



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FORTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume XLVII

SECOND SESSION

Number 28

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Ross Wiseman, MHA

Wednesday

13 November 2013

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Wiseman): Order, please!

Admit strangers.

Statements by Members

MR. SPEAKER: Today we will have members' statement from: the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis; the Member for the District of Signal Hill – Quidi Vidi; the Member for the District of The Straits – White Bay North; the Member for the District of St. John's East; the Member for the District of St. John's South; and the Member for the District of Burgeo – La Poile.

The hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I rise in this hon. House today to congratulate Jack and Elizabeth Hogan and their family on the fiftieth anniversary of their business, District Drugs.

On June 17 way back in 1963, in the Town of Torbay, the doors of District Drugs opened and an important part of the area was established.

Mr. Speaker, it is sure to be said that not many businesses have put back into their community as District Drugs have. Whether it has been sports teams, school trips, school fundraising, or any group or persons needing assistance, the Hogan family was always first to come forward and help.

District Drugs has changed its appearance over the years from a small store with an apartment at the top. Today, it is a beautiful building that houses many different businesses including a doctor's office, a large store and pharmacy; however, District Drugs still maintains its great service that people have become accustomed to. They have great staff and the business continues to be operated by family members.

On behalf of all the people in my district I would like to thank and congratulate Jack and Elizabeth Hogan for fifty years of business in the district, and I ask all hon. members to join with me in congratulating the Hogan family for fifty years of success in business and serving the people of the Torbay area.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Signal Hill – Quidi Vidi.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I stand today to congratulate CUPE on the fiftieth anniversary. The Canadian Union of Public Employees is Canada's largest union with over 627,000 members across the country, and over 6,000 here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

CUPE members serve their fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians every day. They work in our public system – in health care, education, public housing, provincial libraries, municipalities, the university, in child care, social services and more.

Through their advocacy work for programs that improve the lives of everyone in the community, such as universal child care and an improved Canada Pension Plan, CUPE has proven that unions stand for social justice. Their commitment is to work for a society where everyone is taken care of.

By striving for good working conditions for their members, unions like CUPE improve working conditions for all workers. The labour rights that workers enjoy are there because of the work of CUPE and the labour movement.

Here is to fifty years of fair representation and improvements for everyone working in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I ask all hon. members to join me in congratulating CUPE, their members, and all

workers who labour for a more fair and just world.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for The Straits – White Bay North.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to recognize Korean War Veteran, Mr. Frank Slade, who was honoured at the 2013 Remembrance Day Ceremonies in St. Anthony deemed year of Korean War Veterans.

Mr. Slade, Paratrooper with Royal Canadian Regiment 2nd Battalion, served in the Korean and German wars. He participated in the only jump made by Canadians in the Korean War defending the Pintail Bridge. He is also credited with saving a Korean child who lost both legs and an eye in a mortar explosion. Frank received numerous service medals, including Ambassador's Korean War Service Medal this past Memorial Day.

Mr. Slade served eighteen years with Canadian Rangers, holding ranks as Lieutenant and District Commander from St. Anthony to Flower's Cove.

Mr. Jamie Bussey of St. Anthony Canadian Rangers told Slade's story to Sgt. Rude with the Gander 5th Canadian Ranger Patrol. In turn, Rude arranged Cpl Marquardt, Cpl Sanchez-Groleau and Pte Broden Kelly 3rd Battalion, Royal Canadian Regiment, Petawawa to march alongside Mr. Slade and present a plaque to honour his service with the Regiment.

"It has made my week and a Remembrance Day I'll never forget", said Mr. Slade.

I ask all hon. members to join me in recognizing the contributions of veteran Frank Slade.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the thirty-four young people from Gonzaga and Holy Heart High Schools who attended the ceremony this June recognizing a big achievement in their lives.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award is a challenging program that encourages youth to reach their full potential in several areas: fitness, community service, and developing skills. To receive the gold award, the highest level, they must complete a series of outdoor challenges and spend five days and four nights away from home working with people they have never met before.

While the award itself can only be presented by a member of the royal family, I had the privilege of attending and speaking at a ceremony honouring these young people and their achievement last June.

Also recognized that day were the volunteers who helped make the program the success that it was at Gonzaga High School. Three of them – Don Burrage, Don Ryplen, and Janet Ryplen – received ten-year service awards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. members to join me in congratulating these Duke of Edinburgh Award recipients, and the parents and volunteers who helped them get there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to recognize the Fieldians Athletic Association boys' under fourteen soccer team. They are the provincial champs and represented Newfoundland and Labrador at the Club

Nationals in Lethbridge, Alberta. The team finished with a 2-2-1 record.

Our Province was represented well; the National Golden Boot Award was presented to Emmanuel Dolo of our Province who was the top goal scorer in the tournament with seventeen goals in five games. The National Fair Play Award was presented to our Province as well.

The team members are: Daniel McCarthy, Evan Bursey, Stephen Haring, Seth Bryant, Morgan Cole, Marcus Greene, Emmanuel Dolo, Matthew McCarthy, Dean Turpin, Saul Bryant, Tristan Wawrzakow, Ryan Connors, Jordan Robbins, Thomas Osmond, Felly Elonda, David Goudling, and Joshua Taylor; the head coach was Ian Osmond, the assistant coach was John Acreman, and the manager was Hugo McCarthy.

I ask all members to recognize the team for making us proud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. A. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to pay tribute to Tyler LeFrense of Isle aux Morts, who was the recent grand prize winner of Lay's Do Us a Flavour contest.

Tyler's moose and maple syrup combination won the nation-wide contest to develop a new flavour of Lay's potato chips. He got the idea while cooking maple ham one day, and tried the same with moose meat.

The online and texting voting process for the favourite finalist flavour began on July 30, 2013 and ended on October 16, 2013. Tyler's unique flavour beat out other top entries from across Canada and he won a \$50,000 grand prize plus 1 per cent of the overall sales of the chips as long as they are sold.

Tyler is the son of Calvin and Linda LeFrense of Isle aux Morts and he has a three-year-old daughter, Erin. He was recently elected Deputy

Mayor of Isle aux Morts and is a member of the community centre committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of this House to join with me in paying tribute to Tyler LeFrense, one of our own, who has done us all proud. Way to go, Tyler!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I want to, at this point, acknowledge a special guest in the gallery this evening, Major Lorne Pritchett of the Salvation Army.

Welcome to our gallery, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FRENCH: Mr. Speaker, for more than twenty years, Music Newfoundland and Labrador has played a significant role in supporting and encouraging musicians in this Province. On Sunday evening, I had the opportunity to attend their 2013 awards gala in Gander, an event which was the culmination of a week of workshops, roundtable discussions, songwriters' circles and other activities dedicated to musical artists in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some of the awards presented this year include The Once, as Entertainer of the Year, while Ennis received the FACTOR Album of the Year and Canadian AV Group of the Year. Amelia Curran received SOCAN Songwriter of the Year, and Folk/Roots Artist/Group of the Year. Some of the genre specific awards presented included the Idlers, as Alternative Artist or Group of the Year, and RocketRocketShip as Pop/Rock Artist/Group of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I had the distinguished pleasure of presenting the Lifetime Achievement Award to Maxine Stanley of Grand Falls-Windsor at the gala awards. Ms Stanley was honoured for a lifetime dedicated to advancing the arts, particularly choral music, in the Province. She has conducted the Bel Canto Singers for more than thirty years and has served on the board of directors of numerous arts and culture-based institutions, such as the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, and The Rooms. The Lifetime Achievement Award is a wonderful means by which we can celebrate the outstanding contributions of leaders such as Ms Stanley who have contributed tremendously to the Newfoundland and Labrador music community.

The amount of musical talent in Newfoundland and Labrador, both established and emerging, is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, and opportunities to showcase this talent, such as Music NL's conference and awards gala is certainly very important. Music artists are provided with the opportunity to work with industry professionals, hone their skills and learn how to successfully promote their music. At the same time, the public is given an opportunity to get a peek at some of our most promising rising stars – which I have to say, Mr. Speaker, was one of the things that certainly blew me away at that conference this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, our Province's music sector is an important contributor to our cultural industries, and our government is proud to support MusicNL with \$350,000 annually. Since the launch of Creative Newfoundland and Labrador, our government has also invested \$87 million through the plan to promote culture and heritage, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FRENCH: Undoubtedly, these investments have contributed to the outstanding performances by artists of all genres and sectors within our cultural community.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement today. We also on this side would like to congratulate Music Newfoundland and Labrador for another successful weekend. There is no doubt that there is a lot of great talent in Newfoundland and Labrador. These types of events help the more experienced to mentor the younger and the rookies coming on the scene. It is great to see that the artists in Newfoundland and Labrador are being recognized and it is growing on an annual basis.

Congratulations to all the winners at the awards last weekend, also to Ms Stanley for the Lifetime Achievement. I always said before and I have said in this House, there is no better recognition than when you are being recognized by your fellows. To receive this award is a great achievement, and to be recognized by your fellow artists is even greater because they understand the contribution that you made.

To all the groups, congratulations, and I say to the government, yes, it is great that you are putting money into this type of achievement. The minister made the statement that these investments have contributed to the outstanding performances of the artist. I feel that they have made some, but I think these artists would make an outstanding performance with or without it because they are great musicians on their own. Congratulations to all and congratulations to the minister for presenting that award to Ms Stanley because it is well deserved.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's Centre.

MS ROGERS: I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement. Congratulations

to Maxine Stanley, Ennis, RocketRocketShip, the Idlers, Amelia Curran, The Once, MusicNL, and all the musicians who have shared their brilliance with us.

While government congratulates itself for supporting the arts, I would remind them that they cancelled the school Visiting Artist Program, a program that is so vital to young people who dare to think of a career in the arts. Many of these winners were inspired by musicians who visited their schools and have now gone on to be visiting artists themselves.

I urge government to reinstate funding for this very important program. Bravo to all the musicians and to MusicNL.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member for St. John's North have leave?

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's North.

MR. KIRBY: Thank you for the advance copy of the statement. I say to the minister it is important to celebrate all of our music industry talent. There is no question that the Cultural Connections program does expose Newfoundland and Labrador students to music, art, culture, history and heritage. I would strongly recommend that government reinstate funding for that program with the next Budget.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister Responsible for the Office of Climate Change, Energy Efficiency and Emissions Trading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS SHEA: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to update this hon. House on the progress made in implementing the 2011 Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Action Plans.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is one of the greatest long-term challenges facing the planet. All jurisdictions must be part of the solution, and I proud Newfoundland and Labrador is committed to pursuing an environmental sound and economically prudent path. These action plans are a key part of achieving this balance.

Mr. Speaker, this year our Province is leading the country in economic growth. We are achieving this while advancing action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by working with large industrial companies in the iron ore and offshore oil sectors.

We are working to increase the energy efficiency of our homes and buildings and now require new homes to meet energy-efficient standards. We have launched a guide to help homeowners, builders, and municipalities make this happen.

Our government is leading by example with a policy stating all buildings receiving provincial funding must be built sustainably. As a result, City Hall in Corner Brook and Nalcor's new employee residence in Churchill Falls has silver certification under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design rating system.

Mr. Speaker, we are playing our part to tackle climate change, but some impacts are now unavoidable. That is why our government has worked with researchers at Memorial University to better understand the coming changes and we share that information with decision-makers in business and communities.

Our public awareness campaign on climate change – Turn Back the Tide – has seen great success with 36,000 visits to its Web site alone, not to mention widespread television and print ad exposure.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a brief overview of some of the important work completed to date. I

look forward to keeping you updated on the next phase of our implementation plans.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for a copy of her statement in advance. Climate change is real and our Province has to be prepared, and that is why adaptation planning is so important.

The minister mentioned in her statement working with researchers at Memorial University to better understand the coming changes and to inform decision-making, but it was just last week that we discovered that government was sitting on a coastal erosion report for two-and-a-half years, a report that says 250 of our communities are at high risk of coastal erosion. On top of that, there was no inventory work completed in Labrador, while experts tell us that the Northern regions will be impacted the most.

Mr. Speaker, last week while I was asking the minister about coastal erosion, she was answering with emissions. One thing you need to do in order to take effective action on climate change is to understand climate change, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the advance copy of the statement from the minister today.

Particularly evident over the last couple of days are the effects of climate change, of course, is the situation that is happening in the Philippines right now. I have been in communication with

the Philippine community here and they are absolutely devastated by the damage that is done over there. So we have to be particularly aware, being a coastal nation as well, as regards to the effects of climate change.

I would also like to tell the minister that she also has some other issues that are coming upfront, namely fracking. Fracking has to do with all kinds of emissions as well. There are verging issues that are here on the government's plate and hopefully she will deal with them on a timely basis as well, Mr. Speaker. As well, just to remind her, too, this government also practiced a policy whereby they cut the Residential Energy Efficiency Programming here that cut out a lot of people from helping impact climate change.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member for The Straits – White Bay North have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for The Straits – White Bay North.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of her statement.

Just a couple of suggestions; I think government should look at adopting smart home technology like used in some European utilities where credits are offered to encourage using appliances, like dryers at night, in periods of low demand and to maybe see an energy efficiency program that will benefit non-profits as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker, government wants to debate a CETA deal this afternoon but the Premier still has not honoured her commitment to table the documents on the deal.

I ask the Premier: How can you expect us to debate this motion when you have yet to release any information, which you committed to personally?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the CETA deal, one that we approach very cautiously as a Province because we are not a great exporter beyond oil and fish. We felt we might be in a precarious position with regard to these negotiations. Because of the fine work of the negotiating team and the direction they receive, the CETA negotiations have turned out to be extremely successful for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are very proud of that, Mr. Speaker.

In my remarks with regard to the negotiations around the CETA deal, Mr. Speaker, I did make a commitment to table in this House our correspondence with the federal government with regard to the negotiations of the CETA deal, and I will keep that commitment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JOYCE: I say to the Premier, it is too bad we could not have it to have an informed discussion today. The last time we took your word on something without having the documentation it cost \$200 million for the Grand

Falls mill. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Premier guards her precious, secret vault.

I ask the Premier: Will she tell the people of this Province how this \$400 million fund will be allocated? Will it be allocated to research? How much to marketing? Finally, how many job losses, as confirmed by the federal trades minister but denied by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have a CETA Agreement-in-principle between Canada and the European Union which now has to be translated into legal documents and come into effect, hopefully, within a two-year period. As part of that negotiation, Mr. Speaker, we were also able to negotiate with the federal government a \$400 million fund for our fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Mr. Speaker, we cannot find any evidence of any investment into the fishery previous to this greater than \$60 million. Often those investments were described as palliative care for a fishery that was dying. This is a fishery that will thrive and grow because of this new investment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JOYCE: I am glad our Premier finally admitted that there are no details on this agreement because of negotiations for the next two years.

I ask the Premier; since the Premier is still keeping the terms of this deal secret, I ask one pointed question: Under CETA, will fish that is caught off our shores still have to be required to be landed in our Province?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, any fish that is offshore is regulated by the federal government. Right now, any fish that is landed onshore will be processed onshore.

As the Premier mentioned, CETA, in terms of the fishery, is a game changer for us. It is a \$400 million package that for a billion dollar industry it is unprecedented. For a billion dollar industry we are going to invest \$400 million. The federal government and the Province, this Party, this government believes in it. We are not sure what the other sides believe in, but we believe in the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and the opportunities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for the District of Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The federal Finance minister said yesterday that Ottawa is open to discussing a potential sale of their 8.5 per cent Hibernia share. This is welcomed news to this side of the House.

So I ask the Premier: Can you provide any further details on this, such as the status of the talks with the federal government and what would be the price range for this potential sale?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this government has stated publicly a number of times, and in this House a number

of times, that we are very interested in purchasing the equity stake that is held by the federal government. In fact, we have made several bids for the stake. The negotiations were not successful up to this point.

We are very glad to hear the Finance Minister say they are prepared to open discussions again. We will enter into that discussion. Our primary mandate, as it is with everything else, will be to do what is in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for the District of Humber Valley.

MR. BALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Part two of the federal government's profit from Hibernia comes from the 10 per cent net profits interest. Back in 2007, the former Premier said that this was really a royalty regime on the provincial resource and should be provincial revenue.

I ask the Premier: Is the Province still interested in obtaining the federal government's 10 per cent net profits interest, and is this part of this discussion?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are interested in the whole package or part of the package, whatever the federal government is prepared to put on the table, if it is at fair market value. So the product has to be valued properly in the same way that these kinds of things are done throughout the industry. If the price is fair and the return is going to be good for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, we are very interested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. BALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is now clear that, under the Muskrat Falls Project, Nalcor plans to build more wind and more hydro plants in our Province to satisfy the needs of Nova Scotia.

I ask the Premier: Why are these additional plans not reviewed by your consultant Manitoba Hydro as part of the Muskrat Falls Project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, building more wind and small hydro is not a part of the agreements with Nova Scotia. Nalcor has always stated that we are going to develop Muskrat Falls for the interest of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. We are going to have an opportunity to have a least-cost option and to lower the utility rates in this Province, but at the same time we are going to have excess power that we are going to be able to sell and make money for the people of the Province.

I suspect from the continuous questioning, Mr. Speaker, they would prefer we just flow that and not deal with Nova Scotia. Let the water flow. We are going to sell that excess power to Nova Scotia. Nalcor has always said and we believe that when we get to a point in this Province where we use all of our energy, we use it for industrial development, commercial needs as well as our residential needs, we will build more. We will do what we have to do because it is for the best interests of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for the District of Humber Valley.

MR. BALL: I ask the minister the question; you just said it was for the best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Do you plan to build more wind power and more hydro plants to meet the condition in the UARB that has been said in the media already? Will you build those plants?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are not entering into contracts or making agreements that we cannot keep. We know that we have a firm power supply to meet the needs of the people of the Province. We know we have excess power that we can recall at any time but we are going to sell and make money for the Province.

Mr. Speaker, beyond that we have non-firm power which, due to accumulation of rain and snow in this Province, we are going to have excess power. Power which we want to sell to make money; power which our critics in the Opposition said there is no market for. There is a market. The market happened to be in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker. They want access to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are going to sell that power; we have that power. The only way we are not going to have it is if it does not rain or snow for twenty-four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. BALL: I will tell you about excess power. The minister has said that building additional plants will only be required if the capacity at Muskrat Falls is used. The minister's own mining report says that all the capacity at Muskrat Falls will be needed by when – 2020.

I ask the minister: Do you still believe your own mining report that was just released last year, or are you giving up on the mining industry in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, what we are developing – there are two fundamental principles; it is about Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and our needs, and we are committed to meet that need; secondly, that we are not subsidizing power going into Nova Scotia. We are not building power at the expense of Newfoundland and Labrador and send it into Nova Scotia for free.

What we are committing to is that we will meet the needs of this Province. We believe through Muskrat Falls, Mr. Speaker, we can do that, and any excess power we will sell and enter into agreements to make money for the Province.

We retain the right to recall the power, to use the power as we need it, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you, it is going to be a great day in this Province if we get to the point where we have to use all of our power and have to create more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 2013 the former Minister of Fisheries said that his government had conducted investigations into forty on land aquaculture sites and they proved to be uneconomically viable. I did an ATIPP request just to check the facts of the minister, and the deputy minister came back in August and said they had done no such research.

Yesterday, the former minister again repeated what he had said in May, that they had done research and (inaudible) that they were not economically viable.

I ask the current Minister of Fisheries and Aquaculture: Has your government done any research into onshore aquaculture to determine economic viability; and, if so, will you provide us with those reports?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on land aquaculture, we have done some analysis in terms of the cost of that, in terms of energy, in terms of growing those fish in pens on land. We have known from other jurisdictions and around the world some discussions on that. It is not economically viable.

We know the industry we have on the South Coast and how it is growing. It was \$110 million two years ago, \$120 million last year; this year, it is expected to be \$180 million. It is a growing industry; 1,000 people employed. That is not including the supply chain that supplies that industry. It is an industry that is working, it is growing on the South Coast, it is in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, we support it and we are going to continue to grow it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, if the minister has done any such research, then I will ask him to supply the results of that research.

In May 2013 the Province of Nova Scotia put in place a regulatory panel headed by two environmental law experts to balance the opposing interests in aquaculture and to ensure their province has a more environmentally, socially, and economically sustainable aquaculture industry.

I ask the minister: Will his government show similar leadership and appoint an independent

panel to help government do what is best for our Province?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HUTCHINGS: Mr. Speaker, over the last number of years, we continue to grow our industry. We are moving forward with a bay management plan now. We have consulted with industry, with the industry groups. We have gone back to them with the details of that. We expect to have that signed off later in the year.

In addition, in 2010 I believe, the Veterinary College in Prince Edward Island did an evaluation of the protocols for biosecurity, compared New Brunswick, British Columbia, Newfoundland and Labrador and found Newfoundland and Labrador certainly led the way in biosecurity.

Together, we are working with industry, working with the players, continuing to build an industry in the Province that is leading the way. We are proud of it, it is doing well, and we are going to continue to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, the RNC is concerned about rising violence in the St. John's area, with many of the recent homicides as a result of domestic violence. Budget 2013 cut the Family Violence Intervention Court. The Minister of Justice called it a dollar-and-cents decision and not a priority with the Budget.

I ask the minister: Given the RNC's concerns, will you re-establish the Family Violence Intervention Court?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Everyone in this House takes very seriously the work that our police force do in the administration of justice in this Province – the RNC and the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to police Chief Johnston, and I know with the Commissioner of the RCMP as well – I know the Minister of Justice meets with them periodically to ensure that they have all the resources they need to carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, since 2004 this government has put \$920 million into policing in this Province –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: – including an additional 144 police officers, an additional forty-eight support staff, and we will continue to work with the police to ensure that they have the resources they need (inaudible) –

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I would say, actually, the funding to the RCMP was cut by over \$2 million last year.

We also know the rise in violent crime is related to addictions issues. The 2011 PC Bluebook committed to establishing a drug treatment court. Two years later, no funds have been allocated to this desperately needed court.

So I ask the minister: When will you implement this much needed service for the people with addictions?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, no government in the history of this Province has put more money into the administration of justice in this Province, and all aspects of the system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We started off when we came into office and we found the justice system in an absolute mess. We had to start off with policing, we had to add prosecutors, we had to add Legal Aid lawyers, and we had to improve Victim Services and probation. Mr. Speaker, we have done that, the facts speak for themselves, and we will continue to do so.

Just last week, I think, a new joint police force was set up in Central Newfoundland that will improve investigation of serious crime in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting now reports from Leigh DesRoches on the Sheriff's Office, and John Rorke on the Legal Aid, so that we will continue to put more services and more resources to enhance the administration of justice in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. A. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess that is no to both questions.

On June 20, 2012 in this House the Minister of Health and Community Services said they were very close to finalizing a paid family caregiver program, and that it would be announced very, very soon. That was seventeen months ago.

I ask the minister: Will you announce details on the paid family caregiver pilot project by Christmas of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today's announcement on a new ferry is good news for Fogo and Change Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OSBORNE: However, Mr. Speaker, the announcement falls short of government's replacement strategy, which envisioned ten ferries built in Newfoundland and Labrador. We have seen large-scale projects at Bull Arm for the oil industry where components were built right here.

Why did government not ensure that components of these ferries would be built in Newfoundland and Labrador?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It certainly is a great day for the ferry system in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCGRATH: Mr. Speaker, when we were making the choices as to where the ferry would be built there were four things we took into consideration: number one was capacity, number two time frames, number three was the price, of course, and number four was technology.

Damen Shipyards came in acing all four of those components.

We looked at having the ships built in Canada, or components of, and the price factor went up quite a bit. In negotiating with Damen, what we have done now is we have secured a new company that wants to come into Atlantic Canada, specifically Newfoundland and Labrador, to open an industry and to build new industry in –

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister saying they are going to open a shipyard here?

Mr. Speaker, we have developed a very skilled workforce, building components for oil platforms. Damen shipbuilding has confirmed that the ferry will be built in the Netherlands or Romania. There are still six months before the engineering work is complete. You still have time, I say to the minister, to ensure that Damen shipbuilding uses all available provincial resources when constructing these ferries, including having components build right here.

Will you ensure they do that?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, and if the member opposite had listened carefully to what the representative from Damen Shipyards commented today, they are very interested in increasing their capacity in Newfoundland and Labrador and working with Newfoundlanders

and Labradorians to ensure that in the future components of the ships and future ships will be built here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

MS DEMPSTER: Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting for the RFP for replacement of two Labrador ferries, the *Apollo* and the *Northern Ranger*. Today's announcement of two Island-based vessels with delivery dates of 2015 and 2016 comes after a lengthy RFP process.

I ask the minister: Can you also guarantee the people of Labrador two new replacement vessels for the *Apollo* and the *Northern Ranger* by 2016 as committed?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, shame on the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair for separating Newfoundland and Labrador. Many of us on this side of government have been too long trying to make sure that it is recognized as one Province, Newfoundland and Labrador; so shame on the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MCGRATH: Mr. Speaker, we are working very hard on working on the RFP to have the ferries replaced in Labrador. Right now, we are hoping that by 2016 those ferries will be replaced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

MS DEMPSTER: Mr. Speaker, I must watch the news too much and all the talk of the Island owning Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, traffic on the *Apollo* has already exceeded capacity, and based on the past two seasons the reliability of the *Northern Ranger* is very poor.

I ask the minister: Knowing that 2016 is no longer realistic for two new replacement vessels, what contingency plan is in place to ensure Labrador has the same quality of service as the Island, since we are the same Province?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated to the member opposite in the past few days here in the House of Assembly, we are working diligently to have an RFP out at the end of this year, and we do have a contingency plan in place. Perhaps the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair should consider the \$450 million that was invested into the Trans-Labrador Highway by this government to improve transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS DEMPSTER: Mr. Speaker, Nalcor, contractors, and the unions are all giving different stories on why Newfoundlanders and Labradorians cannot get work at Muskrat Falls.

I ask the Premier: Why is there no consistency in hiring on this project, and who has the ultimate responsibility to ensure that the benefit plan is followed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Mr. Speaker, consistency is something we should all strive for, particularly in this House.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, we heard the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair talk about the fact that people in her district could not get jobs on Muskrat Falls, almost in the same breath she spoke about the fact that small business could not hire people in her district because they had to compete with Muskrat Falls for labourers and pay as high as \$50 an hour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, most recently a significant contract in millions and millions and millions of dollars was let to a company in her district to build a project in Forteau, the owner of which is one of her greatest supporters in Labrador. Are you telling me he will not hire his own people in Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The member has time for a quick question without any preamble.

MS DEMPSTER: I ask the Premier: When will Nalcor honour its benefits agreements and get more people from our Province and more Labradorians working at Muskrat Falls?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier for a quick response.

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, all benefits agreements are honoured. I am happy to say that representatives of the Innu Nation are on the project site on a daily basis to ensure that happens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the CETA deal extending the patent on drugs could cost this Province up to \$20 million annually. British Columbia and Ontario already have federal government commitments for compensation for this increased cost.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier: Has she received a similar promise from the federal government to cover the added cost to the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our objective, as it is with anything that we are doing in terms of drug costs in this Province, has to do with ensuring the lowest cost. The federal government will compensate for any additional costs that we might possibly incur over the next few years. There will be absolutely no ill effects felt in this Province and we are guaranteed that until 2023.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

What are they going to do about compensation from the federal government when it is needed, Mr. Speaker, because I really question what the minister has just said?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what that comment meant. I do not know if she is questioning the provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and our integrity. I do not know if she is questioning the federal government and their integrity, or if it is my own personal integrity. I am really not sure what it is she is questioning.

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is what we have learned from the federal government regarding this particular deal, and that is there will be no ill effects felt in this Province at all. That is guaranteed until 2023.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am questioning the facts as they were presented. I would like to see that. I would like to see something presented here in this House that shows that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS MICHAEL: Seniors on fixed incomes feel the financial squeeze from rising heating, food and housing costs which Muskrat Falls will make worse. The CETA agreement on drugs is yet another financial hit they may face.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier: Does she have a plan to help seniors and others cope with rising drug costs due to CETA, because it is going to happen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education and Skills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

As noted in my speaking in the House yesterday, I noted all the investments we have made in seniors and affordable housing in Newfoundland and Labrador to date. As a matter of fact, one of the areas we invest in is the Rent Supplement Program, which we have doubled over the last number of years to \$8 million per year; plus we have the REEP program as well. That is all helping seniors afford housing in this Province and deal with the needs they encounter on a daily basis, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

News reports indicate that the federal government has kept secret documents which may reveal how much more people will have to pay for drugs under the CETA deal.

I am asking the Premier: Has she obtained this information and kept it from the general public?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would ask her to table those documents because they are not documents that we have.

Mr. Speaker, what we have with regard to the CETA deal around patent protection on brand name drugs is they have guaranteed us that compensation will be paid to the provinces if need be and that that will be in place until 2023. I do not know what she is referring to but I am asking her to table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am asking them to table it if the federal government has given them something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS MICHAEL: Today in the news, Finance Minister Flaherty is stating he is open to discussing the potential sale of the federal government's stake in Hibernia. In 2010, Premier Williams offered to buy the 8.5 per cent share of the oil field when the current Premier was Minister of Natural Resources.

I ask the Premier: Has she entered into negotiations to buy back the 8.5 per cent share?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER DUNDERDALE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Third Party just answered her own question. We opened negotiations with the federal government some time ago on purchasing the shares. We were not able to arrive at an evaluation that we agreed to, Mr. Speaker, that we felt would be in the best interest of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. So there has been a hiatus for sure in the discussions.

I am delighted to hear that Minister Flaherty and the federal government are prepared to re-enter into those negotiations, Mr. Speaker. If we can get a deal that works for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador we will be more than happy to purchase those shares because they will be of great value to the people of this Province, if the price is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Under Bill 29 proprietary information may be considered out of bounds for public knowledge and that may include a toxic soup of fracking chemicals.

How does government plan to allow the full disclosure of fracking chemicals under the law?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if he is talking about fracking soup? I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, I think our commitment has been clear to the people of the Province and to industry of where we are with hydraulic fracturing. We will do a comprehensive internal review. We will take all of that information, we will look at that information, analyze it in the best interests of the health and safety of the people of the Province, in the interest of the environment of the Province, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you in the interest of economic development.

When we look at all that, Mr. Speaker, that will inform our next steps in which we can be assured that we will do some public consultation so that collectively we have the right information, we have a balanced view, and then decisions will be made beyond that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's East, time for a very quick question without preamble.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will they come out with another act to ensure the full disclosure of fracking chemicals or are they still going to stick with Bill 29?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources, a quick response.

MR. DALLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that they will connect Bill 29 to a very open and transparent process. Obviously they are confused, Mr. Speaker. Either they do not understand Bill 29, or they do not understand what we are doing with hydraulic fracturing. It is a very open process, Mr. Speaker, and when we get the information we will go public and certainly share all that with the public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Notices of Motion.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for The Straits – White Bay North.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the hon. House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in Parliament Assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of Newfoundland and Labrador humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS government has a responsibility to ensure that Internet access is broadly available to people, have the right to be able to access the Internet in order to exercise and enjoy their rights of freedom of expression and opinion and other fundamental human rights; and

WHEREAS Great Breat still remains without broadband services; and

WHEREAS residents rely on Internet services –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MITCHELMORE: – for education, business, communication and social activity; and

WHEREAS wireless and wired technologies exist to provide broadband service to rural communities to replace slower dial-up service;

We the undersigned, petition the House of Assembly to urge the government to assist providers to ensure that Great Breat is in receipt of broadband Internet services in Newfoundland and Labrador.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions here that were signed by constituents in this community who are concerned they are not able to tap into broadband Internet services so they can avail of and enjoy what many other Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and many Canadians can. The federal government has passed legislation to look at making broadband accessible by year 2017.

We really need to move towards making sure that we have the plan and we are adapting the wireless and wired technologies to make sure these smaller communities have access to broadband, and at a reliable and acceptable speed. Great Breat, St. Carols, and St. Anthony Bight are all in a cluster. They are very close to each other, so there is a great opportunity to map and provide using wireless technology to ensure that these communities receive broadband Internet.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will put this forward to the House and look forward to working with the minister and with government to see that we can look at accessing broadband for the community of Great Breat.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

MS DEMPSTER: To the hon. House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS Cartwright is an existing port of call for the *MV Northern Ranger*; and

WHEREAS Cartwright is connected to the Trans-Labrador Highway, providing access to truck freight destined for the North Coast of Labrador; and

WHEREAS Cartwright would eliminate unnecessary travel and cost for freight destined for Northern Labrador now being trucked to Happy Valley-Goose Bay; and

WHEREAS there has always been, and continues to be, commercial trade between the South and North Coast of Labrador;

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to designate Cartwright as a shipping port for freight destined to the North Coast of Labrador, beginning with the 2014 shipping season.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

It is dated November 5, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, this past season in my district has been nothing more than an absolute royal mess. What the businesses in my district are asking for does not even mean extra money. It is just asking for a will on the part of government to provide a service to the people of the North Coast.

We have a boat that goes in Cartwright, yet we have businesses that are shipping to the North Coast that have to drive past Cartwright an extra 600 or 700 kilometres on a dirty gravel road to ship out of Goose Bay. Myself, and my

colleague for Torngat, we have been inundated with calls over the past number of months from businesses.

It is very unfortunate that the people on the North Coast are paying an extra \$600 or \$700 even on a single item like a snow machine because they cannot ship out of Cartwright. If I go into Cartwright and I am travelling to Black Tickle I can take my four wheeler, but if I am travelling to Makkovik I cannot take my four wheeler. There is something wrong with that. We are not asking for extra money, just a service, Mr. Speaker.

Just the other day I received a call from people trying to do business in my district with the North Coast doing jobs up there. They are going to Cartwright, they are shipping their goods to Rigolet, and they are having someone take it off, put it back on the boat and ship it to Makkovik. What a fiasco that is, just because there is no will.

People on the Island can drive on a paved road to Lewisporte and ship to anywhere they want on the North Coast but the people of Labrador have to drive right to Happy Valley, and it is not good enough. I am happy to present this petition here today for these people.

I hope that in 2014 we will see a change. A lot of times the things that we are looking for do not require extra money, it is just smarter spending, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

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

MR. BENNETT: A petition to the hon. House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS there is no cellphone service in the Town of Trout River, which is an enclave community in Gros Morne National Park; and

WHEREAS visitors to Gros Morne National Park, more than 100,000 annually, expect to communicate by cellphone when they visit the park; and

WHEREAS cellphone service has become a very important aspect of every day living for residents; and

WHEREAS cellphone service is an essential safety tool for visitors and residents; and

WHEREAS cellphone service is essential for business development;

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to partner with the private sector to extend cellphone coverage throughout Gros Morne National Park, and the enclave community of Trout River.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, Trout River just received a Tidy Towns Award for being such a unique, interesting place. It also has a fabulous restaurant. You can go into the restaurant in the summertime and you can read the names of visitors and comments that they make, people like David Suzuki, prominent people from all over Canada and the rest of the world. So they go to Trout River, they go to Gros Morne National Park and if they try to use the cellphone to call anybody, to call home, there is no response.

The residents of Trout River would more than gladly pay an additional fee, an additional cost, and I have had that discussion with them that it might cost more for their service if they were to have it. They would absolutely be committed to pay additional costs per month on a monthly cellphone bill. The whole town could be served with one cellphone tower and they are asking for government to partner with the private sector and give them cellphone service.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. A. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A petition to the hon. House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS the residents of Burgeo, Ramea, Grey River, and François must use Route 480 on a regular basis for work, medical, educational and social reasons; and

WEHREAS Route 480 is in deplorable condition, such that the shoulders continuously wash away and there are huge potholes; and

WHEREAS the condition of the road poses a safety hazard for residents and visitors; and

WHEREAS the Department of Transportation is responsible for maintenance and repairs; and

WHEREAS the local division does make periodic repairs to this route but these are only temporary patchwork and the road needs to be resurfaced;

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to support the users of Route 480 in their request to have Route 480 resurfaced.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again I stand up and talk about the Burgeo road which has not been given enough attention. I did recognize yesterday that the current Minister of Transportation did make sure that the washout that occurred back in June has been fixed. It took us six months. Again, I give the minister credit because when I brought it to his attention he made sure it was done. How it took six months before that – I will just say that I am glad this new minister got in because he made sure that it was done.

Mr. Speaker, however, this road is 150 kilometres long, a lot of it is in very, very terrible condition. We have a road that has no cell service. Again, we are facing a safety concern. It is a deterrent to tourism. It is a deterrent to economic development. It is a deterrent to everything. Cellphone service is one thing, but we actually need a road that is fit to travel on.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I put this petition in and I look forward to working with the minister.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Private Members' Day

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Member's Day, I now call upon the Member for Bonavista South to introduce the motion that stands on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I moved a resolution, seconded by the Member for the District of Port de Grave, the following private member's resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House

(1) acknowledges the tremendous importance to Newfoundland and Labrador of the terms of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement-in-principle, CETA, between Canada and the European Union for which the provincial government successfully advocated; and

(2) supports the decision of the federal and provincial governments to establish a \$400 million fund to improve our fishing industry's global competitiveness to capitalize more fully on the phenomenal opportunities that CETA will generate for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement-in-principle, CETA, reached between Canada and the European Union will bring tremendous benefit for Newfoundlanders

and Labrador, and is a significant achievement for the people of our Province. More than 19,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently employed in the provincial fishing and aquaculture industry, primarily in rural areas of the Province, such as my district, will benefit directly from new opportunities created by CETA.

The agreement will facilitate the attraction of foreign direct investment, which is critical to maintaining economic expansion all across economic sectors within the Province – natural resources, ocean sciences, forestry. When CETA comes into effect, it will provide significant benefits for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, particularly in the fishery. This is certainly going to be beneficial to my District of Bonavista South, where the fishing industry is integral to our local economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: To ensure that industry is prepared to take advantage of the opportunities presented by new market access, the provincial and federal governments have agreed to cost-share a \$400 million fishing industry transition –

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. LITTLE: Four hundred million dollar fishing industry transition fund, Mr. Speaker.

The fund will be used to invest in research and development, new marketing initiatives, fisheries research, and enhancements to provincial fisheries infrastructure – all with the goal of improving the industries capacity to compete globally. Working in consultation with industry, we will seize the opportunities emerging from this Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement. We will provide support to processors, both large and small, to help them successfully enter new markets. We will help harvesters pursue innovations and efficiencies with large harvesting technology. We will support the development of new value-added products throughout Europe.

This unprecedented level of investment in Newfoundland and Labrador's fishing sector is a game changing development, one that puts us in a tremendous position to establish our products throughout Europe quickly while pursuing continuous improvements in every facet of the industry.

This funding is planned to roll out when CETA comes into force, which is expected to be 2015. This two-year period provides ample time for the provincial government to collaborate with industry and determine the best ways to allocate the fund to improve the global competitiveness of the provincial fishery.

The fishing industry is a \$1 billion industry right now. In the coming future we will see an infusion of \$400 million investment in the fishing industry which is substantial – a \$1 billion industry right now and an infusion of \$400 million going into that particular industry. This is substantial, Mr. Speaker.

These trade negotiations presented a unique opportunity to eliminate tariffs and to address non-tariff barriers that have impeded provincial seafood products from entering the valuable European market. This has been a goal for the Province's fishing industry for decades, Mr. Speaker, and now this goal has been accomplished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: The elimination of tariffs will result in significant benefits for rural communities whose fish and seafood processors have experienced high tariffs when exporting products to the European Union.

The immediate elimination of tariffs with no restrictions, such as further processing requirements in EU countries, will permit Newfoundland and Labrador producers to develop new value-added seafood products which can create additional processing employment opportunities, particularly in rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

The industry will definitely move forward and succeed because of the elimination of tariffs, Mr. Speaker. This will be a positive for all fishing industry workers, such as plant workers, harvesters and processors, a win-win situation for all those people involved in the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Newfoundland and Labrador seafood processors will now be free to produce consumer ready products that can be branded and thus marketed for greater added value, which is another bonus, Mr. Speaker. It was critical that this Province ensure obligations in CETA that did not undermine the policies in this Province that are central to economic development, such as those that flow from the Atlantic Accords or the ability to procure for the purposes of regional economic development, these policies are not eliminated because of CETA, Mr. Speaker.

We will maintain our minimum processing requirements but we have agreed to grant requests from licensed seafood processors wishing to sell unprocessed fish and seafood to EU seafood processing interests. The Province elected to make this move based on our confidence that Newfoundland and Labrador seafood processors already hold a strong comparative advantage over the EU based seafood processors.

Our industry will now have the level playing field it needs to grow and to thrive. We consulted with key fishing industry interests who supported this concession in favour of the accelerated removal of the tariffs, Mr. Speaker. This was a great accomplishment and certainly will pay dividends in years and years to come.

The EU is a huge market for Newfoundland and Labrador cold water shrimp and white fish products. Provincial producers of these products will now be able to diversify into different market segments and brand these products for the EU marketplace. The immediate elimination of the tariff on frozen, sectioned snow crab will open markets and provide new opportunities to diversify away from traditional USA and Japanese markets.

This is a new market, a market that is very competitive, a market that will help the seafood industry in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. Producers in our Province will now be able to compete with Norway and Iceland for pelagic markets in Europe, Mr. Speaker. The immediate elimination of tariffs on flounder will provide significant opportunities as Europeans are major consumers of flatfish products.

The EU, the European Union, with its twenty-eight member states, 500 million people, and an annual economic activity of almost \$17 trillion is the largest and most lucrative market in the world. The average per capita consumption of seafood is roughly three times that of North America. It is also the world's largest important market of goods. As the knowledge-based service economy continues to develop in Newfoundland and Labrador, it is critical that we continue to attract foreign direct investment and expand markets for service providers, oil, gas, and the service industry, et cetera.

CETA will not only provide preferential access for Newfoundland and Labrador goods and service providers throughout the European market; it also means our Province's service providers will not be placed at a competitive disadvantage when the EU enters trade agreements with our competitors. This is because CETA contains a most favoured nation commitment, whereby Canada will gain comparable benefit if the EU provides better treatment to any other trading partner, such as the US with whom they are already negotiating. Mr. Speaker, this is another great accomplishment in CETA.

CETA includes mechanisms for dealing with non-tariff barriers which can restrict access even when market access commitments have been achieved. For example, standards and labelling rules can in certain circumstances act as discriminatory barriers to trade. CETA will provide the Province with the ability to preemptively question and challenge non-tariff barriers in the European markets.

Fish and seafood is very important to the rural parts of Newfoundland and Labrador. Our government has negotiated terms with the federal government that provides our provincial fishing industry with unprecedented access to the European market. For years and years the fishing industry in our Province has been at a competitive disadvantage because of tariffs placed on our fish and seafood entering the European market, ranging from 8 per cent to 20 per cent on species such as shrimp, cod, and crab. Meanwhile, our competitors, such as Greenland, Norway, and Iceland, have long enjoyed effective duty-free access.

Most noteworthy and burdensome of our industry has been the 20 per cent tariff on cooked and peeled shrimp. It is important to note that the two most important species for the provincial fishery at this point in time, shrimp and crab, will be duty-free immediately upon CETA coming into effect – a very important point, Mr. Speaker. The elimination of tariffs is expected to have an immediate impact on economic development in the rural regions of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, creating employment opportunities and supporting market and product diversification in the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker.

Newfoundland and Labrador producers will now be able to diversify into different market segments and brand products for the European market. Immediately, duty-free access will be provided to the EU with over 500 million people and an average fish consumption of over twenty-one kilograms per capita, per year, which offers tremendous opportunity for provincial seafood producers in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The market is becoming increasingly conscious of food security and resource sustainability leading to an aversion of low-cost suppliers who cannot meet food security traceability requirements. Newfoundland and Labrador fish and seafood producers are able to meet this demanding security, traceability, and sustainability for the key fish and seafood products that is needed in the European market.

Increased market access to the European Union will reduce our dependency on current markets, which will support higher prices, as other markets, such as the USA and Japan who compete for Newfoundland and Labrador producer supplies. This will also result in greater returns for provincial fish and seafood. Our government remains focused on maximizing the economic benefit for our fishery for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is an excellent opportunity for the Opposition to try to help the government get something right. That would be, in this case, the private member's resolution they are putting forth now. The reason we have real concerns about the government negotiating this deal is that we know we can trust their intentions because we know they mean well, but watching this government do a deal is like watching a child on a bicycle with training wheels out on a four-lane highway; we know they are going to get run over. Who is driving the truck? Stephen Harper. We know you cannot trust him.

So this is a government who has demonstrated repeated incompetence in practically everything they have touched, and even more so in the fishery than in any other area. The Opposition would really be remiss if we did not help the government along a little bit with this private member's resolution.

First and foremost, this party is very much in favour of free trade, has always been very much in favour of free trade, and will continue to be in favour of free trade, but free trade does not mean giving away everything.

Mr. Speaker, mature economies do not give away their natural resources. Mature economies keep their natural resources so they can develop their economies and so they can grow their population, not what we have done under this government, because we have seen no population growth in ten years. We have seen population growth strategies, but a population growth strategy is not population growth. As a matter of fact, this Province has shrunk in population since the early 1970s, and most of those decades have been under the administration of the party represented by the government opposite.

So when we hear this government making deals or doing things in haste, the type of nightmare that we envision when they stumble into some sort of negotiation with the federal government is the type of nightmare when our Opposition Party spontaneously and automatically endorsed the Abitibi disaster in Grand Falls. Under the promises and the commitment of the government, we unwittingly expropriated a paper mill, and a paper mill that was not much better than a toxic dump.

The amount of the fallout and the dollar cost to the taxpayers of this Province has not yet been quantified, but not only did they get that part of it wrong, they brought on a NAFTA challenge and the NAFTA challenge was because under NAFTA this government was not permitted to expropriate an international asset without paying compensation. Abitibi having US interests, the Abitibi company launched a challenge under NAFTA. We were fortunate enough that the federal government was able to come in with \$135 million in a chequebook to correct the mistake this government made in the expropriation in the first place. It was an illegal expropriation under NAFTA.

Now we have them with another free trade agreement, CETA. They say they have done wonderful negotiation, and we wonder have they really done wonderful negotiation. My reservations about their ability to negotiate and the fact of their negotiation goes right back to the very first briefing I had under CETA. As the critic for IBRD I was entitled to and received a

briefing in early 2012. Unlike the Department of Education which does not give critics briefings, IBRD did give a briefing. They explained really the role of the provincial government and by that time we were in the ninth round or the eleventh round of the negotiations. They basically sat back and watched while the federal government negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to believe that they have done anything except sit back and watch the federal government negotiate for the last two, three, or four years and now they are expecting us to rubber-stamp this deal.

If you look at the conflicting statements by the various Ministers of Fisheries and the Premier that the immediate past – I am tempted to say the immediate past president, but the immediate past Minister of Fisheries and then we have the past Minister of Fisheries before that and the current Minister of Fisheries that I have dealt with as critic in the Fisheries portfolio, they have stood firm and steadfast and they have said repeatedly how important minimum processing requirements are to the Province.

They are absolutely the benchmark that secures 9,000 jobs and they have waxed eloquently – and the Premier, not to be outdone by any of her ministers, said when Nigel Wright, now the much disgraced Nigel Wright from the Prime Minister's office, telephoned her, she said she banged down the telephone because he wanted our minimum processing requirements, the minimum processing requirements would be done away with and this would help the feds do the deal.

She told him absolutely not. She implied, if she did not say, that the federal government was in fact attempting to hold the loan guarantee for Muskrat Falls over the head of provincial government to say you must give up on your minimum processing requirements because we want CETA. We are going to give you the Muskrat Falls guarantee; we want a quid pro quo. The Premier used the very words: We want a quid pro quo. She said: Absolutely not; you are not going to get our minimum processing

requirements in exchange for the loan guarantee that you promised us in good faith. She was right.

So if minimum processing requirements were so important then and they have been so important all along, why have they all of a sudden become celebrated that now we have given up minimum processing requirements as one of the inducements that we have been able to provide to the people of Canada, to be able to enter into the CETA deal so that Europeans will have greater access to our seafood?

Mr. Speaker, it is out of an abundance of concern about this government's ability to negotiate and it is out of a concern that the party that they are negotiating with, the Stephen Harper government, through the now disgraced manager, or the principal secretary in the Prime Minister's office, Mr. Wright, who has been now originally resigned in good faith after the \$90,000 payment to Michael Duffy, Senator Duffy, and now he has been fired from the PMO, these are the people that our Province claims to have been dealing with and now they have come forward and they say: Oh, we have a wonderful \$400 million deal.

Well, the \$400 million deal, \$120 million of that is our own money. When you negotiate a deal with somebody else, you expect that you are going to get their money. So, the \$120 million is our own money from the taxpayers of this Province, \$280 million is federal government dollar, and if you divide that by the population of 510,000 people, it is about \$549 per man, woman and child in this Province, that this Province is going to receive from the federal government to put into the fishery in order to secure their agreement on CETA.

Where is this money going to be allocated? Where is it going to go? Well, the Premier had a secret briefing and in that secret briefing she included various industry representatives, but not all of them, and she included the leadership of the Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union. We have not received any feedback as to what they are going to receive, but the FFAW is going to get a piece of the public money.

Industry is supposed to get some for research and also for marketing. What the Premier has not said but the representative from the minister has said clearly is that a certain amount of this money is for job losses, for relocation, for people who are thrown out of work, for the most vulnerable workers in our Province, in some of the most vulnerable towns.

This private member's resolution makes no mention whatsoever – in clause 2, it says “supports the decision of the Federal and Provincial Governments to establish a \$400 million fund to improve our fishing industry's global competitiveness to capitalize more fully on the phenomenal opportunities that CETA will generate for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.”

Well, in fact, we know that some of the money is earmarked for job losses; some of the money is earmarked for relocation. Is some of this money going to be going to plant workers who lose their businesses because of being non-competitive under CETA?

The federal minister's representative says that some of the money to be allocated goes to job relocation. So, if the federal government says we are paying this amount of money for these reasons and the provincial government says we are receiving this amount of money for different reasons, what are the people to believe? Given the Province's very poor record in deal making with a complete inability to demonstrate that they can do deals effectively – we have seen this week the to-ing and fro-ing of the \$1,400 for the collective agreement with their employees. When they have a lot of money and a lot of time, they have had to go back and patch that up.

So they do not have to go back and patch this up, so the people of our Province are not left completely in the lurch, and so that we continue to support free trade and to give our fishing industry an opportunity to be able to progress further, I propose the following amendment, the amendment supported by the Member for Cartwright – L'Anse au Clair.

The proposed amendment says in subclause (2), before the word “supports” we insert the words, “Subject to the Provincial Government and the Federal Government providing further details of the CETA agreement to the people of the province, public consultations being held regarding those details, and the CETA agreement being finalized”.

Mr. Speaker, all we are seeking with this amendment is an amendment that recognizes the people need to be consulted in public consultations, and that we need all of the details. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that motion, moved and seconded, will be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The House (inaudible) the amendment being proposed by the Member for St. Barbe.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER: I had an opportunity to review the proposed amendment by the Member for St. Barbe. I find that the amendment is not in order.

The hon. the Member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The size of the CETA agreement is only dwarfed by how small the amount of disclosure has been that this government has provided. We know this government is not about disclosure. We know this government introduced the official secrets act, which people have come to call Bill 29. This is an absolute, major concern of the Opposition: What are they sliding past us this time?

They want us to vote in support of a feel-good private member’s resolution to try to have us all, as it were, sit around a campfire and sing Kumbaya, and say what a wonderful deal they are doing with CETA. In fact, they are not doing any deal with CETA. The federal government is doing the CETA deal. The federal government operated by and controlled by the Prime Minister, probably the least-regarded Prime Minister, certainly in recent history in this Province, the Prime Minister who

people in this Province have voted against, and the same Prime Minister this government launched an ABC campaign against only a couple of elections ago.

Now all of a sudden they trust him absolutely. They think he has done a wonderful deal. They have the people’s rubber stamp; they are going to rubber-stamp the deal with the European nations. This tiny Province is going to be exposed to have our most important and historic industry, the industry that provides food to a world, 500,000 people able to provide \$1 billion worth of food, and we are going to take a chance on this government rubber-stamping a deal negotiated by Stephen Harper’s negotiators that allows access with no protection whatsoever for our processing sector.

Mr. Speaker, you have to wonder why? When commentators, shortly after this deal was arrived at, said the European’s would have settled for a lot less. In contracting, when you bid too high, the contractors say you left a lot of money on the table; you could have had a better bid.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to know where the federal government fell down in negotiations that exposed this Province; or, in fact, did our Premier give up too easily? Did our Premier simply say: well fine, we have our Muskrat deal so we are going to let you go ahead with this?

To sweeten the pot, the half a dozen huge interests in our fishery, the same people who have been permitted to control and corral our fishery, are the people now who are celebrating on most high. The people in the small communities, the people who are so dependent for small fish plants to operate, so dependent for small open boat fisheries to operate, these are the people who are most exposed and these are the people it seems that nobody speaks for.

I have no doubt the big players; the vertically integrated companies will do fine. The vertically integrated companies that are both the harvesters, the processors and the sellers, they will do absolutely fine; but what will happen to the small players in the small communities, the 9,000 jobs that the former Minister of Fisheries

said the minimum processing requirements were designed to protect?

Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat at this point. In absence of the amendment, I simply cannot support this private member's resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for the District of Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLEJOHN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too, Mr. Speaker, watch the news at night and I am very interested in what has been said. Outside of the Opposition critic, I have not heard a whole lot of criticism over this CETA deal. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, I have heard mostly positive remarks; the majority, by far, are positive remarks.

I am pleased to stand today, Mr. Speaker, and say a few words on this motion. I was pleased to second the motion for my hon. colleague, the Member for Bonavista South.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this could be a great opportunity. I am going to try over the next few minutes to outline why I believe it is a great opportunity. It is a great opportunity to speak on an issue that is so important to my district, the District of Port de Grave.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery has been the lifeblood of my district for hundreds of years. It is probably the reason that all of us settled on the Port de Grave Peninsula and in the surrounding areas. Today, in my district, there is somewhere between seventy-five to eighty harvesters. There are three local processors. At any given time during the crab and shrimp season, this past season, there were at least ten different processors purchasing product off the wharves in Port de Grave and Upper Island Cove.

Mr. Speaker, there is a significant impact of the fishery in my district that has a significant impact on the day-to-day lives of everyone who

lives in my district. Not only the people who fish and the people who work on boats, the people who truck, the people who have businesses, but this deal provides opportunities.

As we go forward, Mr. Speaker – I still have trouble because I think \$400 million in a \$1 billion industry is a significant investment. Wherever that money is coming from, that is a significant investment. Four hundred million dollars into our \$1 billion industry, obviously, that has to be able to do some good.

Mr. Speaker, if I could use an analogy the European Union may be what we would consider a fish heaven. Each individual, on an average basis, consumes twenty-one kilograms of fish product per year. That is a significant consumption amount. There are 500 million consumers in the EU. They have a GDP of \$17 trillion to spend, and it is a market that many call a luxury market. Mr. Speaker, we could not get into it, or we have had limited access. This deal gives us unfettered access to 500 million people and a \$17 trillion investment.

By eliminating tariffs, Mr. Speaker, we get to enter this valuable market of seafood lovers, of all kinds of species, and we can sell in there. I know the Opposition critic talked about rural Newfoundland and Labrador. I would like to talk about some of the things in rural Newfoundland and Labrador. I believe when you look at this deal there are opportunities for the people in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, and there are opportunities for people to work longer. We are experiencing some of the highest tariffs that this country ever saw when we try to put our products into the European Union.

Mr. Speaker, what I see, I think about a couple of small processors in my district and we talk about the value-added product, what a great opportunity for some of those local processors in my district: Atlantic Light Seafoods and Bay Roberts Seafoods. These people purchase and produce consumer goods, smoked salmon, fish cakes, fish and brewis, kippers. All of this, Mr. Speaker, these finished products, can now go into the European Union branded with the Newfoundland and Labrador logo on it and be

sold there without tariff. What an opportunity maybe to create more employment for these small processors, people to produce the product.

Mr. Speaker, I believe at the end of the day that some of these small producers who are into value-added products may have the opportunity to create employment and create great employment, not only in my district but throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, consumer-ready products are very value added. We get a very high rate of return on consumer products. Mr. Speaker, we have to remember that if we can open up a market and we can ship directly into that market our products, we are going to get a very high rate of return on that investment.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is very important. The elimination of tariffs, you have to be competitive. We cannot compete with the Icelands and Greenlands right now, because we are tariffed to death, basically. We have a 20 per cent tariff on shrimp. We have a 6.6 per cent tariff on lobster. We have an 8 per cent tariff on crab. We have a 20 per cent tariff on mackerel, Mr. Speaker. Everything that we send into the market has a tariff, which makes it uncompetitive, Mr. Speaker. We are very much at a disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, just on that alone, I think we can be more competitive; therefore, I believe there is an opportunity for our processors, big and small, to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the Opposition kind of just talked about tariffs and how Mr. Harper is not friendly and how he does not trust our government and all the rest, but I want to talk about a couple of other things that were not discussed: the potential for infrastructure. I believe the hon. member was up last week or one of the hon. members opposite was up and talked about the deteriorating infrastructure in our communities, the wharfs that need to be fixed, the sheds, the storage areas.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in this agreement part of the agreement is for infrastructure. I cannot recall which hon. member, the hon. Member for Burgeo – La Poile – again, they talked about infrastructure and wharves. Mr. Speaker, I am in the District of Port de Grave and right now I am dealing with an issue in Upper Island Cove, a wharf that needs repair that has had some storm damage and all the rest. That wharf needs replacement. Under this potential deal, wharves that have been deteriorating for years will have an opportunity to be repaired and fishermen can go back to using them safely.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I do not think the member talked a little bit about the science. We were criticized as well because we have not done a whole lot in science. Well, we are the only Province in the country that has our own fishery science, and we have been doing some great work. I believe, speaking on behalf of the seventy-five or eighty harvesters that are in my district, the innovations that could come to harvesters through technology, new ways of fishing, new ways of catching different types of species, and maybe even new ways of catching crab and shrimp, I think that is very important. So science is very important.

Also, Mr. Speaker, George Rose has been doing some great work on the tracking of species, and in particular cod and halibut. One of the concerns, and we have always had the concern, is about quality. We need quality. If we are going to ship to the European Union and we are going to compete in that market, I have no doubt that quality is going to be essential. We have to ensure the quality of our product going into the European Union is of the utmost quality, excellent quality.

Because of the science that George Rose is doing, I believe, Mr. Speaker, we will have the quality. I know he has been doing a lot of work around whole cod and big cod in the bays, tracking, and all of those things. That is going to pay benefits in the long run. I know on the West Coast he has been doing some tracking of halibut and all of the other things that are going on there, the science that is going to go into there and the opportunity for us to get significant

investment back to go into science so we can use science to improve the future fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador.

As well, Mr. Speaker, in the science area there is an opportunity here to make sure we can monitor change. We know water temperatures are changing. We know cod patterns are changing. With this new deal, the CETA deal, hopefully we are going to have more money in science and we can monitor better the water temperatures and the changing patterns of migration patterns of fish species.

As well, Mr. Speaker, through our science and technology we are building capacity. We are building capacity where capacity never existed before because Mr. Rose and his group at CCFI are building capacity. They have employed twenty grad students. When this program started, there were no Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in the program. Right now we have five Newfoundlanders and Labradorians working in the program, building capacity in the industry, wanting to stay here, wanting to improve the science, and wanting to improve fish culture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLEJOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think that is important. I think that is very important because prior to this, there was nobody – nobody – no Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in this industry. Through the work of the CCFI and through the work of Mr. Rose, we have five grad students now in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, talking about fish plants and the opportunities with fish plants, going back to that and employment. Mr. Speaker, we believe that through this deal we can lengthen the season. How often have we heard about crab plants closing and not enough hours, and people cannot get their EI and all the rest?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we believe through the elimination of tariffs that will have an immediate economic development impact on rural areas of our Province. It will create employment. I believe in the two plants that I talked about

earlier, in the two small processing plants, the one in Bay Roberts and the one in Port de Grave, I believe we can get longer seasons. I think it is very important that these tariffs come down.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about marine sustainability. The EU talks about marine stewardship and certification. Eighty-two per cent of our fish in Newfoundland and Labrador is marine stewardship certified. In the European Union, environmental conservation and sustainability is very important. Mr. Speaker, we are doing that; we have 82 per cent of our fish product in the marine steward certification program. So I think that is also very important to us.

Mr. Speaker, what that program does, that basically allows product to be traced back to where it was caught. Not only back to where it was caught, but how it was caught, and what methods it was caught, if it was caught environmentally friendly and all the rest. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is very important. Environmental stewardship is a big part of this.

As we go on here, I believe that our government continues to be focused on maximizing the net economic benefits for our people of the Province. We believe this deal is a good deal, Mr. Speaker; \$400 million provides opportunities. I believe the \$400 million will provide opportunities for us to have a sustainable fishery of the future. If we do this right, we believe we will have a sustainable fishery in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested on Friday, I was reading letters to the editor and I saw an article in there from Mr. Bill Barry, one of the processors. He talked about different things about the deal, but he said here, “This is good for everyone in our industry; fishermen as well as processors. The provincial government is to be commended for hard bargaining and the federal government for completing such a complex trade agreement...” That is not my words, Mr. Speaker; it is Mr. Barry’s words.

Mr. Speaker, he also talked about, “I have also heard it said that CETA would discriminate

against small companies, while the opposite is more likely, due to less bureaucracy and clearer rules to facilitate trade.” These are not my words, Mr. Speaker. Again, these are Mr. Barry’s words about the CETA deal.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, he said, “What we need as a province is more customers....” I might add, Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity. This is 500 million customers with \$17 trillion to spend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good deal. I was very proud to stand here today and speak to it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for the District of Cartwright – L’Anse au Clair.

MS DEMPSTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a teenage daughter at home and oftentimes she will come to me and say: Mom, do you think this is a good idea or a bad idea? I cannot answer right away. I need more information. I ask questions. I say: You let me know this and this and this, and then I will make the decision. I am not standing today, Mr. Speaker, to say that CETA is a bad deal, but I am standing to say we certainly need more information before we can make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, the private member’s resolution is asking us to support, and I want to read it because it is very, very vague. It is very general. It says: we acknowledge “the tremendous importance to Newfoundland and Labrador of the terms of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement-in-principle (CETA) between Canada and the European Union for which the Provincial Government successfully advocated” for. It is all positive.

Then, it finishes with: we support “the decision of the Federal and Provincial Governments to establish a \$400 million fund to improve our fishing industry’s global competitiveness to capitalize more fully on the phenomenal opportunities that CETA will generate for

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.” It is very, very vague, Mr. Speaker.

You want us to support a deal that will capitalize fully on the phenomenal opportunities. All we are really asking is: Where are the details? How will the \$400 million be spent? Well, \$120 million of that \$400 million is the taxpayers of this Province, and we have an obligation to the taxpayers of the Province to tell them how this money is being spent.

From the outside it looks good. Yes, it gives us access to a market that historically, Mr. Speaker, we have paid big fees on. Is this money going to marketing? Is it going to infrastructure? Is this the long-awaited marketing plan that was promised two years ago?

I found it personally, Mr. Speaker, a little bit peculiar that at the recent announcement it was a joint funding agreement, but while the full PC caucus was there, not one federal minister was there. What is that all about, Mr. Speaker? I believe the people have a right to know.

Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Littlejohn): On a point of order?

MR. JOYCE: No, no, by leave. I am going to finish her time; that was agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition by leave to finish the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Aquaculture.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to the private member's motion on CETA, a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the EU. It has been ongoing for a number of years, approximately four years.

As Minister of IBRD involved with the trade file, I have worked through the file in terms of the opportunities for CETA, Canada, and the economic union. We have –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Aquaculture.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again, it is a long time in the making in terms of this agreement, Canada and the EU. Looking at from the broader perspective, access to a huge market, 500 million people, \$13 trillion in terms of GDP; enormous opportunities overall in terms of technology transfer, labour transfer, as well as those new markets I speak of, and on a national scale, dairy, beef and from our perspective, Newfoundland and Labrador fish.

Early on in these negotiations, as Minister of IBRD, my colleague for Fisheries at the time, were steadfast from the beginning that our main priority of these agreements was to get access to the EU, reduce tariffs; the elimination of those tariffs, to get our product into the EU, and the removal of end us restrictions, which is so important. It is very important in terms of growing our industry.

What it does is it creates another environment, another market for our goods. Right now we export into the US, we export into Japan, and we export into China. Now with access to the EU, it is another market where we can be competitive. We can grow our industry which is so important because the more market, the more competitive, and we can get that seafood into those markets.

As I said, it is very important when you look at our industry, our fishing industry. It is significant for our Province. It is significant in rural Newfoundland and Labrador; a very important role it plays. We have all seen the numbers, production value of a billion dollars. It is very significant.

I know in my own district on the Southern Shore, we have two processing facilities and a number of harvesters right along the shore from Petty Harbour, Maddox Cove South to St. Shott's. Historically, it has been very important to the region, going right back to the early days when we came here and settled the ports and harbours in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We transformed from a ground fishery into a shellfish industry. We shut down the ground fishery in the early 1990s. We saw a huge change, a huge upheaval in terms of what the fishery was and the type of fishery it was to what it is today. We seen it evolve into – as I say, shellfish has become a huge commodity. It is very high in value with huge returns to all of the industry, from the investors in the processing sector, the harvesting side, and those who work in our facilities.

We have a challenge in terms of labour supply, in terms of those communities and those fish processing facilities, with the age of up around fifty-four. As we look to the future and how we develop it, we need to extend out those weeks of work, making sure that we can attract people to the industry with increased value, increased markets, and increased opportunity.

We will have increased wages, so it becomes a competitive labour force and we can have those people to work in the industry. So, 90,000 people employed overall in the industry is significant, as I said, scattered all throughout Newfoundland and Labrador in rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

The elimination of the trade barriers now basically under this tentative agreement which was signed by the Canadian government and the EU, implementation anywhere from sixteen to twenty-four months in regard to everything

being translated into the various languages, all the t's being crossed and the i's dotted, in terms of moving it forward. At that point, our seafood, about 99.1 per cent of all the seafood lines that are important to us, will go into the EU with all tariffs down to zero and as well with the ability for the removal of end-use restrictions.

The tariffs right now are anywhere from 7.5 per cent to 20 per cent. If you have to build that into your business model and put that into that market, obviously that is a disadvantage in many cases to get that product in. It is an extra cost and the business model does not work. With those removed, certainly for species like crab or shrimp, once you hit your ATQ that is there now, you cannot go in over and above that now. If you do, the tariff is there.

So what happens now is some of that product, say, shrimp, would be held, maybe stored, and could not go into the market now because of the quota. With this removed, obviously you can access that market and get that product in, even products going to other markets. Now there is a competitor. You can look to put that product as well into the EU.

This also opens up opportunities with tariffs on species now that maybe are not going into the EU because of the restrictive tariffs. There is a new opportunity to send that species into the EU. It may be even species now that we are not fully harvesting because of the restrictive nature of the tariffs. That is another opportunity, new species that we can look at putting into the EU and any of those individual states and working out relationships in those particular areas to do it, which is so important.

Immediately when we see the Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement between Canada and the EU signed, from that three-year period, minimum processing requirements with the EU will stay in place over that period as well. We spoke about the \$400 million fund that will be dispersed over that three-year period as we look to grow our industry and do a whole range of things, certainly strengthening that industry and making it grow.

Then based on our estimate in terms of what that new market would mean, conservatively we are looking at basing our analysis somewhere in the range of \$100 million a year based on getting into the EU. That is growing, as I said, our \$1 billion industry, which is so important as we move it forward to get into those markets.

The other thing we have come to learn is that from a Newfoundland and Labrador perspective, from an Eastern Canadian perspective and around the world, especially in Europe, sustainability of fish products are so important. The market now wants to trace back and see where that fish and seafood is coming from. Is it a sustainable environment?

Eighty-two per cent of the value of fish in the Province now has Marine Stewardship Council certification or in the process of obtaining it. That is so very important because around the world, especially in Europe, as I said people want to see that it is sustainable, it is environmentally friendly, it is harvested in a sustainable fashion and if that is so and you receive your certification, it is a marketable product and people certainly look to Eastern Canada to do that and recognize us as a player in that regard.

Now in the overall scheme of things, we look at our fishery and the volume of fish we have and you look at the global marketed fishery, we are small in scale and scope, obviously; but we need to make sure that we have a good product, that is sustainable, value added, is certainly leading in terms of the quality and find those niche markets. The EU is certainly another opportunity to do that, along with what we put into Japan, China and our friends to the South, the US, which is very important.

I mentioned the \$400 million in terms of what was negotiated; 70 per cent by the federal government and 30 per cent by the Province. When you look at it, Mr. Speaker, it is a billion dollar industry and \$400 million is going to be put in to support this industry and drive it. It is unprecedented in the Province and certainly in Canada as a whole, I would think, in regard to when you look at the production value of an

industry and combining the amount of funds that is going to be put in to continue to grow the industry through things like research and development, infrastructure, and certainly marketing is very important as well.

Some of the bigger companies have their own marketing in places like China, but those smaller firms, smaller processors, which are competing today I might add – we often hear some negative comments in regard to it is going to hurt the smaller processor; nothing could be further from the truth.

Right now, the smaller processors in Newfoundland and Labrador are in international markets, they are selling into internationally markets, foreign markets, and they are doing quite well; but this allows again another opportunity to get into an additional market like the EU, a large market, which some of the funds that we have, we can work with them in regard to marketing initiatives whether it is bringing a group together collectively, small processors, identifying markets for them, and identifying added value.

A lot of times when you sell to a broker, the broker is selling a commodity and they are selling it into the market as is and you do not learn a lot about the intelligence about value added. What does the market want? What does the consumer want in another country? Is there another species they want or can you value add to a species you have now to increase the value of that product?

Also, as I said, from a secondary processing point of view with the end-use restrictions gone, we can see in our processing facilities here in the Province in rural Newfoundland and Labrador the ability to do more secondary processing. Right now we will send shrimp into the EU, industrial form goes to the EU, it is thawed, it is repackaged, secondary processing is done to it, and it is branded and put in the market in one of the EU states. What is going to happen under CETA is the opportunity for that secondary processing to happen here where a value-added product can be done, stamped, sealed, a Newfoundland and Labrador company can send

it into one of the EU states, so we can certainly value add and when you value-add, the prices goes up and certainly all players get a return on that.

Other areas, in terms of the fund, we look at harvesting and various technologies, how we get the product as I said through Europe and even in other jurisdictions as well. This is not solely for the EU; it is certainly across the board when we look at marketing.

An initiative we looked at through DFA just a little while ago, working with the Centre for Fisheries Innovation looking at cod; 14,000 tons of cod now is available and not being full utilized. We are doing some research now through the centre in regard to Mr. Bob Verge in terms of how can we get that into the market, top-quality fresh cod, how do we get into the market in places like the US. We will be looking at that as well. It gives us intelligence as well in terms of that industry and that species. There are many species like that that we will look at as we move forward through this and build our industry.

As well the industry players – as Minister of IBRD, we called in industry some time ago, certainly the FFAW, ASP, all the industry players and sat around in regard to the minimum processing requirements and we were solely looking at Europe; we were not looking outside of that. Right now with minimum processing requirements, we provide exemptions where it is in the best interests of the Province and we can generate the most wealth we can for our Province and for the industry players. This is the same process we went through in regard to the EU. We looked at: If we were to just look at removing the exemptions at request for the EU, will this help grow our industries? Will there be competition for that raw resource?

We looked historically at the Atlantic Provinces, and no MPR restrictions in place. We feel strongly and certainly all of our intelligence in what we have done, historical patterns, are that the EU processing cannot compete with us. They have not tried to compete with us when you talk about MPRs not being in place in other

jurisdictions. We are quite confident that we are competitive. We will compete with the EU in terms of processing and we will continue to grow our industry.

Overall, this is a good resolution today as we move forward. My understanding is this will go to the House of Commons where there will be debate because it is between Canada and the EU. There is a significant process as we move forward of anywhere from sixteen, to eighteen, to twenty-four months, a lot of discussion, a lot of talk about answering questions back and forth, where it is, and what we have achieved.

Overall, as Fisheries Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador, our Premier, our government and industry as a whole – and we have heard it loud and clear that this was needed. We are going to move the industry forward; it is a \$1 billion industry. We are going to grow it. We are going to grow it with the funds we have. It is a new market; it is new opportunity.

It is a new day for the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. CETA is going to grow it. We are going to continue to build our communities in rural Newfoundland and Labrador through this, build industry as a whole, and continue to be a global player in the fishing industry in the world.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Third Party and Member for Signal Hill – Quidi Vidi.

MS MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am very glad to get the opportunity to stand and speak to this resolution. Not because I am going to vote for the resolution, but because it is going to give me an opportunity to speak to issues that I have wanted to raise in this House with regard to CETA. Having this private member's resolution means I now will have the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say it is rather disconcerting that here we have in front of us something which is asking us to approve an agreement-in-principle without the details of what that agreement is going to be. What I have to say is here we go again. We have this government asking us to approve something without the details that tell us what the agreement is really going to mean for the people in this Province.

That is what they did to us with Muskrat Falls, Mr. Speaker. That is what they did to the Public Utilities Board around Muskrat Falls, asking the Public Utilities Board to approve the Muskrat Falls Project before it had even gone through the DG 3 decisions.

They are famous, this government is, for putting things in front of us and asking us to agree with them, asking us to acknowledge how wonderful it is, asking us to give approval for things without giving us details. That is exactly what they are doing with us here again today, Mr. Speaker. We are really going to get used to it, not getting any details from them when we ask questions on the floor of the House and not getting details from them when we have debates in the House, whether it is legislative debates or whether it is a private member's resolution, expecting us to approve things without details, which fits right in with the whole principle that was behind Bill 29 when it was brought it.

Accept us, follow us, listen to us, and do not think you are going to know anything we are doing because we are going to hide everything. That is what this government is all about, Mr. Speaker. They have no idea what openness and transparency is.

So here we are today, looking at this agreement, CETA, which is an agreement-in-principal, as I have just said. Even what we have, even what we have been given, is only a summary of an agreement. That agreement has to be ratified by all Canadian provinces, not just by Ottawa – by all Canadian provinces – and all twenty-eight EU countries. We are far from having a full agreement in place, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many things about CETA that have been disconcerting and we have not been able to debate it because this government never even acknowledged what was happening at the table when they were at the table. We did not even know sometimes if they were at the table, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS MICHAEL: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that.

We did not even know sometimes if they really were at the table. There was so much secrecy about our Province's involvement in the CETA negotiations. It was unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many things here in this agreement that critics are really concerned about. One of them is that this agreement is going to strengthen the rights of corporations, and this is a serious one I am going to pay some attention to, by removing public oversight and democratic decision making from even more areas of our lives and giving private investors more rights to penalize governments. That is an important point.

We have had this experience, Mr. Speaker, with the North American Free Trade Agreement where a section of NAFTA, section 11, actually gives the right to corporations to take Canada and parts of Canadian society to court if the corporations feel they are not being treated correctly under NAFTA. CETA is going to continue that.

What we are dealing with here is a document that we do not have in our hands and a document that is going to shock people when it becomes public. This government is going to have to take responsibility for the fact that if it approves the document, it will have to take responsibility for the fact that they were part of the discussions that gave this power to corporations.

The first thing I want to talk about is something I brought up in Question Period today, Mr.

Speaker, and that is the issue of CETA getting a longer period of time for patents for brand-named pharmaceuticals. This is a very, very important issue. The Minister of Health and Community Services did not deal with the seriousness that I would have hoped today. Everybody who has analyzed the information to date are saying that we are going to be negatively impacted.

Right now in Canada, our current patent for new drugs is twenty years, so a new drug can hold a patent for twenty years before the patent ends and a generic drug can be put in place. The EU companies, of course, wanted twenty-five years, so it is now twenty-two instead of twenty-five. That in itself is going to have a tremendous effect on the lives of people who have to pay for drugs because cheaper generic drugs are going to take longer to become available.

I would suspect – and we do not know because we do not have the details – that this would be the case for drugs which are already on the market and in the middle of a patent. I am suspecting – as I said, we do not know for sure because we do not have the details – that the agreement will affect not just future drugs that are going to be patented but drugs that are already in the market, drugs that are already patented.

We really are concerned about the impact on people. Studies done by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, which were released on October 31, will show that the cost to Canada for this agreement to allow a two-year extension to the time for patents is going to cost Canada \$850 million and \$1.65 billion annually, somewhere in between there, to the cost of prescription drugs in Canada. What it is going to mean for us here in Newfoundland and Labrador, according to their estimates, is a minimum of \$20 million that will be added to the cost of pharmaceuticals here in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we know that this is going to hurt people. It is going to hurt people who are expected to pay for their own drugs. There are many people on low, low incomes; seniors, for

example, who are slightly over the bar that is put by this government on them. Seniors who now cannot afford their drugs, they are going to be in dire straits, Mr. Speaker.

I did not get any comfort from the minister today during Question Period with regard to an agreement being in place with the Canadian government. Apparently, she is saying the government has said, but where is the document? Where is it in writing that the Canadian government is going to work with our government to make sure that people are not going to suffer?

Mr. Speaker, the Harper government has admitted there will be cost to the pharmaceutical patent term extension. He says they are prepared to address them once those costs begin to be felt in 2023. The thing I want to see, how do we know it is not until then that the costs are going to go up? We do not have a guarantee about that. That is the kind of detail we want here in this House. We want to know, how do we know it is not until 2023 that we are going to be affected? There are certainly a lot of critics which are putting forward that it is going to happen before then.

I would like to see our government show that they have a written documentation with the federal government on behalf of the people of this Province that shows they have the same kind of commitment that Ontario and BC has received from Harper. Words are cheap, Mr. Speaker. We have seen that many, many times. We see it even here in this House how cheap words are. So having something in writing is extremely important.

It is really interesting that our country, which supposedly is a strong country, a country that has status on the global stage, could not stand up to the EU the way India stood up. India is also in the process of a free trade agreement with the EU, and India refused to have a change to their patent law. They would not accept it. They said their drugs were high enough and they would not have patent changes because it would have meant drugs going higher.

India stood up to the EU but not Canada, and not the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now if they did they better tell us, because we do not know what happened at the table. They have not told us what they stood for. They have not told us what they stood for in fighting for the people of this Province when they were at the table.

We know they stood with regard to the fishery to get the \$400 million. They have waxed on that, and we know there is going to be money there from their perspective that is going to, in some way, be money that will help with the effects on the fishery of the changes that have happened in the agreement with regard to the fishery. Mr. Speaker, they are putting a smoke screen up because they are not letting the people of the Province know the other issues that are there in CETA that is going to affect them.

There is a lot more I could say about the issue on pharmaceuticals but I want to go to the other area which is going to affect people in this Province that this government is not acknowledging, and that has to do with the extending of investor rights. It is a major issue in this CETA document. We know this even without the greater details that we are going to get.

CETA has set thresholds for government tendering. In our agreement, if we, whether it is the federal government, the provincial government, or a municipal government puts out a tender for goods, the limit for the tender is \$315,538. If they go below that, the tender is only for people within Canada. If they go beyond it, it is opening itself up to Europe, to the European Union.

The limit for services is also \$315,538, and the limit for construction is \$7.8 million. What this means is that at the limit for goods and services, at the point of \$315,538, CETA public tendering rules come into force. Now that is really something that is extremely important for municipalities, for example. Above those thresholds – and I will not repeat them – municipalities have to fully open the competitive bidding process to EU firms.

We think it is bad right now. People are complaining now about people from outside of Newfoundland and Labrador, and people outside of Canada being at Muskrat Falls. The workers are complaining now about workers from outside of the Province and the country being out in Long Harbour. Well, you just wait until CETA is put in place, Mr. Speaker. CETA is going to open our doors for any project, for any tendering process that goes over these three limits, opening it up to the whole of the European Union. That is part of the CETA agreement.

Larger municipalities have raised concerns about this, Mr. Speaker, but they have not been listened to. Did this Province fight for our municipalities at the table? We do not know, because we had no idea when they sat at the table, if they sat at the table, and what tables they sat at. We do know that the agreement in principle has given us this much information. There are some exemptions that they went after.

Naturally, the government made sure Nalcor and its subsidiaries would be exempted from these thresholds for government tendering. Naturally they protected their baby, because Nalcor and Muskrat Falls is their baby. They have that protected, but they do not care about what is going to happen to municipalities that cannot be protected when municipalities have to have their tenders opened up to the European Union if they go over the limit. Mr. Speaker, we all know enough about projects out there that municipalities have to be involved in that the \$315,000 is not a lot of money – it is not a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, we fought this stuff when we were fighting NAFTA, some of us in this room. I know I was. I was heavily involved in fighting the NAFTA deal. There were things we fought with regard to NAFTA and one was the whole issue of municipalities. Now, under CETA with this government approving it, we are going to see municipalities being challenged. We are going to see municipalities really being in a bad situation. We are going to see seniors and other people affected because of the price of drugs going up.

We still do not have from this government any details about what their plans are for the \$400 million that is supposed to offset the impact on the fishing industry. We do not know how much is going to be spent, Mr. Speaker, in marketing, how much in research, how much in infrastructure; we do not know how they are going to make the decisions around that. We do not know if the communities are going to be involved in those decisions. We do not know if the union is going to be involved in that decision making.

Are they just still going to continue doing everything behind closed doors secretly, using documents that have the word Cabinet on it so nobody can ever find out what was behind any decision they will have made?

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to stand up here today and to speak on this private member's motion on CETA. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, a couple of points I just wanted to address first of all, though. The last time I spoke in the House earlier this week, I found myself compelled to defend the great work of our public service, in particular a deputy minister from our department, because of comments that were made by the Member for St. Barbe.

Now, only a couple of days later, I find myself having to do it once again when we have qualified people in this Province, public servants who work for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I know he is over there, he is heckling, he is shaking his head, and that is fine. I must have hit a nerve. That is fine, Mr. Speaker. It is pretty bad when only a couple of days later now I have to make these comments again as he tries to tear strips off public servants

from this department who negotiated the CETA agreement on behalf of Newfoundland and Labrador.

To say that those public servants simply sat there and did nothing while the federal government negotiated on our behalf is shameful.

MR. SPEAKER: I remind the member he is speaking to the resolution.

MR. LANE: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think it was important to get that out there.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of CETA, I can recall since I have been elected there have been two opportunities where I felt very proud, where I felt like I was a part of history, quite frankly. It was two very proud moments. The first actually happened when we had the sanctioning of Muskrat Falls. What a proud moment that was for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say the second one happened not too long ago and that happened at The Rooms. It happened at The Rooms where all of our colleagues and the critic, actually, was there, the president of the FFAW, the head of the processors, Mr. Butler, and there were all kinds of people from industry who gathered at The Rooms for an historic announcement. It was endorsed very strongly by the FFAW, endorsed very strongly by industry, by fishers, by processors, by this government, and by all the people who were there.

With the exception of a couple of people, primarily the Opposition critic who we hear all the time, everyone who I have talked to or for the most part everyone I hear is speaking very, very positively. Not only for CETA, Mr. Speaker, which was wonderful in itself, but for the \$400 million that was negotiated by this Premier, by this government, and the great public servants working on our behalf.

I think it has been said that prior to this the biggest announcement anyone could ever remember in terms of an investment was \$60

million. We have managed to leverage \$280 million out of the federal government along with our \$120 million. That is going to make a big difference in this industry. It is going to make a big difference to the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the fishery, and certainly I am not going to stand here and pretend I know a big lot about the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: Jim does.

MR. LANE: Absolutely, although from what I have been hearing from the Member for St. Barbe, the fisheries critic, I suggest I know as much as he does for sure. I am sure I know as much as the Leader of the Third Party over there

–

AN HON. MEMBER: The fourth party.

MR. LANE: – and the fourth party.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery has had and does have an impact on urban areas as well. It has had an impact on the City of Mount Pearl. I can recall having a conversation one evening when I was a member of Mount Pearl council and we were talking with the mayor and the council. Some of the councillors who had been there for a while were talking about the time when we had the cod moratorium.

During that time it was very interesting because they said there was a period just shortly after that when they had gotten the report from Mount Pearl's director of economic development talking about all of the new business starts, the businesses, and so on that were either starting, expanding, or so on in the City of Mount Pearl, in particular in Donovans Industrial Park, it was called at the time. It is now Donovans Business Park. It was noted that there had been a sharp decline in businesses in Donovans Industrial Park. It was interesting to see; well, what was the cause of this?

When they looked at the actual companies that had shut their doors, all of those companies were directly or indirectly involved in the fishery because they were service companies. They

were companies that were selling supplies to the fishery and to fisherpersons. They were companies that were providing supplies, packaging, and so on to fish plants. They were trucking companies that were involved in trucking of product from site to site and so on. They were companies that were providing all kinds of services to the fishery. When the cod moratorium occurred it actually had a negative impact on the City of Mount Pearl. I am sure likewise it would have had an impact on Paradise, perhaps Conception Bay South, Gander, and so on, because they were all tied to the fishery.

So when we see now an opportunity, and we know that we have had challenges in the fishery in terms of capacity and so on, but we also recognize now that we have an opportunity. That is how we have to look at this; we have to look at it as an opportunity for us to grow what is already a billion-dollar industry.

This is a billion-dollar industry that is providing jobs and spinoff in rural Newfoundland and it is providing jobs and spinoff in urban Newfoundland. Now we have an opportunity to grow that from that \$1 billion dollars.

It has been said here by my colleague, \$400 million to be invested in a \$1 billion industry. I think it is absolutely fabulous. It is very positive. Despite the doom and gloom we hear from the Leader of the Third Party and so on, this is very positive for Newfoundland and Labrador.

The money that is going to be invested in this is going to be invested into things like technology. It is going to be invested into fisheries science. It is going to be research and development and it is going to be invested in things like marketing.

Marketing is going to be very important because, as has been said, with the tariffs now lifted in Europe there is going to be an opportunity. We are opening up I think somebody said 500 million consumers who all consume fish, or most of them consume fish. Certainly on a per capita basis it is huge. This is going to open up opportunities for

Newfoundland and Labrador companies to get into that market and to thrive in that market.

We have always said here in Newfoundland and Labrador, and we all believe and we know it to be true, given a level playing field, and I am sure that nobody in the Opposition parties could disagree with this – well, they probably could but I would hope they would not – given the opportunity, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can compete, and not just compete but thrive with any competitor on this planet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: We absolutely can, Mr. Speaker. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we have proven it. We have proven it time and time in our Province and we have proven it when you look at the accomplishments of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians abroad. In all types of businesses, industries, public service, and so on we are always the cream of the crop; we are always at the top. We know given that equal playing field we can be at the top of this one as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the fishery, I think it is also important to note that while we tend to focus on the fishery, that this is huge news for the fishery and this is very beneficial to the fishery, I think we also recognize that CETA applies to other things in addition to the fishery. When we talk about the ingenuity of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, when we talk about the expertise, take the expertise we have. One of the things I have been exposed to since going to the Department of Innovation, Business and Rural Development is the expertise we have in ocean technology, just as one example.

We see all the things that are happening at the Marine Institute, we see all the things that are happening at Memorial University, we see all the things that are happening out in Holyrood, and we see all the things that are happening in private industry that are involved in the area of ocean tech. When we look at this, even, look at the opportunities that will be brought to Newfoundland and Labrador where our local

companies, our experts and in ocean tech, for example; when you look at that as an example, where we are positioned geographically on the edge of North America, right across from Europe where our ancestors come from, we already have that connection. To have the opportunity now to have those tariffs lifted, to have our people be able to provide goods, services, knowledge, and so on to these European countries I think is going to open up all kinds of opportunity for local companies here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We also have companies here in Newfoundland and Labrador that import products. They import products from Europe or from other countries, including Europe, which they either resell or they take the products they import and they use it to manufacture other items and so on. By having those tariffs lifted on the other side, there is an opportunity for them to be more competitive in that regard as well.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about investment, I heard the Leader of the Third Party talking about the foreign companies. My goodness, we do not want these foreign companies coming here to Newfoundland and Labrador. Well, I tell you what: I would challenge the Leader of the Third Party to go down to Marystown, walk into Peter Kiewit & Sons, and tell all the people who work for Kiewit that they do not want Kiewit here. We do not want Kiewit in Newfoundland and Labrador, a company that has been here providing employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians when we look at the investment that is coming into Newfoundland in terms of oil, in terms of gas, in terms of mining, and in terms of tourism.

Are we telling all these companies we do not want you coming here to Newfoundland and Labrador creating wealth, creating jobs, and making our economy boom? My goodness, we do not want to do that. All the Leader of the Third Party is interested in doing is just tearing up all the contracts. That is what she would do, tear up the contracts, go home, and for those of you who are left, we are going to tax you to death. That is what we are going to do. For those who are left standing, we will just tax you.

We will either tear up your contracts and send you home or we will tax you out of existence. That is really where they come from.

It is important that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador realize that. I have made it my mission to make sure they realize it every opportunity I get because it scares me. Quite frankly, it scares me. Some of the stuff I am hearing on the other side scares me.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, and I just have a couple of minutes left, I just want to say that this is a very positive announcement –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – a very positive announcement for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It lends itself to the principles that this government and the principles that this Premier stand for. That principle is anything we do is in the best interest of the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Member's Day and 4:45 p.m., I ask the hon. Member for Bonavista South to conclude debate.

The hon. the Member for Bonavista South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to commend all of the previous speakers on all sides of the House for speaking to this very important motion. I had to ask myself the question: How important is this CETA agreement economically to our Province and to my district? This particular agreement is very important to our Province and very important to my district: Bonavista South.

I listened to the Leader of the Third Party make some comments negatively about the CETA agreement. I listened to my colleagues on this side of the House talk positively about the

CETA agreement, how important and the value of what it is to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I listened to some of the criticism, and some of the criticism that was mentioned was mostly talking about no consultation, no transparency. I would like to say there was plenty of consultation and a lot of transparency as well.

When people like the President of the Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union and the Executive Director of the Association of Seafood Producers have commended the provincial government for the landmark gains that have been achieved through CETA and agree that CETA will create significant benefits for the industry in years to come, that shows me that there was consultation through the process of the CETA agreement and we do listen to all stakeholders in the industry as the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Any time that you can reach an agreement with the European Union, with twenty-eight member states, 500 million people and an annual economic activity of almost \$17 trillion – \$17 trillion – and it is the largest and most lucrative market in the world, the average per capita consumption of seafood is roughly three times that of North America and North America is a market that we are dealing with on a regular basis, the same as the Japanese market. This opens up a world market, the largest importing market for goods in the world, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: This CETA agreement is significant; it is certainly going to pay off dividends for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador for years and years to come, Mr. Speaker.

I am delighted to be able to introduce the motion to the House, to speak on the motion, and to bring concluding remarks to the motion. This is a very enjoyable day in the history of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We can all commend the leadership of the people who participated in bringing about the CETA

agreement from a provincial and a federal aspect, Mr. Speaker.

There was a lot of time that went into the negotiations of this CETA agreement. It will definitely pay off dividends to people in the fishing industry; the plant workers, the processors, and people who have invested millions and millions of dollars into the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador. This will open new doors for value-added products. It will definitely, with the non-tariff regulations that are put in place, assist the processors in taking their product and putting it into the European market for years and years to come.

This agreement is an agreement that I can stand on my feet and credit a large number of people. I would like to take this time to commend the Minister of Fisheries and Aquaculture for spending time on this particular agreement. Also, I would like to identify and say that the Premier of our Province showed her strong negotiating skills once again in delivering on this wonderful deal, \$400 million for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LITTLE: I can stand here, I am proud. This is a proud day in the history of our Province. A lot of people are to be commended in the negotiating teams and so forth. A lot of work went on behind the scenes. Any time that you can pump \$400 million into an industry that is worth \$1 billion, I tell you that is a substantial amount of funding, a substantial amount of investment in that particular department, Mr. Speaker.

At this time I would like to bring my remarks to a conclusion.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We have all heard the motion.

All those in favour, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 1:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

MR. SPEAKER: Division has been called.

Summon the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER: The Whips are ready?

You have all heard the question.

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

CLERK: Ms Shea, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Davis, Mr. McGrath, Mr. Crummell, Mr. French, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Jackman, Mr. Hutchings, Mr. Littlejohn, Mr. Hedderson, Mr. Dalley, Ms Sullivan, Mr. Kent, Mr. Felix Collins, Mr. Kevin Parsons, Mr. Cross, Mr. Forsey, Mr. Dinn, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Brazil, Mr. Granter, Mr. Sandy Collins, Mr. Lane, Mr. Cornect, Mr. Peach, Ms Perry, Mr. Little, Mr. Russell, Mr. Kirby, Mr. Mitchelmore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: All those against the motion, please rise.

CLERK: Mr. Joyce, Mr. Andrew Parsons, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Edmunds, Ms Dempster, Ms Michael, Mr. Murphy, Ms Rogers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

CLERK: Mr. Speaker, the ayes thirty-one, the nays nine.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!