes many economic matters. There is a broad range of instruments and mechanisms available to the federal government, and the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and others on numerous occasions have urged the federal government to use that broad range of mechanisms, not merely very limited, specific ones most immediately associated with the fishery, but to use the broad range of economic and diplomatic levers that it has.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, for the same minister. He made reference to the Premier suggesting that the Ambassador be recalled. He indicated that the federal government had to be aggressive and so on, and I would hope he intended to mean the Newfoundland Government as well, and I would suggest another term to him as well, consistent. I am wondering now, a month after the fact, when we had these demands for the recall of the Ambassador, for the imposition of trade sanctions, etc., why is it now that the government of Newfoundland is taking the position that they are

satisfied with much less than that, with the closing of ports? We had one of the federal MPs for Newfoundland in the papers saying how delightful a move this is. We all know it is a very empty gesture. I ask the minister, the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer), why again the change of stance, from wanting trade sanctions to the recall of the Ambassador, to be now satisfied apparently with what amounts to a token gesture in the closing of ports?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the government of the Province is not of the opinion that the closing of ports is by any means sufficient pressure to require France to cease overfishing in the EE zone off the Coast of Newfoundland. It has been said a number of times by the Premier, a number of times by the Minister of Fisheries and by others and indeed it is right here in the statement I have before me which I am going to table at 4:00 p.m., but there is nothing new about it so there is nothing wrong with referring to this part of it. Canada must use the full weight of its foreign policy to exert pressure on France, and that is true of third party arbitration, that is true in terms of overfishing, and it is true in terms of any and all illicit activity of France with respect to fishing. To limit it only to fisheries measures - closing ports - has not proven to be sufficient in the past and obviously will not be sufficient in the future. Canada therefore must, I think, recognize that however important Francophone relations are, and

nobody is saying that they are not equally important - the issues are not mutually exclusive - and indeed perhaps of more importance, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, is the protection of our fishery resource, and therefore all of the levers, economic and diplomatic, should be used by the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The minister, as he has indicated, is privy to the statement that the Premier will make before the Senate in an hour or so. Now that the federal government has not responded to the immediate list of suggested sanctions, like the recall of the Ambassador and so on, can the minister indicate to the House what specific measures the Premier will be recommending, through the Senate Committee to the Government of Canada, be taken now in addition to the closing of the ports? Can he be specific in terms of what additional steps the Government of Newfoundland feels should be taken to redress this issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the session that the Premier will be attending, or the session he will be attending of the Senate Committee will be dealing specifically with the Canada-France fishing agreement. It may well get into a much broader range of issues related to the fishery. I suppose to a certain extent that will depend on how the meeting goes and how the Chairman conducts it, but it is

specifically on the Canada-France fishing agreement. But there is no doubt, I think, in anybody's mind about the consistency of the Province's position with respect to protecting the fishery resource in the EEZ, With respect to overfishing by France, with respect to overfishing by the Common Market in general, indeed with respect to the renewal of the LTA, the long-term agreement, which was signed with the Common Market some years ago and has now expired, the government has stated its position very clearly and very forcefully, that these resources have to be protected for the benefit of Newfoundland and Canada.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Today I received a Telex, which has also appeared in print, I think, from the town of Fogo which illustrates quite well their frustration with icebreaker services. I understand the Premier has also received the same kind of telegram and I can understand their frustrations, I have no problem with that.

The minister will recall, Mr. Speaker, I met with him yesterday concerning getting icebreaker services for Fogo Island. He will also recall I have written him on numerous occasions concerning the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. TULK:
I would ask the minister has any progress been made in regard to getting extra icebreaker services not only for Fogo Island but for other parts of the Coast as well? And he will understand, of course, that Fogo Island is presently fogged in, and may be fogged in for a number of days, and the only means of transportation out of there might indeed be by water.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, first of all I should go on record as complimenting the Coast Guard service for the service that they are providing to many residents and many vessels around the Province, and they have been only too willing to co-operate whenever they have been called on to assist one of our ferryboats. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members opposite, and to members of the House in general, that they do have an extra icebreaker in service this year in Newfoundland waters. An extra vessel was brought in, and as of late this evening the icebreaker will be in Hamilton Sound and by seven o'clock tomorrow the ferryboat should be operating with the assistance of the icebreaker.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
The minister will also know that at present icebreaker services are available first to shipping other than the provincial ferry service. In other words, ferries

are the last priority on the list for icebreaking services. Without saying anything about the Coast Guard personnel in Newfoundland, the minister is right, they do give us the best of co-operation. I ask would the minister approach the federal minister with the intention of, if not getting more icebreakers for the Province, getting the ferry services in the Province placed on a higher priority when it comes to icebreaking services as far as the federal government is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

As it relates to the priority that the Coast Guard puts on the various vessels and so on, Mr. Speaker, it is a long-established regulation. They have been co-operative in cases where we are in an emergency situation or where supplies are running short. They have, in fact, left existing duties to come and assist the ferry services. So it is a rule of thumb that they use, but certainly it is not a hard and fast rule. They have often left other vessels or other situations and come to the aid of our ferryboats.

I have contacted the minister and written the federal government, first of all, Mr. Speaker, complimenting again the service of the Coast Guard and the existing personnel and vessels that they have, and, secondly, requesting that an evaluation be done on the adequacy of the number of vessels that they do have in the Newfoundland service with a view to looking at increasing that in the future.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, at present - the minister is probably aware of this - there are some thirty Memorial University students who are stuck on Fogo Island and have exams in the morning. I have contacted Search and Rescue to see if there is something that can be done to get them off, in spite of the weather conditions that we have down there. Will the minister, at this point, use every possible means and measures to see that those people get off the island today or at the earliest possible opportunity in the morning and get here to St. John's to write those exams?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

It is very difficult for me to give assurances of what will or will not happen, particularly as it relates to weather conditions and ice conditions. As I indicated, the plan is that the icebreaker will be in the area to open up a channel during the night. Our schedule is that the boat will operate at seven o'clock in the morning. If there are some arrangements that can be made to accommodate these students or others who need to come off the island, then we will see what we can do to move that schedule up. Certainly we have to operate through the dictates of the weather and the ice conditions.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Jack Frost.

MR. EFFORD:

Yesterday the minister said that he would not allow a private visit with the boy in question at the Health Sciences Complex on the advice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, could I have order and silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

I will repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the minister said, in answer to a question, that he would not allow a private visit with the boy in question at the Health Sciences Complex, neither by me or by a family member, on the advice of the attendants. I would like to ask the minister, first, is that the policy of his department? He compared it to the Minister of Justice seeking advice from the police, so, secondly, is he telling us that the attendants have the same training as the police, and would he accept their advice?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social

Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make something very clear before I answer the question. It appears to be coming across in some of the media that members of the family and other people are not permitted to see the offender in question. That is not true. I would hope that that message can be gotten out the way that other messages get out. Such is not the case. Members of the family and the MHA for the offender have been and will be, as always, permitted to visit offenders. However, Mr Speaker, it is the standard security policy of the department, and I suppose of the government, which has been in place for years and years, and is in place at Her Majesty's Penitentiary, that all visits are to be supervised. That is standard policy. Now, I understand that in minimum security prisons around the Province they may be a little tiny bit lax on that, in areas outside the city, for example, Bishop's Falls or Clarendville. But even there it is frowned upon even when it is done. There are some exceptions to that policy, and the exceptions are the doctor or the nurses who may be treating the juvenile, the juvenile's lawyer, if he has one, psychiatrics, clergy and, of course, staff who are working on the case. I want to assure the hon. member that this policy was not brought in specifically for this particular offender. It is standard security policy that has been in place for a long, long time and I really have no reason to question it. I would remind the hon. member that we have a duty and an obligation when young offenders are placed in our secure custody. We have an obligation to protect, first of

all, the juvenile, and then we have an obligation to protect the general public. Now, we must do that. The first question asked in this House on this case was, why the lack of security? That was the very first question asked. Now the hon. member, for the last two days, has been hounding me because he cannot visit the juvenile alone, so I wish the hon. member would make up his mind. I would like to remind him, the press and the general public that it is not all that long ago that a seventeen year old juvenile took a baseball bat to a professional person who subsequently died in the hospital. I would like to remind the hon. member that not too long ago a doctor was treating a juvenile and the juvenile physically assaulted the doctor and did severe damage to the room. I tell the hon. member this simply to point out that certain procedures are necessary and our procedures in Newfoundland are no different than they are in any other part of Canada. I would suggest to the hon. member that he is falling into the same trap that he did last year when he stood upon the floor of the House and waved a so-called report about the bacteria count at Exon House. I challenged the gentleman to table the report but he never did because he did not have it. I would like to tell the hon. member that he has caused an awful lot of concern to innocent people around the Province, to staff who were working at Exon House, to people at the Department of Health and to people in Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

First I want to make this point clear: The question was not to visit him but to visit him in private. The second part of the question he did not answer. If the minister was responsible for his job we would not have the problems that we have. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that I am not waving a piece of paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. the member pose his question?

MR. EFFORD:

Is the minister aware of the fears expressed by the boy, why this young boy is afraid to go back to the Boys' Home, and the allegations made by the young lad about the problems between him and an attendant of the Boys' Home?

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Now there are two or three questions, Mr. Speaker. Number one, I believe that the security people are sufficiently trained for the job. Number two, I think I should comment on the fact that the hon. gentleman was on the radio this morning asking for my resignation. And there is one thing that I should suggest to him, that he is most certainly a very consistent person because a few days ago he was asking for a

resignation on that side of the House and this morning he was asking for one on this side. So I must say he is certainly fair. That is one thing about the gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

He does not know if he is coming or going.

MR. BRETT:

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any reason why the juvenile in question should be afraid to return to the Rec Centre, where they are now being housed, for the simple reason that he was there, give or take some minutes, approximately one hour and a half. He was not on the floor, he was only with the staff, and he was not alone with any member of the staff, at least to the best of my knowledge. We have checked and double checked and double checked to see whether there might have been an incident of abuse or whatever, but we can find absolutely no such evidence, absolutely none.

On the other hand, the hon. member has made a very, very serious accusation, by innuendo, that something terribly wrong has happened here. I am not suggesting that it could not have happened, because these people are human beings and prone to certain weaknesses and failures. And probably something did happen. It is my understanding the hon. gentleman went to the police. I compliment him. If he knows something that I am not aware of or some member of my staff is not aware of, then, you know, if you choose to go to the police rather than go to the staff - you do not

have to come to me; I happen to be a politician - but if you choose to take that route, that is fine, and I compliment you. But to answer the hon. member's question, we have no knowledge, we have absolutely no knowledge of why the boy would be afraid to go back to the Rec Centre, other than what juvenile would wish to be returned to secure custody. Now you would have to be kind of crazy, would you not, to be sort of itching to get back where you are going to be confined for ninety days. So, no, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge. But I compliment the hon. member on going to the police. I am sure that if there is anything substantial, if there is even the slightest hint that something happened that should not have happened, then I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the police will do their usual very good job and investigate. If somebody had done something wrong, then action will be taken and I suppose it is up to the courts whether or not they will be punished.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is actually for, I guess the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), but it has to do with the information the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) says that she got from the Department of Social Services, so I will direct it in that direction.

In the reply yesterday to my question, the minister indicated that there were thirty-eight cases last year of young offenders who

asked for reviews in the Provincial courts. She indicated that they were all over the Province; ten in Stephenville, and in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and St. John's. My question for the minister is in light of fact that they were all across the Province and the Young Offenders Board that is being set up will be stationed in, I would assume, one location, does the minister not recognize that it will be much more difficult for the families, individuals and social workers involved from all over the Province to come to wherever this Young Offenders Board is located in order to have their cases heard?

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I do not recall anybody suggesting that the Board would be confined to this side of the overpass. I would assume that the new chairman, and the very excellent board that he has, in their wisdom will decide if it is necessary to travel to Grand Falls or Corner Brook or Labrador or Clarenville or any other part of the Province where it might be necessary for them to go.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
My supplementary is that if that is the case we are talking about something like a court on circuit, I think that is the idea you have

in mind. If that is the case then we are talking about it probably going like the court on circuit, maybe once every six months or so. My question to the minister is how in God's name will that improve the accessibility of these young offenders to it if they have to wait for a six month delay until the board moves into their areas in order to hear their cases?

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I see the board more as an appeal board really, than a court. Because it is my understanding the board will be able to suggest to the court that a disposition be terminated or shortened or whatever, but in fact it is still the court that will have to make that final decision. So I do not see them as a court. I see them as an appeal board, really.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There are just two minutes left and I will recognize the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). In view of the fact that the government have time and time again rejected the popularly held notion that the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary are not under a quota system in respect of issuing traffic tickets, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether there has been any change in that

policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the member is getting at, but to my knowledge there never has been a quota system policy and there has been no change. The policy now is, as it has been to my knowledge, to give tickets when situations arise warranting the giving of tickets, with police officers exercising their judgement in response to whatever situations they encounter.

MR. LUSH:

A new question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

A question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In view of the fact that the minister recently announced that the tax auditors working in his department had been placed on a quota system re the collection of retail sales tax, I wonder in advance of announcing this did the minister check with his colleague, the Minister of Justice, to check on the legality of this apparently medieval approach for collecting retail sales taxes, or at least ensure a consistency of policy with respect to this entire quota system?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is using the word quota very, very loosely. What in actual fact happens is that we

have a limited number of auditors, they are fairly expensive to keep so we must make sure that they expend their efforts in the most efficacious and efficient manner possible. So we do not want them to spend a lot of time auditing accounts which will raise very little revenue for us. In particular, auditors are supposed to keep track of accounts that are falling in arrears so we therefore can bring those accounts up to date as quickly as possible. So our system is designed to make sure that when an auditor is doing an account that he very early on sees is not going to raise much revenue, that he will get off that account and go on to others.

MR. SIMMS:

That is pretty clear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery forty-five Grade XI students with their teacher Francis Corrigan, from the Stella Maris High School in Trepassey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is to just table the statement of the Premier to the Senate Committee now but to actually do it for release at four o'clock.

Notices of Motion

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Just on a point of order. I think I am right in saying that I give notice of a motion yesterday and that obviously would have been a government motion which should have been on the Order Paper today. There may have been some confusion. There was no leave required for the Notice of Motion. I had a right to give Notice of Motion. The next question was whether there was leave to pass it without debate, and there was no leave given. That is a different matter. But presumably, that motion will appear on the Order Paper tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand there was some confusion about that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, are you ready to rule on my point of privilege today?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am not ready to do that yet. I hope to be able to do that tomorrow just before Statements by Ministers.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I would like to provide further information to a question asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) on March 12 concerning the leasing of space in Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, I table this for the information of the House. The Lundrigan Group submitted a bid for two blocks of space and indicated that additional space was available, Mr. Speaker, in adjacent floors or buildings. By awarding the lowest tender, over the life of the contract, the government saved about \$500,000.

Petitions

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present another petition along the lines of the petition I presented yesterday in the House on behalf of 116 high school students from Grand Falls and Windsor and from the District of Grand Falls. Today I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 240 residents of Grand Falls and Windsor, and in fact some from Bishop Falls too, Mr. Speaker.

The prayer of the petition is as follows:

WHEREAS the Olympic Torch Relay

route only includes a small geographic portion of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and indeed it eliminates more than three-quarters of our Province; and

WHEREAS this Torch Relay programme is a major and significant national event; and

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador should supposedly be a part of this nation-wide event; and

WHEREAS a large number of people and municipalities in Central and Western Newfoundland and Northern Labrador are extremely interested and anxious to participate along with other Canadians in this programme.

We hereby petition the House of Assembly to use whatever efforts it can to see that the Olympic Torch Relay Committee include the three-quarters of the Province that has been eliminated from the original schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need to repeat the essence of this petition. Everybody should be aware of it. Certainly everybody in this House should be aware of it because we did pass an all party resolution a few days ago condemning the situation and asking for a review of it.

In addition to that of course, and subsequent to that all party resolution, there was a petition presented in this House yesterday which many members spoke to, by leave as I recall. Today there is another petition. I know there are more petitions coming. I do hope that other members might have petitions coming from their own constituencies because, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that we cannot give up on.

We must keep the pressure on to get this changed. It is a simple request to add one day to the tour of this Olympic Torch Relay. I can assure members of this House that if they think that this is a minor issue, not too important, not too serious, let me tell you that is being naive, if anybody thinks that. I can tell you there are people all over this Province, including Labrador, as the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) knows, who are very upset that this relay route is not including three-quarters of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, today I delivered a copy of the House resolution to a Mr. Marcel Raymond, Petro-Canada's Promotions Chief, who was here for a press conference at City Hall in fact earlier today to announce the old timers game that is coming here in April. I did not personally present it. My executive assistant went down because I could not make it. I had another meeting on. However, Mr. Raymond did say that they were aware of the feeling over the torch relay programme and he would certainly make sure the resolution is passed on to Petro-Canada's public relations people in Upper Canada.

I also checked further to see how many stations Petro-Canada had in this Province because my concern was that they were using this for commercial purposes only. In fact, there are twenty odd stations but the majority of them, as I suspected, are here on the East Coast.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that I have sent telexes today to the Chairman of the Calgary Olympic Committee, the overall committee, to the Chairman of Petro-Canada, Mr. Hopper, to the hon. John

Crosbie, the Federal Cabinet Minister, to Otto Jelinek, the Federal Minister responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport, and again to Mr. Jim Hunter, who is actually the Petro-Canada employee co-ordinating and organizing this torch relay programme.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe, and I am not as the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) suggested yesterday, playing politics with it, I am not playing politics with it, in fact I encourage all members to get petitions to this House, because this is a matter I think that we have to pursue.

As I said yesterday, it is typical of the Upper Canadian thinking when it comes to Newfoundland. It is so easy to forget us and to ignore us because we are so small. I think this is a simple request in line with what the Provincial Amateur Sport Federation has proposed to get an additional day to that relay programme so that young people, and older people alike across this Province, can have an opportunity to participate in this very significant and important nationwide event. I trust that members of this House will aggressively do their part to try to keep the heat on and keep the pressure on. Let us see if we cannot get this particular thing changed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not go into all the points that were made in the previous presentations, but it is worthy to note though, and pleasing to see that the minister is continuing his efforts, as other members in this House are, and to take again the opportunity to emphasize the fact that Labrador is certainly an integral part of our Province. When we say extend the route and add at least one more day to the route within our Province, then it certainly should include Labrador. I am pleased to see the government side, and indeed all parties in the House, agree to that.

I agree with the minister in his comments that it is not a minor issue. It certainly is not. If we are a part of Canada, that would be one simple and easily adjusted method to demonstrate that to all Canadians, not the least of which, of course, are the Canadians who live within this Province, both in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I remember in talking about this a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and making reference to one of Mr. Hunter's reasons as to why the torch could not have a greater exposure in this Province. One of the reasons given, I believe, was the cost. At that time I queried that a little bit in that I asked if the government had been approached to determine that they could not do something, or if they would be required to do something to help offset the cost. I wonder, in the many things that the minister is doing to generate interest and to create a change in the decision by Mr. Hunter and the Committee, if he has made any inquiry as to what additional cost they are talking about. Are they talking huge amounts or smaller

amounts? What is the amount when he says it will be too costly to add a day or so?

If the minister wishes to answer, I will yield to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, in my discussions with Mr. Hunter, the cost issue was not raised with me. So I do not know where the hon. member -

MR. KELLAND:

Media reports.

MR. SIMMS:

No, that was not the issue. The issue for him was the precedent-setting nature of changing their decision, because there are other areas in Canada who are not being served either. But we argued, of course, that this is fine, but in other provinces at least they are going through the majority of the province. Here they are eliminating three-quarters of the Province.

But the cost factor was not a factor or a question. I mean, they are spending thousands of dollars in Southern Ontario, as the member for Windsor - Buchans mentioned yesterday, and in British Columbia. They are using helicopters and everything else. So I do not think that is a very significant factor. I do not know where the media got it.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, I did hear the two reasons. One was the precedent thing and the other was a cost factor involved, and that was attributed to Mr. Hunter. I heard it on one or two media reports, Mr. Minister.

So I wonder then, to carry that just a step or so further, perhaps we can determine from Mr. Hunter and the Committee if indeed cost was one of his decision making factors and find out what that cost might be.

Again, to get back to the Labrador part of it, it seems to me that if we can convince the Committee to make a change and to see our Province have greater exposure of the torch, obviously our four regions in Labrador are not that simple to travel to. So we would have to come up with some sort of an acceptable route by everybody. Then the logistics of making sure that, for example, some representatives from the district of Torngat Mountains, Menihek district, Eagle River district, and Naskaupi district, could find a way -

MR. SIMMS:

The sports federation has a proposal. I do not know how detailed it is.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes. What I am saying is the logistics of getting representation to at least a central point or a central route in Labrador could be left to this House and to the various members that represent these four somewhat remote districts. Perhaps the same thing could apply if we could convince the Committee to go, say, the Trans Canada route. Maybe some arrangements could be made to make it representative of the

entire Province, and not just a very small portion, as the minister mentioned.

So again, the Liberal Party, myself and obviously all the members representing Labrador seats are in total support of much more exposure for the Olympic Torch and we will continue our efforts, as the minister has. I also encourage, on behalf of our party, every single member to solicit petitions from school children and from everybody else in the Province in support of our efforts to have the torch appear here to a greater degree.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
I rise to support the petition presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:
'Barry' will deal with you, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT:
(Inaudible) dealing.

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

There are hon. members on both sides of the House talking and we are trying to hear the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird). I

ask them to please keep silent.

MR. BAIRD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe if I had the torch I would know where to put it and shut the two of them up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Ha, ha!

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker, to get back to where I was before I was rudely interrupted, I fully support the petition introduced by my colleague the Minister for Grand Falls. I think it has been a noted fact over many, many years that when it comes to anything that is national, for some reason, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is slighted to some degree. I think this is another typical example of people not caring. Certainly it is apparent that they do not care when you are talking about a very small segment of the population having the opportunity to participate in such a venture.

I represent the West Coast part of the Province, and I know the whole House, in fact, is certainly supportive of the efforts of the minister and the government in general for this effort, coupled with the all-party resolution.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that cost certainly was not mentioned as part of the reason behind the decision, except by the news media, as was already mentioned here. I cannot see where the cost would be in excess for the type of venture they are talking about. So, without further ado, I fully support the petition as presented.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). Is this a new petition?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The problem is it is now five minutes to four and we will have to call private member's motion at four o'clock so there will not be time to conclude it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

I also thank the hon. gentlemen opposite for granting leave, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the signatories here, the forty-two people who signed this petition. Now, the fact that forty-two people signed it, Mr. Speaker, is not indicative of the fact that there are only forty-two people who want to support the prayer of this petition. The prayer is not written out the way that prayers on petitions are usually written.

It says, "We, the concerned citizens of Bellevue," that is the

town of Bellevue, "and Thornlea refuse to let any school children be bused from our communities to the high school and elementary schools at Norman's Cove, Chapel Arm or Long Harbour."

It says, "We are doing this because we do not have any pavement from these communities to Norman's Cove or the Trans Canada Highway. These roads have about thirteen miles of dirt road that now is a mud hole. These roads are very dangerous for buses full of kids to drive on. These kids are getting pretty shook up and stomach sick on their way to and from school.

"Also, we are afraid that pretty soon there will be a serious accident involving the buses. We feel that we, as taxpayers in the Province, should not have to put up with these conditions any longer.

We, the undersigned, attended a public meeting at Bellevue," that was last night, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, while at that meeting they signed this petition which I suggested to them in the telephone conversation before the meeting took place.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It appears to the Chair that that petition is out of order. There is no petition to this House. I did not hear any petition to this House on that matter so I must rule that petition out of order.

Are there any further petitions?

This is Private Member's Day and the motion for debate is by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. W. CARTER:
A point of order.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
I do not want to cut into the hon member's time but I have a suggestion which I am sure will be of interest to him and maybe to the House itself. We view this motion as being very important and we will be supporting it. In fact, we view it to be so important that we do not believe we should take two weeks in order to get the House to approve this motion. For that reason and in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the prosecution of the limited seal fishery in my district at least, and I think probably along the whole Northeast Coast, is now about to get underway, then we believe we should not spend two Wednesdays debating it. We are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, on this side, that there be one speaker per party. The hon. member will be speaking for his party.

MR. MORGAN:
We could put the motion today?

MR. W. CARTER:
Well, at least an undertaking that this motion will be adopted before the House adjourns this evening. If that is understood, Mr. Speaker, fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
If that is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, then we will work to that aim.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Well, if the proposer of the motion is in agreement and if everybody else is in agreement, then we would put it to a vote at 5:55 and today would be treated as if it were the second day of debate, so that would give the hon. gentleman the right, presumably, to open debate and to close it. So if that is agreeable, we would come to a vote at 6:00, or whatever the procedure is.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, not being over-excited about what has just happened, this is the first time, I think, that any member has come into this House on two occasions and had the motion he was putting forward passed unanimously. About seven years ago, when I was on the other side, I brought in a resolution and government members of the day came up with the same suggestion and the motion was unanimously supported by all parties. Today we have the same thing, and I am quite pleased, Mr. Speaker, to consider myself one of the few politicians in Canada who really knows, as the hon. member for Twillingate knows, that an

issue is so important that we can get everybody on side. Also, I must compliment the member for Twillingate on agreeing to supporting this resolution.

MR. MORGAN:

Hear, hear! He is good leadership material.

MR. WARREN:

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has in the past aspired to be leader of a certain particular party, I have a feeling he has his foot in the door again and after the weekend, when the executive of the party sets a date for the convention, I would hope that the hon. intelligent member for Twillingate will throw his hat into the ring.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is of importance to people who prosecute the seal fishery. Now, in all due respect I have to say this: I spoke to my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), today and I have to compliment him. In the last two years, since we have seen the downfall of the seal fishery, there has been an infusion of funds from the Department of Fisheries to the Sealers Association and the Sealers Co-op - this year alone \$700,000. Mr. Speaker, that is going to go a long, long way toward saving our cod fishery.

You might say that the seal fishery is more important, yet we had to get rid of the seals, yes, but, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give you some very alarming facts about what is happening in the waters off Newfoundland and Labrador which could tie in with an incident in Norway. Two weeks ago I was out in Trinity Bay visiting friends and relatives of

mine in the district of Bellevue - I get so many calls from that district, I do not know what people are up to. A fisherman happened to be out in Trinity Bay after turr's at that time and he came across this pan of ice about twenty feet in diameter, and on that pan of ice were six dead cod fish with one bite taken out of each of them.

Mr. Speaker, I have an article from The Mail-Star of Friday, February 20, and I just want to quote what people are saying in Norway about the seals: 'Nobody denies that seals eat at least an immense amount of fish. An adult swallows between fifteen and twenty pounds a day, but it destroys a great deal more than that.' A seal will only take one bite out of a large cod fish and then the cod fish usually sinks to the bottom. This is what is happening off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador today; all the larger cod fish that the seals come in contact with have just one bite taken out of them and then they sink to the bottom.

If the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) does not come out in full force, with both barrels blazing, saying that he is going to open up the seal fishery to harvest a number of seals, while maintaining a quota at the same time, then the fishermen in Makkovik, the fishermen in Twillingate, and the fishermen in Trinity Bay are doomed. Because the cod fishery is going to be gone, and we may as well face that fact. Now, the Minister of Fisheries and the Provincial Department of Fisheries are carrying out a programme.

In the next few days a representative from the Labrador

Inuit Development Association - incidentally, with due respect to my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the people in my district are the ones most affected out of all the fishermen, because up to three years ago half of their yearly income came from killing seals and selling the pelts to the Hudson Bay fur auctions, or the Western fur auctions.

I am going to read for the record of some serious concerns that the LIDC has as it pertains to the seal fishery and the cod fishery. 'Number one, the federal government has brought in a regulation against the Inuit hunters in Northern Labrador. No longer are they treated like hunters in Northern Quebec, in Hudson Bay, in James Bay and the Northwest Territories, they are treated differently.' So the federal government, number one, has to get rid of that regulation. 'Sealing should be looked at as an industry, not as a political issue.' Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further from the truth.

MR. MORGAN:
Who said that?

MR. WARREN:
This is coming from the General Manager of the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation. 'Sealing should be looked at as an industry, not as a political issue'. We can look back over the last three or four years and see that sealing has become a political issue because of Greenpeace. And because the federal government has not put its foot down strongly enough, we have ruined the lives of many Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but cut out something that was in the paper a couple of days ago headlined: 'Britons stage seal hunt protest'. It is still going on, and our federal counterparts are not doing anything to fight this anti-seal campaign. Now what are we going to do, Mr. Speaker? The sealing industry and the cod fishery are as important to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as farming is to Saskatchewan and Alberta and Manitoba. It is just as important, and if the federal government can come up with millions of dollars to help the farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, surely goodness they can come up with a few measly dollars to help the seal fishery and the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador. Because if they do not, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we are doomed.

MR. FLIGHT:
Nail Siddon again.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, it makes no difference I say to my hon. colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who, as I said last Wednesday, is one of the ones who put the knife in his leader's back, whether it is Tom Siddon, or whether it was our friend, when I was sitting over there, Roméo LaBlanc. Roméo LaBlanc gave as much support to the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery as Tom Siddon has. That is how much they gave, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member that he should be considering this resolution one of the most serious resolutions for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I should say, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. colleague that he would be wise to keep his money pocketed,

because I am sure he would waste it in campaigning for the position of leader of that party.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is not what the Premier said.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, LIDC also said, 'Public relations campaigns for the seal harvest and marketing programmes for seal products should be co-ordinated and integrated to present consistent views of the sealing industry.'

You know, what I found so amazing was that the anti-harvest groups, the protestors, have said that they do not object to Native people hunting seals for subsistence purposes, but they do oppose Inuit hunting for commercial purposes.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing. There is no distinction between subsistence hunting and commercial hunting in Labrador. An Inuit person does not go out and kill a seal, throw away the meat and just keep the skin, they do not do it. They use all of it. It is subsistence hunting and it is commercial hunting. It is the whole thing. And this is one of the things that the anti-protestors, the Phil Watsons or the Paul Watsons, whatever the case may be, are saying. Furthermore, I believe the federal government should take members of the Legislature, members of business, such as the LIDC, and let them put on a campaign against these protestors. The markets are out there, but they are being blindfolded by stuffed seals and by Cuddles, as Mattel Products used last year.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that we are in danger of losing our cod fishery. Our Northern cod is right in the path of the seals. And what do most of our Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen depend on? They depend on the Northern cod.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand there is only going to be one day on this resolution, and I realize that there are other members who want to speak, so in the five or six minutes I have left I want to say to the Minister of Fisheries that I have to compliment him on the project that is going on in Fleur de Lys, and with Carino in Dildo, with the marketing of pelts, two excellent projects. However, it is impossible for either of those companies to obtain seal products from Labrador because of the cost factor, so I would like to suggest to the minister that in due course, if he can find a few dollars within his budget, that he look at the possibility of tying in with the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation, or Torngat Fisheries, and that he set up some kind of a small plant right in the path of the seals. In fact, at the present time the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation are building a large building in Nain for the commercial caribou hunt and this could be tied into the processing of seal pelts.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, for the interest of my colleagues, that I checked with two large supermarket chains in our Province and I learned that there are in excess of 6,000 tins of cat food and dog food consumed daily in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. MORGAN:

On a daily basis?

MR. WARREN:

On a daily basis.

Now, where does that cat food and dog food come from? It comes from outside of our Province. Here we have a food that could be canned for dogs and cats. We all have pets. It is a market in itself, the canning of this product for our domestic animals such as cats and dogs, number one.

Number two, we have fox farmers. Seal meat is an excellent meat, full of protein, which could be used by fox farmers in their business.

The third thing is that we have mink farmers out in the Blaketown area who last year wanted 600 carcasses. So we do have a potential market for seal carcasses.

On top of that, everybody outside our Province are looking for Newfoundland and Labrador handicrafts, seal skin boots; seal skin mitts; seal skin coats. The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is always wearing his seal skin boots. I think we all should wear them. We all should support the sealing industry, but it has to be a combined effort by all of us, by Liberals, government and NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I talked to the LIDC today and they were quite impressed to learn that this resolution was coming up for debate. The hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has already shown his support for this resolution, so let us get our act together and come up with ways and means which will see the sealing industry being revitalized for all fishermen and all people of

Newfoundland and Labrador.

At this time of the year, my district has about 80 per cent unemployment, and for the last three or four years they could not sell seal skins because the market was gone. So if there was a possibility of having a cottage industry somewhere along the Northern Labrador Coast - I would take it. Anywhere at all in my district. Wherever the minister and his officials see fit to put it - I am sure it would employ a number of people and, at the same time, next year maybe, we would see in Dominion and Sobey's seal meat in different forms for dog food and cat food; the mink farmers out in Dildo could be using it, and the fur farmers in Happy Valley - Goose Bay could be using it. The potential is there.

So I would like to say to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and to this House, that this is a resolution that is serious. We have to come up with means of, number one, fighting the protesters, making sure that our voices are heard over and above their voices, our concerns go out to Europe, to South American, to North America, whatever the case may be, to make sure that the people of our Province, who have to make a living by the sweat of their brow, are getting every opportunity possible through the federal government and through the provincial government. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, during my point of order, we, on this side of the House, certainly in the official Opposition, are quite willing and, indeed, anxious to support the motion that has been put on the Order Paper, and is now being debated, by my friend and colleague from Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Speaker, I think with the support that we are giving this motion, and the fact that the House is going to be debating this motion now for the next hour and fifteen minutes, carries with it some responsibility in that it is not enough to stand here and make great flowery speeches about the importance of the seal fishery to the social and economic life of this Province. I think the mover of this motion, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), will have to take and show some leadership in his caucus and use his considerable influence on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), on the Cabinet, and on his colleagues on the other side to make sure that this motion does not go the way of most private members' motions, that is be debated for a day or two days during a two week period and then forgotten. I urge my friend and colleague from the other side to make sure that that does not happen to this motion. He must now take some responsibility. He has the support of the official Opposition, and I think the member must take some responsibility to ensure that the government acts on the motion that hopefully will be adopted here in this House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested that we limit debate on this motion because I honestly believe that the Newfoundland people are a little sick and tired of talk and speechifying when it comes to the seal fishery. That is not to take away from the importance of the seal fishery or the importance of the elected members sitting in this House to support the revitalization of that very important industry. I know people in my district, in Twillingate district, feel that the time is long gone now for talk and long speeches on this very important matter. The time is at hand now for some action, some meaningful, decisive action to bring the industry back, at least somewhat, to what it was before the industry was effectively killed by the protestors.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains in the resolution makes reference to the effect of an increased seal herd, for example, on the cod stocks in our Northern waters. Of course that is no secret. It is not something that came to light just a few days ago, or today. In fact, I believe it was the Bedford Institute in Nova Scotia, sometime ago in a study that was undertaken by that institution, which stated that the seal herd is a very serious threat to the cod fishery and to the cod stocks. In fact, they estimate that there are, I believe at the present time, around 3 million seals inhabiting the Northern areas - 3 million seals - and they estimate that each seal will consume approximately thirty pounds of fish a day. So you do not need to be an expert, Mr. Speaker, to appreciate the effect that that is having on the cod stocks. As the hon. member so rightly said, it is a proven fact

that a seal does not just eat fish from the tail to the head and swallow it and be satisfied. Apparently the eating habits of the seal are that they will take one bite of a fish, enough to ruin that fish, and then go on to another. So when we talk about a seal eating thirty pounds of fish a day, that might very well mean that 200 or 300 pounds of fish are actually being destroyed.

Now, the biologist claim that a lot of the fish being eaten by seals are caplin and, of course, we all know the importance of caplin to the cod stocks; cod feed on caplin. In recent years, we have seen an increased harvesting effort and more pressure being placed on the caplin stocks, which would certainly mean that we can ill-afford to have that species decimated by an increased seal population. I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that most Newfoundlanders, most outport Newfoundlanders especially, people who are dependent to some extent and had depended on the seal fishery, have come to the conclusion that the time is long past for talk and now we must have some action. Mr. Speaker, it is clearly evident, I think, to most people that the Newfoundland sealers, the Newfoundland fishermen generally, have been badly maligned by the people who have set out to destroy the industry. And I have encountered a large number of those people. I remember back in 1978, when the government of the day mounted an all-out public relations campaign against the people who were then protesting the seal hunt, that I had the privilege then, as Minister of Fisheries, to lead that delegation to a number of American and Canadian cities.

For example, I recall that our team had a press conference and a series of meetings in New York. We were in Washington, where we had similar meetings and a press conference, and in Chicago, Boston, Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa. In each of these cities we had a well-planned campaign mounted to counteract the effect of Greenpeace and other people, some in highly placed positions. For example, there were American congressmen. I think there was a Senator Ryan, who is now deceased. I think he was murdered in the Jonestown massacre. He was a very prominent, outspoken opponent of the seal hunt. In fact, I believe that at one point he visited the ice floes and he and some of his colleagues almost physically attacked people.

MR. TULK:
Senator Tait?

MR. W. CARTER:
No, Senator Ryan. He was an American Senator.

MR. MORGAN:
He attacked John Lundrigan.

MR. W. CARTER:
Yes, a former member of this House, in fact, and a former Minister of Rural Development and a good friend of mine. I believe he had a confrontation with the good Senator on the ice floes off Labrador. Believe me, knowing Brother Lundrigan like I do, and knowing of his firm commitment to the preservation of the seal hunt, I am surprised Senator Ryan lasted long enough to be murdered in Jonestown. He was courting danger, courting disaster, and obviously it finally caught up with him.

Mr. Speaker, in our travels around

North America, and subsequently to Europe, what we encountered was a shameful and disgusting exhibition of total ignorance on the part of a lot of people, on the part of people, as I said, in some cases in very high places.

The seal hunt should never have been allowed to suffer the fate that it suffered. I still say that the Government of Canada and the Government of this Province, and maybe our neighboring Atlantic Provinces governments, should have taken a decision then to do what had to be done to ensure that the seal fishery would continue, and these do-gooders, whose motives I question, should never have been allowed to get away with what they got away with in that instance.

I recall, by the way, seeing pictures of Brigitte Bardot clad in a mink coat with her kidskin gloves on, just probably having finished off a meal of calves liver, out on the ice protesting the killing of baby seals by these barbarians, these poor Newfoundlanders who were guilty of nothing more than pursuing an industry that they have pursued now for centuries, one, that to a large extent, helped them keep body and soul together. This great international movie star, protesting the killing of baby seals.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, Madam Bardot's attitude towards abortion. I would suspect that the same person who was willing to bleed and die, as it were, to preserve these baby seals, would probably hold a different view with respect to abortion. That is the unfortunate and maybe the sad thing of all, the hypocrisy that was being practiced by these do-gooders in their determination,

in most cases for personal gain, for monetary gain, to put the boots to the Newfoundland fishermen.

I remember in Ottawa one time, when I was a member of the Parliamentary Committee on Fisheries, that about this time of the year we held hearings and one of the witnesses who was summoned to appear before that Committee was one Brian Davies, a gentleman who, just a year or two prior to that time, was secretary, I believe it was, of the SPCA of New Brunswick, a job that then paid, I believe, around \$50 or \$60 a week. Of course, back in 1967 that was not altogether a starvation wage. Anyway, this man was certainly on the bottom half of the income ladder, I suppose.

Prior to getting that job, and this is not a criticism of him for this, but prior to becoming Secretary of the SPCA of New Brunswick, Mr. Davies, I believe, was serving as a soldier in the army and was trained as a sharpshooter - a man trained to be able to kill another human being with a rifle at great distances. That was his professional training. Then, of course, and I have good reason to think this, he sensed in this great crusade a chance for Mr. Davies to accumulate a lot of wealth, and indeed he did create a lot of wealth, for himself. Because a few years later, he was flying his own aircraft and living pretty high on the hog on funds which came from this one source, from his crusade to stop the killing of baby seals off the Newfoundland Coast. And that is what I meant a moment ago when I talked about the hypocrisy of the people who were so much involved in that movement.

I recall the trips we had around Europe and America, and it was the most insidious, impossible situation you could imagine. I recall we had a meeting in the Royal York Hotel in Toronto. In fact, Captain Morrissey Johnson and I were the two members of the team who went there to hold a press conference to try and convince our fellow Canadians that the Newfoundland seal hunt should be allowed to continue.

Well, that was humourous. We were all sitting in this room, and there were a lot of rather senior ladies were sitting around, and we were up making a great pitch for the preservation of the Newfoundland seal fishery; we had our press conference and Morrissey Johnson and I left that room to go out to the mezzanine floor of the Royal York to go to the airport and we were physically attacked by some of these little old ladies, we were chased by little old ladies who were brandishing umbrellas and walking sticks and anything else that could bruise our badly beaten bodies. It was a rather humourous thing to see. I could understand that in certain countries, or maybe in the deep South where the importance of the seal fishery maybe had not dawned upon them, but here was a case where our fellow Canadians, in a province, by the way, that depends so much on the economic input it gets from the Atlantic area, ready to do battle with us because we got up there and defended the rights of our fellow Newfoundlanders and fellow Canadians to pursue this old and historic industry.

Mr. Speaker, the seal fishery is important. It is important to the district that I have the honour to represent, the Twillingate

district. Twillingate district fishermen depended heavily on the seal fishery to supplement their income. In fact, I am told that it was not at all unusual in Twillingate district, when the seal fishery was at its height, for a fisherman to earn up to \$10,000 in the Spring, in a month or two, from the seal fishery. I am told that the average small-boat fisherman, who kept close to the shore, it was not at all unusual for that fisherman to earn anywhere from \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year from the seal fishery. So it is an important economic fact of life on the Northeast Coast of our Province, especially in Twillingate district. I agree with my colleague across the way that maybe there is too much politics in the whole issue. Maybe that is one of the problems we are having, there is too much politics in it.

My father was a sealer and he spent, I suppose, about twenty-five years going to the seal fishery, as did his father and his father. I suppose from the time that my family settled in Bonavista Bay, whenever it was, a couple of hundred years ago or probably longer, they existed, to a large extent, on monies earned from the seal fishery. And I have some very warm and very vivid memories of this time in the year, when the men would go to the seal fishery. They would leave Greenspond Island, drag a pack behind them and walk to Gambo, a distance, I suppose, of sixty or seventy miles, to get a train to come to St. John's to join their ships to go to the seal fishery. In fact, I have the honour of having one of my ancestors, Captain Peter Carter, land the heaviest load of seals, I think, that was ever landed in a

Newfoundland fishing vessel in the history of this Province. Captain Peter Carter, who was then captain, I believe it was, of the Ungava, which was a well-known and very historic fishing vessel. He brought in the largest load of seals that was ever brought in in any one trip, and that is something of which I am rather proud.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to practice what I preach and not spend too long debating this motion, except to say that I would again ask the member for Torngat Mountains to browbeat if he has to, and to use whatever influence he has on his colleagues in Cabinet, and it is considerable I understand.

I would be interested in hearing the position of my two friends to my right here, my right physically, but certainly a little to my left the other way. I have the impression, rightly or wrongly, and I would hope now that the new member will correct this and clear it up, but I have somehow been given to understand that Greenpeace, which, of course, is a very important component in the anti-seal protesting movement, are very close to the NDP. In fact, it has been widely suggested, maybe wrongly -

MR. MORGAN:
Widely rumoured.

MR. W. CARTER:
Widely rumoured, that is the word I am looking for. It has been widely rumoured that the NDP nationally, certainly nationally, support the Greenpeace movement, a fact that I am sure is not going to go down too well in rural Newfoundland. It is widely rumoured that the NDP is a strong

supporter of the Greenpeace movement. Now, we saw what happened in the House yesterday, where the provincial wing of that party took a certain position with respect to -

MR. TULK:
Did you see the headline?

MR. W. CARTER:
No, I did not. - to the NATO base in Labrador.

Then, of course, when their blood brothers in convention in Montreal a few days ago took a different position, we saw the two hon. gentlemen waffle and shift on their feet to hopefully do an about-face. I would now expect the two hon. members to get up and state their position with respect to the Greenpeace involvement with their party. Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that we support this resolution and we look to the government to literally put their money where their mouth is and do what has to be done to take the necessary action, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the seal fishery is reinstated, revitalized, and that once again it will become an important social and economic factor in rural Newfoundland. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say how pleased I am to have the opportunity to say a few words today on behalf of government in support of the resolution, a very timely resolution, I might add, put down and being debated today by my colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). It is an excellent resolution.

The gist of the resolution, I think, speaks, hopefully, unanimously for everybody in this House. I think it speaks for the feelings of the vast majority, almost without exception I would think, of Newfoundlanders.

MR. TULK:

I wonder will CBC report that?

MR. RIDEOUT:

It might be too positive. I think it speaks for the position of the vast, vast majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, Mr. Speaker. I would like to compliment the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) on his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I know he speaks with sincerity on behalf of his colleagues, and the party he represents, in this particular debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the real heart of this resolution can be summed up best in the terminology and in the phrase that this resolution is really about, the rights of coastal rural people to be able to use whatever resources are available to them to eke out a living. That has been the history of people living along the coastal areas of our Province for hundreds

of years. It has been the history of those people for hundreds and hundreds of years, until there was a political opportunity and an economic opportunity for the do-gooders of the world to take advantage of those people and make money and political hay for themselves. We have seen the result of that, Mr. Speaker, like no other province in Canada, the ordinary Newfoundlander and Labradorian living in the coastal communities of this Province, the Native people living in the coastal Northern communities and the Native people of Canada. I mean, it has been the people who have been down, and down for hundreds of years, Mr. Speaker, who have been hurt most by this kind of activity. Surely goodness there cannot be a Newfoundlander in their sane senses who could continue to support the deprivation and the injustice that has been done to our people in this particular cause. And that is what this resolution is all about.

Now, this resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls on the government to take prompt action to initiate a seal harvesting programme in this Province. So it should, and rightly so. Not only is the economic well-being of the coastal people, the rural people, the Native people of this Province being impeded by the lack of a seal industry and a seal fishery as we knew it up until ten or fifteen years ago, that is bad enough in its own right, not only is that happening, but we have to become very, very concerned, as we have been in this Province over the last number of years and as has been mentioned by previous speakers in the House today, about the continued detrimental effect of a growing seal population on

the other harvestable resources of the sea. This kind of trend, Mr. Speaker, cannot be allowed to continue.

I mean, it was only the other day that I picked up *The Globe and Mail* and saw an article on the grey seals in the Gulf crawling up over the highways in Cape Breton. I mean, here it was on the front page of *The Globe and Mail* about the grey seals invading Cape Breton, crawling up over the highways. They found them, I believe, twenty-five kilometers inland?

MR. DAWE:
Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, in your own mind, what kind of an effect do you think a herd of 3 million seals, growing at an average of, I understand, about 300,000 pups a year, is having on the other renewal, harvestable resources of the sea? Even if you could somehow or other support in your mind that the economic activity is not important, which it is to the coastal people and to the rural people of this Province, even if you could intellectualize and justify that, how can you justify this growing population of predators on the other harvestable resources of the sea? Not to mention, as my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, how I shutter ever time a reporter comes around me with a microphone in his or her hand and says, 'What about the parasite problem in the fish?' Nobody wants to talk about it. Neither should we want to talk about it. You have got to try to dance and skate and delicately answer the question for fear that somehow or another there is going to be a big blowup in the market place and we are all going to be

devastated and hurt by it a million times over.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is the reality is something that we cannot avoid. The reality is that the seal is a proven carrier of a parasite that is found in cod fish. There is not so much in Northern cod, but there is more and more and it is growing, unfortunately. The trend is in the wrong direction. The seal is an identified carrier of that parasite. We do not want to say it. We do not want to admit it. We do not want to talk about it. Neither should we, but we have to face the reality of that. Those animals, as has been said here today, have the capacity to destroy, not necessarily consume, but to destroy between a ton and a half and two tons of fish a year, each.

I was talking to Wes Coish from Twillingate down in Baie Verte on the weekend and he told me about a seal he shot just a couple of weeks ago. It still had a haddock in its mouth. It was a five or six pound haddock with just one bite taken out of it. That haddock was still alive and flicking on both ends when he shot the seal. This continues day after day, month after month, and several millions of tons of fish that would be there for the harvesting and for the economic activity of Newfoundlanders and Canadians is being taken because that other resource from the sea is allowed to grow out of control.

Now, the second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is asking for action from the Province, in particular, and, I would submit, also from the Government of Canada, to ensure that the seal fishery is restored to its

rightful place as one component of the economic activity of the rural, coastal people in this Province, restored to where it should be. That is not going to be easy, Mr. Speaker.

We have been engaged over the last several years in a very intense revitalization campaign for the seal fishery. We have travelled, in co-operation with the Canadians Sealers Association, officials from my department and Development, the Fishermans' Union, the Sealers' Co-op, and some of the private enterprise people who are involved have been all over the world, to the Far East, to Europe, and Canada, trying to revitalize, regenerate and rejuvenate new interest in the seal fishery. I believe that that campaign, Mr. Speaker, is starting to bear fruit.

The Northeast Coast Sealers' Co-operative are fairly certain, and we are fairly confident that they will be able to meet their objective, of marketing 40,000 or 50,000 older seals this year in Canada alone for the leather market. There is excellent potential right in our own country for older skins for the leather market. The signs and the signals that we are seeing emanating from Europe these days are positive. There is no doubt about that.

I think what Canada has to do, at the present time on the international front, is to once again, probably very cautiously, in consultation with the Sealers Association and the industry, is something I have already put this to them, Mr. Speaker. They can do many things, but one thing I think they ought to start doing in 1987 is to very cautiously, very gingerly, get into the diplomatic

community in Europe, get into the internal political workings of the European Common Market and become highly politicized in our lobbying with the European Parliament to ensure that the moratorium on the importation of seal products, which is about to expire next year, is not renewed. If, as a country, we could achieve that, Mr. Speaker, then the other positive signals that are coming out of Europe I think would be very, very beneficial to the revitalization of that industry in this Province.

So we are suggesting, we are hoping, we are lobbying, for the Government of Canada not to wait until 1988 to see what is going to happen, but to get into Europe at the diplomatic and political level now and take advantage of the positive signals that we have identified in the European community to make sure that that moratorium, when it expires in 1988, is not renewed.

So we have to concentrate on our own country, we have to concentrate on new market initiatives and new market potential in areas where we were never active before, and we have to concentrate on revitalizing and building back the markets that were lost in Europe because of the moratorium.

If we can do all of that, then I think there is every reason to expect to see a revitalized, humming, very important fundamental part of the economy of coastal rural Newfoundland in the seal fishery again. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this government did not and has not sat back and waited for this to happen.

At the initiative of the sealers

themselves four years ago, they formed themselves into the Canadian Sealers Association. We have supported without exception, financially and every otherwise, the activities of that association. In other words, we have supported the activities of the sealers themselves to rebuild their own industry. There is not a person in this Province involved with that association who can cast a critical eye on this government for our lack of support, not one. That was evidenced when I spoke to them in Baie Verte last week.

We did that, Mr. Speaker, for a reason. We did it for the long range reason that we believe that by supporting the right efforts, by making the right moves, we can revitalize and regenerate this old Newfoundland industry.

When it is revitalized, as it will be, then we want to make sure that the primary producers, the primary participants of that industry are the people who are standing on the edge of the opportunity to be able to take advantage of it because one of the things that has been wrong in this Province in this particular industry is that we had one company, basically, producing one product, basically, for one marketplace, basically. There was no competition; there was no diversity of product development; there was no diversity of market development; so we want to ensure that when this industry is revitalized, as it will be, that the sealers themselves, through their own organizations, through the Canadian Sealers Association and through the co-operative will be poised at the point of opportunity to be able to take advantage of those new developments.

We do not say that, Mr. Speaker, to shut out private enterprise participating in this industry. They have been here for a lot of years and we will support them as well, and they should be here. For example, this year I understand Carino will process 30,000 or 40,000 older seals in their plant at Dildo for the first time in the last four or five years. That is a positive move in the right direction. The Sealer's Co-operative will do about the same thing in their little processing operation at Fleur de Lys so that totally you will have a significant amount of processing in the sealing industry this year.

This government has made that happen, Mr. Speaker, by providing, all together this year, financial assistance to the tune of almost \$1 million to the Northeast Coast Sealer's Co-operative. We have extended them a \$700,000 operating line of credit for which they can buy the seals and process the skins and send them away for tanning, which we hope will be done in this Province in a few years down the road. In addition to that, we have provided an interest buy down so that we will pay the interest on the operating line and the co-op will not be burdened with it as in its infancy it is trying to develop and get on its feet. So I think that is meaningful, legitimate, up front support for that industry.

I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the successful experiment - and I think it will - go forth from Fleur de Lys so that there will be other co-operatives established, perhaps in Twillingate, which is in the heart of the sealing area

on the Northeast Coast; that there will be a co-operative up the Northern Coast of Labrador, perhaps in Nain in cooperation with LIDC who is building a caribou manufacturing plant up there at the moment.

What is happening in Fleur de Lys with the cooperative regenerating that industry with the 100 per cent whole-hearted support of this government, keeping it alive, keeping it going, I think is going to work and I hope that that experiment will move forth through other areas of the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador so that we can return this industry in a few years down the road to where it was.

Let me say as well, Mr. Speaker, that the official position of this government, as presented by me in the government presentation to the Malouf Commission, is fully in favour of an offshore hunt as well. I do not think any Newfoundlander would be against it.

But I believe we have to recognize the reality of the global community. To initiate an offshore hunt for the white coat and blue back seals at this particular point in our history I believe would be a mistake. I believe that most sealers in this Province, in fact, I know they do, believe that that would be a mistake because we would be back into the fight again and everything that we have achieved - it might not be much - but everything we have achieved over the last four or five or six years when there has not been the white coat/blue back hunt, I think would be lost overnight.

Now, that does not make it right

that there should not be one. We are fully supportive of one. But one has to make a decision based on the reality of the global community that is out there. The signals, if you look at the journalistic approach in Europe now and compare it to what it was like five or six years ago, the pendulum is swinging the other way. All those journalists that were calling us barbarians and so on are now starting to write about the seals in another perspective, Mr. Speaker, would you believe.

I saw two articles last week taken from one newspaper in West Germany and one newspaper in Norway and the big cry now is that the poor seals, because there are so many of them, are getting tangled up in fishermen's nets and drowning. So it was barbaric to shoot them or club them or kill them and make economic use of the seal product, that was barbaric, but now it is barbaric and now it is cruel because there are so many of them around and they are getting tangled up in nets and drowning at sea.

So I think there is a new reality dawning, I think there is a new understanding dawning, and I think we have to poise ourselves through our efforts at Dildo, through our efforts at Fleur de Lys, to make sure that we take advantage of that.

The other thing we have to do, Mr. Speaker, and again my department has played a lead role, not only with expertise, but with financial support, the other thing we have to do is ensure that we utilize 100 per cent of the resource. It is not good enough any more in a hungry world just to take the skin and throw away the rest of the seal. There has to be, as much as

is practical and possible, a 100 per cent utilization of the whole seal. There is an excellent return on oil. There is no trouble to sell oil from seals. All you can produce you can sell and get an excellent price for it. I believe there are excellent possibilities in terms of the seal meat for human consumption and for animal feed. We are now putting some money in through a private enterprise company and the Canadian Sealers Association to do further work in the development of the meat, vacuum packaged, frozen packages and so on so that we can get that into the market place.

There is excellent potential I believe in the use of seal skins for handicrafts. Look around Newfoundland and Labrador. I was in a store in Vancouver when I was there for a trade show back in August I believe it was, and any store you go into on the waterfront in Vancouver, there are all kinds of seal skin articles all over the place. The Japanese community coming in from around the Pacific rim go crazy for them. They are getting them all made as handicrafts up in the North.

I think we are not exploiting enough in this Province the use of the seal skin itself for handicrafts. That is why I announced just a few days ago that we are going to fund the Sealers Association to get more into the production of handicrafts so that we can set somebody up in St. Anthony, or set somebody up in Nain, and let us keep alive and let us keep viable in Newfoundland that handicraft part of the industry. If we do not, it is going to die and be lost anyway.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you take it

all together, the efforts of the Sealers Association, the Sealers Co-operative, private enterprise through Carino, and the efforts of this government, then I think that there is a future for the seal fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

There is another crucial factor that must come to play. It is time for the federal government, and I think they will, perhaps next month, I understand, to officially take a position on a number of the recommendations of the Malouf Commission. They have said that the Canadian Sealers Association will be the lead agency or the people that they will take advice from. That is excellent. Who knows better, as primary producers, than they? But what we do need is professional marketers, professional people who can get out in the market with this product and be just as proud knocking on buyers' doors in Taiwan or Hong Kong or in Brussels or Paris or London, just as proud with that product as if they were going with a goatskin or if they were going with mink or some other product. That, Mr. Speaker, is up here and that is what we have got to change.

Thank you very much.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to rise in support of the resolution. In fact, given some of what has been tossed across the Chamber by members of

both parties, I am actually proud, for the record, to be the person representing our party to go on record in support of this resolution. I would not presume to speak with the wisdom or the experience of the two previous speakers, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). So I will not speak at length on some of the details or the specifics that they have touched on in the history of this issue, or indeed some of the developments that are occurring now with the possible options and alternatives for the development of the industry in the future.

I would like, perhaps in a way for my own purposes, to establish credentials in this House and to confront some of the gratuitous remarks that are thrown around all the time, both about myself, as a new member, and about our party and where we stand in relation to this and other issues.

On this issue I would like to clearly state my own personal experience in that this is not the first time I have had an opportunity to speak in public in defence of the seal hunt in this Province. My mother's father from Georgetown, Conception Bay, was a well known sealer who went to the seal hunt thirty-four years in a row and was known to have had quite a record. He was accompanied on his trips to the seal hunt by his wife, my grandmother, who was a cook on the sealing vessels and spent many, many years travelling with her husband to the seal hunt. That is a tradition that I feel very closely and I am very proud of my own personal connection to it.

I would also like to say that ten

years ago, when I found myself in the position of editor of the student newspaper at Memorial University, it was at the time when Greenpeace began to make this a national and, indeed, an international issue. In my position as the spokesperson for the newspaper from Memorial, I found myself in the center of a controversy that was brought to the national organization of student newspapers, and in fact, was able to ensure that the university student press in this country during the mid-1970's basically had an unofficial agreement not to promote the programme of Greenpeace against the seal hunt in Newfoundland because of the strong position taken by the student newspaper, *The Muse* at Memorial University.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

So I had my own experience going to national conferences dealing with this issue and dealing with the ignorance and the absolute intolerance of people who were supporting the Greenpeace campaign at that time in the mid-1970's.

I might also add that two years ago, during the federal Liberal Convention in Ottawa - I believe it was the Summer of 1984 - I happened to be passing through Ottawa at the time. I happened to be outside of the federal Liberal Convention in which there was a street demonstration by members of Greenpeace. Some of the members of the Liberal caucus may recall the demonstration at that convention in which they had a fifty-foot balloon on the sidewalk, a plastic balloon of a Newfoundland barbarian and then a smaller balloon of a seal.

There was this gigantic structure impeding traffic on the sidewalk and people who may or may be not associated with the Liberal Convention itself, but who were drawing attention to the fact that there were delegates to the convention from Newfoundland and they were pressing the Liberal Party for its position on the seal hunt. I happened to be there at that time, and joined with young delegates at that convention in engaging in quite a strenuous argument on the street corner and being part of national media attention with the young delegates from Newfoundland who were dealing with this spectacle on the street.

So that is simply for the record to establish that I have had some history with this question and eliminate suggestions that somehow in this party we are soft on the issue of the seal hunt or somehow in cahoots with Greenpeace.

In fact, I recall the most recent experience I have had with this issue was in the recent by-elections when I was on my way to finding myself taking my seat here, and members of the - I do not know who - some of the brains from away, I guess, for the Liberal Party designed radio ads going after the NDP for its support of Greenpeace. Then we hear the same thing here in the House again today.

Of course, all I would say to that is that it is simply an act of desperation when members of other parties recognize the momentum that the NDP has in this Province. It is a desperate grab for something to try and use which has absolutely no credibility. It speaks only to the problems that people from other parties would have and it really says nothing,

certainly nothing honest about what the NDP is or stands for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

But on the question about Greenpeace, Mr. Speaker, I would like to directly confront the question that has been raised of members of the NDP having association with that organization.

I would say that there is no doubt there are members of the NDP who live on the West Coast of Canada who give support to Greenpeace, because Greenpeace has established itself as one of the strongest environmental organizations and anti-nuclear organizations in that area. My understanding, from actually talking to members of the NDP about this question recently, is that Greenpeace has made a commitment in the recent past, within the last year and a half or so after a long debate within the organization, to not put forward a campaign against the seal hunt because there is a recognition that they have no credibility in this country on that question.

Greenpeace has a commitment to continue to do its environmental and anti-nuclear work, which I support. I support when Greenpeace is doing international campaigns against nuclear waste being dumped into our oceans. I support Greenpeace activities when they are confronting the traffic of nuclear weapons in and out of Canadian harbours. But I have no doubt and no difficulty in stopping my support when they begin talking about the seal

hunt.

So I think it is worth it for the information, whether members are interested or not, that you cannot expect that that organization will be leading a campaign against the seal hunt because they know, in part, due to the good efforts of members of both parties opposite, the good efforts of all Newfoundlanders over the years, that it no longer credible in this country for an organization who wants to have a public presence to be campaigning against the seal hunt. So I would simply like to say that, not in the defence of Greenpeace per se, but simply to try and set the record straight.

MR. BUTT:

Are you against low flying up in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Further to the question of where our party stands, not in relation to Greenpeace, but I am sure all members are aware of where the NDP stands provincially and federally in relation to issues of environmental and nuclear concern. But as for the specific issue of the seal hunt, the NDP is very clear federally on what its position is and I would, Mr. Speaker, like to table a document which is a copy of a resolution passed in recent months by the federal council of the New Democratic Party which establishes a clear and unequivocal position in support of the seal hunt. If I may, I will read one brief part of the resolution from this Council. It says:

"BE IT RESOLVED the NDP support the principles established by the

Malouf Commission, in particular, the compensation of seal fishermen for loss of income and the establishment of a development fund to establish a viable sealing industry."

The motion continues from there, but clearly, Mr. Speaker, not only is the NDP federally in support of the seal hunt, but actually has developed policy which is in kind, in like mind, with speeches that have been made here today by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and indeed by our provincial Fisheries Minister (Mr. Rideout). So members should be clear that the NDP in this country is in support of any initiatives by this government to redevelop a viable sealing industry in this Province.

MR. BUTT:

The NDP has never had a clear policy on anything that made any sense, old boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. FENWICK:

Are you against that policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

That is the only sensible statement the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) has ever made.

MR. LONG:

It is nice to see that members of both parties are able to come together, not on this question, but on what I call the gratuitous attacks on the NDP. But I think, over time, we will see that they too will have to withdraw from this kind of thing as the NDP is

able to bring its message to the public in Newfoundland. To attack the NDP is simply not a creditable position to be taking.

We are here proudly today to stand in unanimous approval with all members in this House in support of the seal industry. We take encouragement from some of the words of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the plans to develop an integrated and diversified industry, particularly with some focus on a small scale development of a co-operative nature; to give acknowledgement to the absolute importance of this industry to Native people on the Coast of Labrador; and to make special arrangements with the LIDC to encourage and get support financially and otherwise to their efforts to develop the industry. We think that is an important approach.

The minister has acknowledged the difficulties in the single focus of the industry in the past and that any attempts to revitalize and regenerate the industry must take a diversified and integrated approach and must have a long-term view to developing support for people on their own terms.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, for the record, I hope that has set some things straight. We are glad to give our support and approval to this resolution.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this resolution.

First of all, I would like to commend the mover for a motion which I think is now going to be unanimously passed by all parties and all members. I think it is very appropriate, and at a time when it is most appropriate, because unless something is done - I did not hear the minister's speech but I am sure he agrees - unless something is done in 1987-88 to control the growth of the seal herd, it is going to be devastating on other commercial fish species. That is the most important issue.

The fact was mentioned by the mover that the consumption of commercial species by seals is substantial. I recall a figure from scientists. One and a half tons of commercial fish species are consumed on an annual basis by one harp seal. That alone is a clear indication of the kind of damage being done by a two million population now or more in the harp seal herd.

The gray seals off Nova Scotia have created a problem which is nothing short of a nightmare to the Nova Scotian fishery, to the Gulf fishery and the Scotian shelf in particular. I guess there is no point in hiding our heads in the sand. It is a problem that is affiliated with the quality of the product from our cod fishery as a result of the parasite from seals. Mr. Speaker, a parasite from a gray seal is going to cause a real problem in the quality of fish getting to the marketplace and is going to cost the industry millions of dollars. I will not say millions so far but hundreds of thousands of dollars will be

spent to correct that problem and ensure that quality is going to be maintained going to the marketplace. I am talking the problem of a parasite in the cod fish on the Scotian shelf. I have heard scientists say that that parasite does not exist or will not be carried on from the droppings of harp seals. You know the process. The droppings from the seals eaten by cod fish causes the parasite. I was never convinced that the harp seal is not going to cause a similar problem with worms in the Northern cod stocks.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

So we have two aspects. We have the parasite problem and we have the consumption of commercial species by the harp seal herd. To add to that there is a third one. I remember last Spring and the Spring before fishermen on the Northeast Coast in particular, Twillingate, Bonavista North and Bonavista South, in that area, complaining about the nuisance factor. The seals are getting so numerous in the Springtime that they are causing a real problem with the fishermen's nets in the inshore fishery. So they are becoming a major nuisance factor.

So this resolution is coming at a time when it is very, very appropriate that it be addressed by both levels of government. I am not at all satisfied and I was never satisfied as minister here in the Province, as a member of the Cabinet, with any kind of concentrated effort by the Government of Canada, by the previous administration and indeed by this one, so far. I do not want to be heard fed-bashing today

but I have to say that I do not see any real concentrated effort on the part of the federal government, External Affairs in particular, on the part of Fisheries and on the part of other departments like the Commerce Department, to go out in an all out effort to revitalize the seal fishery.

The Malouf Commission did not address the most important question in my mind and that is, 'Can there be developed alternate markets to the market we had in the European Economic Community?' We have lost that market but there are potential markets that are sitting there now to be developed. For example, in the Pacific rim countries, through Hong Kong area, in Japan.

MR. TULK:

I am sure you are familiar with that area.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, indeed. I am not going to be too long as I agreed to speak for ten minutes only but there is a market potential and it is the role of the Government of Canada. The minister provincially is doing everything he possibly can on this issue. He has limited monies to spend on it, but the aspect of market development should be done by the commercial sector of the Department of Trade and Commerce, tied in with External Relations. It seems to me that the people in the federal level of government today, the officials, look at this as a problem child. They do not want to deal with it. In fact, it is a nuisance factor to them. Seals are a nuisance factor to fishermen, while the sealing industry and the possible revitalization of the industry is a nuisance factor to the many

officials in the federal level of government.

They would rather see the seal fishery die than have demonstrators sitting on their door steps at the Embassies and the Commission offices around the world. They do not want to be embarrassed by this kind of thing. The fact is they do not understand the importance to the fishermen and to the overall economy in Labrador and the Northeast Coast every Spring and what it means to the inshore fishermen, to the landmen, who harvest these seals for commercial reasons over the years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to put in capsule form what I would like to say today. The motion is asking for the Government of Newfoundland to initiate a seal harvesting programme. I would commend the government if they could do it but I cannot see how it can be done strictly or alone by the provincial government. There has to be involvement at the federal level of government and not only should there be harvest to control the growth of the herd, but there is potential for commercial revitalization as mentioned by the mover of the motion. I want to add to that. For example, there is no reason why we cannot establish a seal meat rendering plant.

I have read up on the high protein content of various types of fish species and fish protein concentrate. My colleague, who is involved with me in an association, is now going to speak in this debate. We are involved in an organization called FADA, Fish Aid Development Association. We are not playing high profile and I do not want to add too much

to what we are doing today but I read up night after night, stacks of information on fish protein concentrate.

One of the best protein concentrates to feed even the humans in places in the world where we did need food in a desperate way is seal meat. Add to that the medicine field. Seal oil is a very, very valuable product and can be used for that purpose. So there is a possibility of a seal meat rendering plant taking the meat, making it into protein concentrate and using the oil as well. That is one aspect.

The other aspect, strangely enough, is in the Oriental world where certain parts of the seal is of high value to them. They use it for an aphrodisiac or for medical purposes but I would venture to say that the organ of a male seal today is more valuable in the marketplace than a seal pelt. For example, I talked to a group of Oriental people recently who are willing to pay a price in the range of anywhere from \$16 to \$20 for one to the fishermen to purchase these seal organs. That is right, the organ of the older male seal. If you couple that with the price of the pelt and you couple that with the market for the meat, there is a good possibility that we will see the seal industry revitalized and back again. In the meantime, it is not back again. It will not be here automatically overnight. Despite the tremendous efforts of the Minister of Fisheries and the Department of Fisheries, and now, this year, Carino coming back on the scene again, and the Sealers Association's work, despite all of that, it will not come back overnight.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this motion is a really worthwhile one. I do not know how the minister is going to be able to do it, but if it can be done, there has got to be some kind of cull of the herd commence this year, 1987. If not, we are going to see further destruction of our commercial species of fish which is so valuable to the overall fishing industry.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hope my good friends from the NDP will be within reach of my voice, because I want to give them notice that before I finish my few remarks I want to address a few comments to their latest picket fence position.

Before I do, Mr. Speaker, just allow me, if you will, Sir, to raise a matter strictly in the interest of what I would describe as Parliamentary purity. It relates directly to the motion.

I say to the deputy, deputy, deputy Premier, the gentleman from Grand Falls, if he would refer to page 184 of Beauchesne, paragraph 560, he will notice, "The tendency in the House of Commons has been to rule out all motions purporting to give the Government a direct order to do a thing which cannot be done without the expenditure of money."

In that context, I say to him that

we may be dealing with a resolution that should have never made it to the Order Paper anyway. But that is another issue, because this one does not urge the government or advocate that the government do something. It says, very carefully, that the government "initiate" it.

The other related clause here is the preceding one, 559, which deals with "Motions which take the form of merely advocating public expenditures" as opposed to ordering them. I say that, Mr. Speaker, not to subtract from the motion, but there is an important motion here insofar as guarding the right of a private member is concerned. If we are going to hang on to that right and not have it erode, we have got to make a clear distinction about what things the government can do in this House - in terms of the words we choose, I am saying - and the things that a member acting in his capacity as a private member can do.

I am aware that the gentleman from Torngat (Mr. Warren) is also a Parliamentary secretary, but I submit to you the fact that we are debating this on a Wednesday afternoon is proof that he put it down in his capacity as a private member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of the issue, I concur with the minister at least on one point. He did not say it in those words, but I am sure I heard him say, in effect, "Let us not fall into the trap of fighting yesterday's battle." We are not back in 1977 when I, and I am sure many others in this Chamber, around that period, went to St. Anthony, took a chopper out and had a look at the thing first hand. We are not

at that point in time where we were still trying to absorb what all the fuss was about. We now know what the fuss is about. We underestimated the furor and how well organized that furor was. We find ourselves today fighting a rearguard action or having lost even a rearguard action.

So, my first point, Mr. Speaker, is that we ought not to ignore today's reality. Today's reality is something different than it was ten years ago. You cannot bring back the past. We have got to operate from where we are.

I am with the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) when he says that we have got to ensure that any steps we take in this area are aimed at making the industry a viable one from two standpoints, for example, from an economic standpoint in terms of the person who depends on it for a livelihood. That obviously has implications for government subsidies.

What the Carino Company is now offering is not sufficient to make it worth while to go out there. Perhaps the kind of programme the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has in mind would embody a provision of a subsidy to make it worthwhile for fishermen. But we also must look at viability or feasibility in the biological sense and that is where I concur with my good friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) that I really do not see how the government could or would want to do this alone. The federal government is part of this and should be asked to get involved.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that half the NDP Caucus has returned to the Chamber because I like to say some

things face to face. Mr. Speaker, one of the gifts that God, in her wisdom, gave us was the gift to be able to rationalize our behaviour. It helps your sanity, or at least it helps your perception of your sanity.

But, Mr. Speaker, like most gifts, whether you give a friend, if you are so inclined and so able in terms of having the money in your pocket, a sports car, the gift, as attractive and shiny and positive as it seems on the surface, can be taken and abused. You can drive it on the highway and kill yourself under the wrong circumstances, in the case of the analogy about the car.

And so it is with the gift to be able to rationalize behaviour. The fact that God gave you the gift does not mean you have licence to abuse it. It does not mean that you should live in a fool's paradise all the time. That is not to say that there are those who do not live in a fool's paradise all the time.

I understand when the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long) stands and talks about how proud he is of certain things, nobody denies him his pride, but I question whether he ought not to be analyzing the things he is assigning his pride to because, in this particular case, to stand and walk that fine line about that bunch of loonies called Greenpeace, now they are either a bunch of loonies or they are not a bunch of loonies. You cannot out of one side of your mouth be saying, 'Oh, we drew the line at the seal fishery but it was all right to bring a Greenpeacer in from Vancouver to manage a campaign up in the Strait of Belle Isle in the last election.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Even a rationalization of
behaviour requires some
consistency.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I just erred in terms of the truth on that particular point, I yield and ask the member to contradict that there was an active worker in the Greenpeace Organization, based in Vancouver, brought in to campaign manage Max Short's campaign in the Strait of Belle Isle. Is he saying I am not telling the truth on that? I yield to him on that point, is he saying I am not telling the truth on that?

MR. LONG:

As far as I know you are not telling the truth.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

- I rest my case, exactly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

I simply say, as far as I know that is simply not true and he should prove his allegation. Give us the proof.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is no point of order.

The hon. the member for
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, back to that God given talent of rationalization. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, fall unduly into the trap of weasel phrases like 'as far as I know'. As far as I know the NDP stand on both sides of the NATO question. As far as I know they stand on both sides of the sealing question. As far as I know they stand on both sides of the Greenpeace question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by their contributions, the NDPers in Ottawa have regularly contributed to the Greenpeace assault on the decency of Newfoundlanders and have gone around this world telling the world what a great bunch of barbarians they are out there because they go out and earn a livelihood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

The NDP is paying for it!

MR. SIMMONS:

The NDP is paying for that.

MR. SIMMS:

Shocking!

MR. SIMMONS:

And now, Mr. Speaker, because it is convenient, they are going to

draw some lines. Yes, I guess they are going to draw lines and I submit they are very fine lines they are drawing, the one they are trying to draw on NATO, the one they have drawn on the seal fishery here in that resolution, which itself is a bit of pandering. Welcome to the eighties. In 1987 they finally discover that fishermen ought to be able to establish a viable sealing industry. Well, I say to the NDP that but for the NDP's aiding and abetting of the Greenpeacers, we would not be here in 1987 trying to establish it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
We would not be trying to establish it. We would have been preserving a long-standing tradition and an economic activity that has gone on in this country for centuries. It only got sabotaged because a bunch of do-gooders - that is not even the real term - a bunch of stary-eyed loonies who wanted to solve somebody's problems far from home, instead of going back home and cleaning up their own dirt, interferred.

I remember being in St. Anthony and I am going to mention the name of a gentleman who is not here, but I will mention it in positive context, John Lundrigan was then the Minister for Development. I was in the hotel room together with Mr. Bill Rowe and Mr. Bill Rompkey and a number of others when he talked to two men, two men who had come up from he States to tell us how to solve our problems, a congressman -

MR. W. CARTER:
Senator Ryan.

MR. SIMMONS:
Congressman Ryan, and a congressman from Vermont. I forget his name now. But I remember that meeting and the Greenpeace element was there then with their bleeding hearts and their inviting pocketbooks.

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

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

MR. FENWICK:
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, was that that lie was repeated in the last election. Mr. Green, the news editor of the radio station in Corner Brook called Greenpeace, asked about the membership list, and found indeed he was not a member.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Cool him down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Why? If he is going to lie, I may as well at least tell someone that he is lying.

MR. BARRY:
Retract that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I think the hon. member realizes

that is not a point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the discomfort of the hon. gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). Pickets are a discomfoting and uncomfotable thing to sit on. It is very uncomfotable.

MR. LONG:

Find something to talk about or sit down out of it.

MR. SIMMONS:

We have found some to talk about.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

We found your duplicity, we found your hypocrisy to talk about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, not to interrupt the hon. member, who is now in full flight, but, as one individual member of this House, I distinctly heard the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) call the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) a liar. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is truly unparliamentary. The hon. gentleman who purportedly leads a party in this House should be forced to withdraw that remark.

MR. BUTT:

Do the honourable thing.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have no doubt that if Mr. Speaker had heard that intervention he would have himself intervened. So the best he can do, I am sure at this point, is to check Hansard. I will not be upset if people call me a liar because I say some things they do not like. I did not stand here to be liked by the gentleman for Menihek. I stood here to call his bluff on a number of important issues. Before I was interrupted I was describing a very -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I did not hear the hon. member's comment. I will certainly check Hansard and see what exactly was said.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now I say to my friend on the other side of the House, if he withdrew, what would it mean? He would then, probably the next day, not withdraw because he has to be consistent on this issue too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

He has to be on both sides of all of the issues, you understand.

Mr. Speaker, that day and that night in that hotel room in St. Anthony with the individuals I have mentioned, the gentleman, Mr. Ryan, who, as you know, met a very tragic end soon after, and I do not mention him in that particular context, but I mention him in the context of a representative of this government, Mr. Lundrigan saying to him basically, but in much more choice language, 'Why do you not go home? Why are you always interfering in other peoples' problems? One of those days you are going to interfere once too often.' Now I do not place a judgment in terms of whether he did interfere once too often. I do not say that. But I remember that moment, and I will never forget it, because that was the whole message that people, including the NDP and all of us, should have been saying to the Greenpeacers. 'If you have so much energy to give, why do you not give it where you understand the problem?'

Instead of that, they came into another culture, they came into a way of life that we have had for centuries and with their bleeding hearts and their inviting pocketbooks, and I suspect more of the latter than the former, a bunch of mercenary loonies were aided and abetted by the party that has a position.

Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa, and this goes back well before we had an NDP member, the member for Menihek or the member for St. John's East, there was such a thing as an Ed Broadbent suit. Now, the Ed Broadbent suit was a very special kind of suit. There was a pocket here on the inside and in it you would have a position on a particular issue, and there was a pocket on this side of the suit

and in it, of course, you also had a position on the same issue and that kind of hypocrisy, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is Greenpeace, whether it is the seal fishery, whether it is NATO, if it is practiced in this House is going to be jumped every time it is practiced. I give you notice, it is going to be jumped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentlemen on the other side of the House and the gentlemen on this side of the House are in disagreement on many, many things, and so we will be, and that is why we sit in different parts of this Chamber, but without getting too heavy on this, Mr. Speaker, the basic rule here has got to be that a man is prepared to stand for something or he is going to fall for everything.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Brilliant! Brilliant!

MR. SIMMONS:

Not terribly brilliant, but it needs to be said when you see two men so sadly prostrating themselves on so many issues.

MR. FUREY:

That is another way of putting it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Torngat (Mr. Warren) is going to rise in a minute and conclude the debate on this particular issue. We support his initiative in calling for a seal harvesting programme. We ask him to note the caveats I mentioned above, at the beginning of my conversation, but that is not intended in any way to subtract from the spirit of what he has done today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I stand and support my friend, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains, and also my hon. friends from this side of the House and from that side of the House. It was certainly articulated well and I see no reason why I should go any further into the guts of that resolution.

Although I have laryngitis, I felt it my duty to tell those people in the House, some of the younger people at least, some of the history of the fishery which we lost because we did not fight well enough to contain or sustain it.

Mr. Speaker, I remember, in Flatrock, my father who spent thirty Springs at the ice, and I remember, in Flatrock, my mother making bread for those men to take to the ice. There was no soft bread, it was hard tack, as they called it. And they made cakes with a lot of molassas in them. Do you know why? The molassas was there so the cakes would not freeze. They worked hard, but they endured it. They did not do it because of history or because of just being out there, they did it because it augmented their livelihood, their income, they did it because it was their right to do, and no one had a right to take that right away.

I can remember sitting on the side of the road out in an outport and

listening to a bunch of men talk. One of the men would say, 'So and so said this,' and this old fellow would say, 'How does he know? He was never to the ice.' It was a teaching. It was a theory. It was everything that Newfoundlanders envisaged, and Labradorians. It was part of their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, there was no subsidy then. There was nothing. They had to go to earn money. I suppose every family in Newfoundland in some way or another can associate itself with some disaster or other.

We all know of The Viking disaster, and the Newfoundland disaster. I lost two uncles, before my time, just off here, again seal hunting. What I am saying is every Newfoundlander can associate himself with some part of that industry. I watched an old gentleman from the Viking disaster being interviewed on television a few nights ago and I was amazed at the interviewer. When the gentleman said that possibly the cause of the disaster was dynamiting - I often heard that word used. I often heard the old people years ago say 'dynamiting'- when the interview was over, in assessing the whole situation the interviewer said - I do not know if she meant it or not but it was in poor taste anyway - she said that possibly the cause was - with a smile on her face - 'dynamite, ignorance.' That gentleman articulated well all the activities on that ship, The Viking.

Mr. Speaker, I know I do not have much time, but remember I said when I started off that people who did not go to the ice were sort of left out in the cold. Everyone,

as far as the old fellows thought, should go to the ice and in 1950, Mr. Speaker, yours truly, went.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am really delighted and proud to say we made one of the fastest trips ever made in the country. The ship's name was the Algerine and we had 31,386 pelts and we made \$85.36. It was not a great lot of money but it was a help. I went because I wanted to earn extra money and because I thought it was my right, and I exercised that right. Needless to say, I am amazed to see some of the cheap stuff that comes across the television or other media when it concerns our fishery. It is a part of our fishery. I agree with my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and all other members of this House, that we are not strong enough. We have to call on governments to come out and tell those protestors, Look, mind your own business. Those people talk about fur coats and little seals crying just to take advantage of poor people. That guy Davies had nothing, and now he is flying around in his private jet at the expense of the poor people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think it is a crime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. PARSONS:

I would like to comment on what my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) said about the organs of the seals. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that that is a truth and it is not only now it is happening, it happened years ago. I have, in my experience, seen old seals, what we call old harps - old harps mostly, hoods very seldom - being left on the ice not pelted but their organs removed for their monetary value. Mr. Speaker, in saying that I wholeheartedly support all members of this House in saying that this resolution will do something to make people understand the plight of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say to the hon. member for Twillingate, to my colleagues who spoke, and to the hon. member for St. John's East, that it is great to see such rousing support for such a very vital resolution. I do, in all honesty, trust the comments that I heard from both sides. I have to say to my friend from St. John's East that I have a copy of your resolution here, Sir, and I also have here a copy of a resolution that was passed unanimously in this House some time ago by all hon. members, including the Leader of the NDP, and then all of a sudden yesterday he would not support the same resolution. So I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, trust

what the two hon. gentlemen say one day, when the next day, like the hands of a clock, they turn 360 degrees. Mr. Speaker, the problem with the NDP in our Province is that they take their orders from Up-along.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

They are not run by the New Democratic Party of the Province, they are run by Central Canada. That is who they are run by, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that the hon. gentlemen think of what Newfoundlanders and Labradorians want, not what people in Ontario want. This is what you have to think about when you stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker.

You know, a while ago Bob Barker refused to host the Miss Teen USA pageant if the contestants wore fur coats. They were not able to wear seal fur, they were not allowed to wear any furs to this Miss Teen USA pageant. Now, Mr. Speaker, he is a person who is an announcer, an entertainer, and everything else, and it is coming out in our papers and on the electronic media that this was the only condition under which Bob Barker would host the the Miss Teen USA pageant, that the contestants not be allowed to wear furs. Now, people like Mr. Barker and Greenpeace have destroyed our sealing industry.

I would like to say before I close that in my district there is only one industry which basically depends on the cod fishery, the salmon fishery, and the char fishery. The fishery is our only industry. Now if we are not careful, and if we do not take the bull by the horns, the seals are

going to kill this industry in my district, as well as in the other districts, but in my district in particular, and in Eagle River, the two Labrador districts, an industry we are dependent on because of the geography and everything else, and the lack of other employment opportunities.

So I would say to my two hon. colleagues, when you go this evening, please do not bother to call Ed Broadbent and ask him if you did the right thing today.

MR. SIMMS:

Or Bob White.

MR. WARREN:

Or Bob White, or anybody else like that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Richard Cashin.

MR. WARREN:

No, with all due respect to Richard Cashin, I would say that he does have some sympathy for the fishermen, although I do not know what the consequences will be of joining the fishermen with the Auto Workers.

MR. SIMMS:

More money for the NDP, you see.

MR. WARREN:

It is also interesting to note that this guy by the name of Franz Weber - I am sure we all know Franz Weber. I am sure my hon. colleagues must remember him - was going to start a synthetic fur industry. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that that man is under full investigation for spending dollars and dollars and dollars that did not belong to him? He took the money and ran off.

I remember a year ago, just before

last Christmas - not this Christmas past but last Christmas - I picked up one of the papers in Ottawa and in it was an advertisement announcing that Cuddles was going to be on store shelves as a nice Christmas toy and the proceeds were going to Greenpeace. I think my hon. colleague for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said tonight that there is a connection between the NDP and Greenpeace. There has been a connection, and I would challenge my hon. colleagues from St. John's East and Menihek -

MR. LONG:

You do not want an answer to that.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to pardon the young chick's interruption because I am sure the young gentleman does not even know he is in the House yet. He does not even know he is here yet. He does not even know what he is here for. That is one thing for sure, he does not know what he is here for. Mr. Speaker, I would say to him, maybe some of your constituents, in all due respect to their beliefs, may not believe in the seal fishery. I could tell him that if he wants to make headway in his political career, if he wants to continue to be in this House, he better speak up for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, not for a minority group of people who think they are going to run this Province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on any longer because I think everybody has said enough. However, in closing I want to read to the House what Patricia Grant of the World Animal Welfare Group had to say. She said, "We will not stop campaigning until we have washed the blood from your hands...we are not asking for

money. We are asking for mercy - mercy for the seals whose only crime is being born with a fur coat."

I want to say to Patricia Grant that I will not stop campaigning for justice for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am asking for mercy...mercy for the people in my district, and in your districts, whose only crime is being born in this Province of ours and having to earn with the sweat of their brow a decent living for their families.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

My friend, those people are crying for our help, our help as politicians in Newfoundland and Labrador. They are crying for us to help save their livelihood. Gentlemen, and the NDP, too, let us not let them down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

On motion, the resolution was carried unanimously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Divide.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion
please rise:

The hon. the Minister of
Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the
hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms
Verge); the hon. the Minister of
Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon.
the Minister of Mines and Housing
(Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister
of Consumer Affairs and
Communications (Mr. Russell); the
hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr.
Collins); the hon. the Minister of
Forest Resources and Lands (Mr.
Simms); the hon. the Minister of
Public Works and Services (Mr.
Young); the hon. the Minister of
Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr.
Matthews); the hon. the Minister
of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon.
the Minister of Environment (Mr.
Butt); the hon. the Minister of
Rural, Agricultural and Northern
Development (Mr. R. Aylward); the
hon. the Minister of Social
Services (Mr. Brett); Mr. Baird;
Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; Mr.
Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Warren;
Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; the
hon. the Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Barry); Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk;
Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. K.
Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Baker;
Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr.
Fenwick; Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The motion is carried unanimously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The House now stands adjourned
until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

March 18, 1987