



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]
[Preliminary Transcript]

15 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Burin -
Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to avail of this opportunity to offer our congratulations to all the men and women who offered themselves to serve on municipal councils in this Province yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

And as well, Mr. Speaker, to the people who offered to serve on the school boards throughout this Province. I believe our Province is extremely fortunate in having such a dedicated group of individuals offering themselves. The various communities are going to be well served by the people elected to the councils. I believe we have seen democracy at work. I am delighted that in these centers where elections did take place, we had such a tremendous group of dedicated Newfoundlanders run for both the school boards and the councils.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

I would like to follow on with those comments and those sentiments, Mr. Speaker. It certainly speaks well of democracy that we had such a good turn-out of candidates and of electorate as we did yesterday.

I followed the results throughout the night and kept in touch with various parts of the island, and in fact the turn out was very good. We had some 94 communities throughout the Province hold elections, and in many cases the numbers of candidates offering for election was substantially increased over 1985. In a couple of communities, in fact, we had some 25 candidates offer for just 7 positions which is a good indication of interest in becoming involved in municipal life and I think speaks well for the future of those particular communities.

So, I too would like to offer congratulations to the mayors and councilors elected yesterday. We will be holding some by-elections in some communities because we did not get a full council in some cases. But those by-elections will be forthcoming and hopefully we can fill the councils. There are only about 15 I believe, 15 to 20 councils that are in that situation. And if we are not successful there, of course, we will proceed to have nominations from the community and appoint people to fill the councils. So, I would like to wish them well in their term of office and certainly as we get all the results in I can make it known to the House the actual make-up of the councils. It will take, I understand, about a week to get all the details and to know all the membership of the councils elected.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before moving on to the proceedings, some welcomes are in order. In the galleries today - through the sponsorship of the Canadian World Youth Movement, a nonprofit organizations which

sponsors cultural exchanges between young people from Canada and eighteen developing nations in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as through the kindness and generosity of three Newfoundland host communities, Carbonear, Lethbridge, Musgrave Town and Placentia - are seven Canadian youths from across the country and seven Malawian youths from Africa. This is the second consecutive year that Newfoundland has hosted the Malawi exchange jointly sponsored by the Canadian World Youth Organization and Malawi Young Pioneers. Since their arrival in September they have become members of the families in which they are hosted and of the community at large. They have been working as volunteers in the fishery, farming, education, social services and small businesses, and have participated in many community services. On December 12th, they will depart for Malawi where they will again be hosted by communities and take part in rural life. Their efforts to come to understand each others society and culture can only lead to better understanding and co-operation between peoples and nations. On behalf of all Members we would like to extend to these students a warm and cordial welcome, not only to the House, but to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Also in the Speaker's galleries today are three people from St. Alban's, the District of Burgeo Bay d'Espoir, they are: Mr. Pat Wilcott - the co-ordinator of the Bay d'Espoir Development Association, Mr. Conrad Collier -

The development officer for the Bay d'Espoir Community Futures Committee and Jeff Gillam, a newly elected Councilor in yesterday's Council election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, and I would like to return to the overused, often used, yet unproven promise of fairness and balance so often enunciated by the Government from time to time. We can all remember accusations made in the past by members opposite when they were sitting on this side, when they were in Opposition, of unfair distribution of capital grants funding. In other words, they were always saying that Opposition districts never received as much as Government districts. There was so much criticism, Mr. Speaker, in fact that the Premier, I believe, has said on many occasions, never again, and I am sure he will use it in his response to me today. Can the Premier tell the House if he and his Government are still committed to distributing grants on an equal basis for Government and Opposition districts and that PC districts will not be punished simply because they are represented by Progressive

Conservatives?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will say clearly what we are committed to, fairness and balance. The hon. gentleman added another word, equal. Equal does not necessarily mean fairness and balance. The Government is committed to fairness and balance in all of its public undertakings and in the expenditure of all public funds and will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I am delighted to hear that response from the Premier. Can the Premier confirm, then, what his Minister of Municipal Affairs said, which was that the Government awarded the recent recreation grants using the list of priority recommendations put forth by his departmental officials? In other words, it was not a decision of Cabinet, I guess, other than to take the list they put forth. If so, just to be clear, is he saying that the recreation officials recommended only approximately \$750,000 in grants for Liberal districts and an approximate \$60,000 for PC districts? Is that what we are expected to believe, 90 per cent for Liberal districts and 10 per cent for the PC districts? And may I ask him this: is this comparison fair in his mind, Harbour Breton \$3,000, Fogo \$4,000, Winterhorse \$1,000, all PC districts, Bonavista South

\$90,000, St. Anthony \$75,000, St. Barbe \$95,000, all Liberal districts. Is this the kind of fairness and balance the Premier is referring to?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, it may indeed take us ten years to correct the great disparity that the former Government created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

It may indeed, Mr. Speaker. But everybody in this Province can rest assured that we will continue to provide fairness and balance. It may take us some time.

MR. TOBIN:

How come the (inaudible) got more money?

PREMIER WELLS:

It may take us some time, Mr. Speaker, to correct the terrific disparities that have been created over the years. It may also take us another few months -

MR. TOBIN:

Not a penny for Burin - Placentia West. Not a penny. (Inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

It may take us another few months, Mr. Speaker, to get fair procedures in place. We found that the procedures that were in place before were not fair. As a matter of fact, some of the lists that have been provided, that have come up through the civil service, have resulted in fundamental unfairness that we have done in the past, and districts that ought to have received benefits did not,

primarily because we were stuck with the list and the procedures of the former government that simply perpetuated the political unfairness of the past.

Now it is going to take us a year or so to get all of these procedures. So, by the next Budget I would say, Mr. Speaker, we will have these procedures collected and fairness and balance will rule forever, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to see the Premier squirm in response to this question, because the disparity here is so evident and obvious that everybody can see it. He did not answer the question for us -

MR. TOBIN:

No, he did not.

MR. SIMMS:

- but I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier was confirming that what the Minister said was correct, you used the list put forward by officials in the Department and that is the way it was done. Did the Premier say that? I am just trying to catch on to what he said. He can tell me when he stands. It appears that the term 'fairness and balance' is now being replaced by revenge on the Tories.

Mr. Speaker, can he confirm this fairness and balance ratio that he

often talks about? Recreation funding in these grants was thirteen times greater for Liberal Districts than it was for Tory Districts; twenty Liberal Districts got grants and only six PC Districts got grants. Can he confirm all of that? The Minister has said these grants came from his officials, these were recommendations of his officials, those were his quoted words, and since I have information, Mr. Speaker, that there were five applications submitted from the Town of Grand Falls and indeed only one, - but one -- was recommended by the Minister's officials, how come that one did not appear on the approved list? Who is telling the truth? And would the Premier investigate this particular one? I will give him a chance to investigate it before I provide any more information.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I remember when the list came up there were some pretty obvious imbalances and unfairnesses in it that had to be corrected. One of the things that has been done over recent years is 'Districts where there were influential Ministers, like Mount Pearl, like Grand Falls, got everything there was in the trough and if there was a few scraps left over for other Districts, they got it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

We are going to provide fairness and balance in this Province, Mr.

Speaker, over the objections of the hon. the Member for Grand Falls and the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl. We are going to help those communities, Mr. Speaker, that need help. We are not just going to pour money into Grand Falls so that the hon. Member can be elected forever. We are not going to do that. We are going to treat the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, with fairness and balance. It may take us a number of years to undo the incredible quantity of unfairness that was perpetrated on this Province by the former Government. It may take us some time, but the hon. Member will learn that ultimately there will be fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister responsible for Recreation, but before I do that I have to respond a little to the Premier. If he is suggestion that there was pork barreling in the past and he continued it this time, then I would like him to explain to this House what happened to Fogo. If we were short-changed before, how did we get short-changed again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, Fogo was not singled out. We did not meet the political promises made by the former Government during the

conduct of the campaign to erect a stadium in Fogo, another one in Harbour Breton area, and another one, I believe, in -

MR. TOBIN:

Bonavista North.

PREMIER WELLS:

No, the one in the Connaigre Peninsula area, and one in the Northeast Bonavista area, in the Speaker's District. We refused to honour those unfair political commitments. Now, if that is what the Member is talking about, okay. If he is talking about the \$2.5 million, I believe, we provided for water and sewer in Fogo District, maybe he would like to hear about that. Maybe he does not think that that is fairness and balance.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

A supplementary to the Minister responsible for Recreation.

This Administration has cancelled or put on hold the Regional Recreation Facility Program that had been announced despite the fact the officials had recommended the three stadiums, all of them, by the way, in Liberal Districts at the time - two of them in Liberal Districts, and in one, I think, there was a vacancy - the fairness and balance of the previous Administration, I might point out. In meetings with Mr. Gullage and Mr. Wells in June, I think, a delegation from the Fogo Island Stadium Committee were told that there would be announcements forthcoming shortly. Shortly has now been three or four months. When can we expect to hear the details of the new regional recreation program that this

administration is going to put in place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the Member must be psychic, because the paper he speaks about and the program he speaks about, which we withdrew, and rightfully so, to address the problems that were inherent in the program, the fact that committees were put in place with no agreements between the town to fund those committees -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not true.

MR. GULLAGE:

That was true.

We will, during the session of this House, introduce legislation to ensure that the program is properly put in place and to hopefully address more than three applications, more than three applications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

A supplementary to the same Minister.

In meetings with the Minister and his officials, they indicate that the financing arrangement for those new complexes, if indeed they ever get announced, is going to follow a program similar to the Municipal Lending Authority,

financing a 20 per cent pay-back, and so on. Can the Minister now tell us what plans are in place, and is this another attempt to force communities to amalgamate so they can become a part of this municipal lending thing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, what we are asking the communities to do, in all cases, recreational facilities notwithstanding, is to co-operate with one another. We are asking them to be together on whatever project they do on a regional basis, whether it be recreation or otherwise, and to cost-share on a per capita basis, in their share of the program.

As for the financial aspects of the program, until I bring the paper into the House, I would not want to speak to that. But, I can say, the details of the program will clearly show that we will be able to provide more recreational facilities than were provided under the previous program.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

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

On October 20, at approximately 1:15 p.m., a seventy-two-year-old woman was transferred from the nursing station in Nain to the

Lake Melville Hospital in Happy Valley, Goose Bay by medical aircraft. I further understand that this particular woman was required to have oxygen while enroute to the Lake Melville Hospital. Would the Minister advise whether the proper procedures were followed in this medical transfer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, this particular case deals with a specific individual and I am not sure it would be fair to that person to try to make political points on this particular issue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And he knows all the answers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

It was on radio. The story was carried, so everyone in the Province heard about it. I do not think it is proper to discuss it, Mr. Speaker, but I would be only too pleased to deal with the Member if it does not interfere with the privacy of the woman involved. I would have to talk with the woman's family first before I draw the Member into this. I do not think it would serve the interests of that family to make it a big political issue.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

The answer I received from the

Minister of Health shows that he already knows of this case and is not doing anything about it. That is the unfortunate thing about it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, my supplementary to the Minister: I further understand that this particular lady was left in a corridor or in a waiting room at the Lake Melville Hospital for three hours and ten minutes, with oxygen being administered without supervision. Now I ask the Minister, is he going to carry out an investigation into the operation of the Grenfell Regional Health Services in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member will be delighted to know that after I heard the announcement, which was carried by the media, I asked officials in my Department to commence an investigation, which has been ongoing, and I should have a report on it soon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Minister is, in view of the fact that only a short year ago this particular gentleman, when he was sitting on this side of the House, advocated increased health care, advocated opening hospital beds, more nurses and so on, and now, only six months later, we have the nursing station in Nain, which is supposed to have seven full-time nurses on staff, reduced to three nurses who are working

overtime, working day and night. Could the Minister now do what I asked him to do when he became Minister, have a public enquiry into health care in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is raising a very important issue, but it applies to Nain, it applies to the Labrador coast, it applies to Burgeo, it applies to Roddickton, it applies to a lot of rural Newfoundland. You see, we have a nursing shortage in the Nation, but you will hear nurses saying they cannot get a job in St. John's. Well, this is the paradox. In the cities across the Nation and urban areas, generally speaking we get can get nurses, we can get doctors, we can get professional people. I do not know how foolish people are not to want to go to Roddickton, or to Nain or to all those rural places, but that is a fact of life, Mr. Speaker. And we have tried every way. Under the Union Agreement you cannot offer nurses extra money to go into Nain or to go into rural Newfoundland. We have made bursaries available. We have tried every way that we can conceive, and we are considering other ways.

It is a legitimate valid point that the hon. Member is making. There is a shortage in Nain. In Burgeo we have positions for nine nurses but we can only get four, and this is a problem all over. I should point out to the hon. Member, though, that the money is in the Grenfell Budget. The positions are there. It is not a matter of not having the positions available. The money is available but we just cannot get the bodies

to go in there. That is the problem which the previous Administration had, it is a problem that all rural Canada is having, Mr. Speaker, and it is a difficult problem to solve. But we are trying to do it. If the Member can suggest some way, I am sure we will consider it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

My final supplementary to the Minister.

Would the Minister now release to the general public the document that his officials have compiled saying that the Regional Grenfell Health Services is wasting money that belongs to the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what document the hon. Member is referring to, as I have never seen a document that said they were wasting money. I just do not know what he is referring to. Maybe he could be a little bit more specific and name the document and when it was prepared, then I will certainly look for it. And if the Grenfell Regional Health Services are wasting money, or if the Department of Health is wasting money, or if we are building toilets, Mr. Speaker, bathrooms to go into some place, we will certainly try to do something about it.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Works, Services, and Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, because of an ever-increasing amount of traffic on Prince Philip Drive, Columbus Drive, Kenmount Road, Torbay Road and the Conception Bay Highway; and because of the closure of our railway the traffic to and from St. John's Airport has increased substantially; and because of the existence of several industrial parks in this area; and because there will be one million passengers pass through the St. John's Airport this year; and because one-third of the population lives in this area and the monies derived from commerce goes into the coffers of the Provincial Government, will the Minister tell this House what is the status of the Outer Ring Road?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Member for the question. It is one that I am sure everybody in Newfoundland is rather interested in - the status of the Outer Ring Road. As you know, it is included in the railway sellout that his Government did before they changed sides. It is there.

MR. TOBIN:

Tell us why you did not send the Hydro people back to Bay d'Espoir

as you promised during the election campaign.

MR. GILBERT:

I will tell you that sometime. We have asked officials, Mr. Speaker, to look into the priority and the needs basis of the money. I might point out to the member that the cash flow for those projects they started - we have already announced some of the projects. The first \$10 million under the railway agreement, or the train robbery, was announced last Friday, and the rest of the money, there is a thirteen year period in which this money can be announced, so there is not really a great crying need. My officials are having a look at it now. There will be a statement made when I get the full report in. So, sometime over the next eight years, I will be able to make an announcement about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

The arrogance of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable. I have a letter where he states something about environmental assessment. Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell this House that that is why it is on hold, because a couple of people out there felt an environmental assessment - another environmental assessment - should be done, which would have little or no impact on the Outer Ring Road?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, at this point my Department is studying the priority and the needs of this

road. There was an environmental impact study done, and whether there will be another one is something that we will certainly tell the member. My colleague from Environment and Lands will certainly be looking into it, but as far as my Department is concerned, as I said, it has been studied on a priority and needs basis. And, as I said, we have eight years before we have to spend any of this money.

MR. PARSONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Would the Minister now tell this House and tell his colleagues, I think there are eight of them over there, some of them high ranking Cabinet Ministers -

MR. SIMMS:

Influential ones.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, influential ones.

- tell his colleagues and tell the people of this area that this project will be placed where it should be, on a top priority basis, or would the Minister concede that the real reason for holding up this road is political and he intends to deny the people of this area their rights to have access to a highway to commute to their place of work safely, thereby helping one-third of the population of this Province? Or is this another personal vendetta by the Minister against this area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister.

MR. GILBERT:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Finance. People throughout the Province are becoming increasingly worried about this Government revoking commitments and trampling on rights. In the last couple of days it has come to light that the Pensions Division of the Minister's Department has notified sectors of the public service, including Western Memorial Regional Hospital in Corner Brook and the Grace General Hospital in St. John's, that the Government is retroactively changing the public service pension regulations to cancel credit for service prior to 1967. Mr. Speaker, the public employees affected are being told they have only until the end of this year to make up the difference by purchasing what is called non-existing service. For some that will involve a cost of over \$30,000, even though these people affected have notices from the Department of Finance that their pre-1967 service has been granted.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister immediately stop the tampering with public service pension rights and will he here and now tell the House of Assembly that this Government will not revoke retroactively public service pension rights?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Member is talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

There has been no -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

What else is new?

DR. KITCHEN:

My problem is I do not know where she is coming from or what she is saying. There has been no revocation of rights under pension plans. We have made alterations in the pension plans at this time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And you are not going to?

DR. KITCHEN:

So I do not know what she is talking about. Perhaps she could document something.

MS VERGE:

I could give you (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN:

What I would like to say, though, if she is referring to the notices that went out with the cheques, is that the Federal Government has decided that at the end of this year they are not going to give tax credits for unworked service. That is their reminder to civil servants to get their act in order before the end of the year. As far as I know, that is all it meant. Now if the Member has

further information, she should let me know, I think.

MR. SIMMS:

Ask your Deputy Minister about it, boy.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East with a final supplementary.

MS VERGE:

I would suggest that the Minister talk to his own Deputy and talk to the administrators of Western Memorial and the Grace Hospital. These people in public service sectors have been alerted that the Government is retroactively changing the pension regulations to wipe out credit for pre-1967 service, entirely a Provincial Government matter.

MR. SIMMS:

It is a different issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there has been no retroactive change in pensions.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I feel sorry for the Minister today. The Premier has just said that Mount Pearl no longer has an influential Minister. That must be

embarrassing to the Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They used to have a (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

He also said that Mount Pearl is now going to be penalized as it relates to Recreational Capital Grants. That must also embarrass the Minister, since one-third of his constituency is within the City of Mount Pearl. He was also embarrassed last night, Mr. Speaker, since the people of Mount Pearl have very clearly given a resounding vote of confidence by a vote of four to one to Mayor Hodder, in spite of the fact -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

- Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Dawe was an excellent candidate and did offer a very clear choice. So I want to congratulate Mr. Dawe on the effort that he put in, as well. Will the Minister now agree that he has a clear message from the people of Mount Pearl, including the residents of his own District who reside within the City, that they are absolutely opposed to the Minister's amalgamation proposal? And will the Minister now agree to drop his proposal and ensure the people of Mount Pearl that only such annexations as a democratically elected City Council deems appropriate and in the best interest of the people of Mount Pearl will be considered for implementation?

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the question is similar to others I have been asked in previous sessions of the House. Yesterday Mount Pearl duly elected a city council and a mayor and that is what happened. It is no more than that, Mr. Speaker. As far as the amalgamation process is concerned and the hearings and feasibility process, the purpose is to hear from the people, from community groups, from the mayor, from the councillors in every community that is involved in the amalgamation process. We did not want to deny the people of Mount Pearl that right. I have not heard anybody in Mount Pearl saying we want to be denied that right. We want to be taken out of the amalgamation process. In fact, I further said that we went into this amalgamation procedure with a grouping of communities, in this particular case, and that ultimately the commissioners will make a recommendation.

The recommendation may very well be that the grouping remain as is, and they will confirm that. They could also say that Mount Pearl could stay as it is, with no amalgamation taking place. Or another grouping could be recommended. We have to wait and see. But to take Mount Pearl out of the procedure and deny the people the right to have a say at the hearings will be blatantly wrong and the Government decided to leave them in the amalgamation process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister might like to try to think that he did not get a message last night from the people of Mount Pearl, but he did. In spite of the fact that he had his political henchmen in there trying to defeat Mayor Hodder, Mr. Speaker, he got a strong message last night. And I want to ensure that indeed the people have the right. In view of the plebiscites that were held in St. Phillips and Burin which also rejected amalgamation, will the Minister ensure that any municipality that was proposed for amalgamation who requests a plebiscite will be given that opportunity to express their views before amalgamation is forced on them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the feasibility hearings process is to hear from the people in a public forum at public hearings with written briefs or oral presentations. That is the purpose clearly stated and laid out in the Act. To go through the procedure of a plebiscite without hearing from the people, letting them have their say for or against amalgamation, letting them have their say in the form of a written brief, where they may want to make different representation than is proposed by the Government would be denying them their democratic rights. And to proceed with a plebiscite without any hearings process would be wrong and against The Municipalities Act. This Government intends to follow the procedures as laid out in The Municipalities Act, the feasibility studies, the hearings process, and give the people their

democratic right to speak orally or in written briefs to the commissioners. Ultimately, a recommendation will be made, Mr. Speaker, to Government. Whether it be Mount Pearl or Burin or any other community, they have a right to be heard and that is what we are giving them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting The Economic Recovery Commission".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Fishery Loan Act".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting The Department of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to

introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act 1957, No.2".

Mr. Speaker, I also give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act 1957 No. 2.

And also Mr. Speaker I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Public Service Pensions Act".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting The Management, Harvesting And Protection Of The Forests Of Newfoundland and Labrador".

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker I have a petition from 525 citizens of Musgrave Harbour. I will read the prayer of the petition. The House of Assembly in Legislative Session Convened. The Petition of the undersigned residents of the Town of Musgrave Harbour. That we the undersigned residents of Musgrave Harbour do hereby humbly request your support and intervention regarding difficulties we are experiencing regarding the maintenance of the main road through Musgrave

Harbour, and winter snow clearing operations between Lumsden and Carmanville, and general winter conditions of Route 330 and 320, and

WHEREAS the Town Council of Musgrave Harbour took over the responsibility of the main road through the Town, some eight kilometers, in 1977 when the new loop road was constructed, bypassing Musgrave Harbour, and

WHEREAS the Musgrave Harbour Town Council was the only Town along the loop road that was required to take over the main road in their town, and

WHEREAS the snow plow leaves Lumsden goes to Deadman's Bay first and then on to Carmanville leaving Musgrave Harbour, which has a fairly large commuting work force, late, in having their highway plowed and sanded, and

WHEREAS the Department of Transportation use a seventy-five per cent sand, twenty-five per cent salt mixture on Route 330 and Route 320 with large stones in the sand which has caused a large number of broken windshields, and

WHEREAS the fact that the sand/salt is far less effective on 320 and 330 because of hills, valleys, twists and turns creating very hazardous conditions, and

WHEREAS your petitioners humbly pray that your honorable House may be pleased to instruct the Department of Transportation to immediately take over the responsibility of maintenance and upgrading of the main road through Musgrave Harbour, and that snow clearing and salting machinery leaving both Lumsden and Musgrave Harbour use a 100 per cent salt on

330 and 320, and as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

With respect to two parts of the petition, one the request to have the Department of Transportation again take over the road through the town. In the late 1970's the loop road went through. Musgrave Harbour was lead to believe that the town was forced to take over the road, which they did, and I think the grant, the municipal component, is some \$2,000 per kilometer. Communities have found that is woefully inadequate to service the needs of the town. I think the Department of Transportation expends about \$5 thousand per kilometer for just snow clearing, and we expect municipalities to be able to service the roads, both summer and winter, for \$2 thousand per kilometer. The figure, I think, was arrived at some 15 or 20 years ago. Totally unrealistic for todays conditions, and it should be changed immediately.

There have been numerous complaints from drivers in the area regarding the sand/salt mixture. The sand comes from a crushing operation nearby, and it is found to have, on occasion, large stones in it, resulting in many broken windshields. So the residents of Musgrave Harbour would like to have that situation remedied.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Works, Services, and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Member for Fogo would present a petition on behalf of 500 citizens of Musgrave Harbour, pointing out that the town was forced to take the road over by a

previous Government.

Now that to me is a strange thing to be saying and I really do not think that he meant that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was lead to believe.

MR. GILBERT:

Well lead to believe. Well maybe the sense of fairness and balance that the previous Government had, dictated that they do that to Musgrave Harbour. I will certainly look into it, and if it is the case that Musgrave Harbour is the only community that is forced to maintain the road through its community, I will certainly look into it, and I will give the answer to the gentlemen. He can come over and see me some time and I will tell him what the answer is or I will write him even, or I might even tell the House if you want, but do not get excited. I think it might have had something to do with it - that is what he is saying. It bears out the point that the hon. Members were saying here during question period - the fine sense of fairness and balance that those people had when they were on this side of the House - because Musgrave Harbour was an opposition District then, so I will certainly look into it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further petitions?

Orders of the Day

Private Member's Day

MR. SPEAKER:

It is Private Member's Day, and I am not aware of any other business

to be called. It is not quite 3:00 p.m. I assume the Government are going straight into Orders of the Day. At 3:00 p.m. we have to call the Private Member's motion, and I am now about to call it.

I call upon the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to debate his motion.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House will recall that yesterday I gave notice of the following motion, and I think the motion itself is certainly not laced with any political innuendo. It is pretty straightforward, I think, Mr. Speaker. The motion is this:

WHEREAS the fishery is the Province's most important industry;

I do not think there can be any disagreement on either side of the House that the fishery is, has been and will continue, I hope, to be the backbone of Newfoundland and Labrador.

AND WHEREAS the fishery is now facing a major long-term resource crisis;

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there can be any disagreement, political or otherwise, in this House that the fishery is, in fact, facing a long-term resource crisis. It is a crisis of management. The fishery is a renewable resource, and if it is properly managed - and that is a big 'if' - over the

next several years - it might take five, six, seven, eight or ten years, who knows? - if the resource is properly managed, the resource is renewable and, therefore, it should build back. That should be the goal of the managers of the resource.

AND WHEREAS it is vital that any Government response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open policy;

Again, Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no disagreement on that statement in this Legislature. There is no need to adopt any other policy other than an all-plants-open policy. Because to do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is, I am afraid, condemning dozens and dozens of Newfoundland communities to resettlement.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
For example, at the present time, and for the next five or six years, it could very well be, in fact it is very likely, that a number of fish plants in this Province, owned by the big corporations like FPI or NatSea, or some of the larger independents, it is very conceivable, with the resource crisis that is in front of us, that there will have to be downtime. It is very conceivable that there will have to be considerable downtime. But, Mr. Speaker, downtime, as bad as that is and as unacceptable as that is, we should never substitute that for forced closures of plants. Because, as I said just a few moments ago, if the resource is managed properly, then, over the next five, six, seven, eight or ten years, the resource should

build back up, and it is vital, in my view, to the rural nature of Newfoundland and Labrador that those plants be kept open. They may have to operate at half-time, they may have to operate at quarter-time, who knows? We do not know what the figures are for 1990 yet. But it is vital to keep them open, so that when the resource does build back in four, five or six years time, those plants are there, the skilled workforce is there, the communities are still there so that those plants can continue to be economic generators in Newfoundland and Labrador. If that does not happen, Mr. Speaker, when the resource comes back, as it will, you will see larger plants in this Province like Catalina, for example, like Marystown, for example, and other large plants that now operate at 65 per cent or 70 per cent capacity go to 100 per cent capacity, and Gaultois will be left out in the cold forever. That is what you will see unless there is an all-plants-open policy. And, Mr. Speaker, unless the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador go to Ottawa with a firm determination that there has to be an all-plants-open policy, the Ottawa mentality - and I do not care what the stripe of the Government is - the Ottawa mentality will prevail. The Ottawa mentality is that there are too many fishermen chasing too few fish in Atlantic Canada, particularly in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Ottawa mentality is that there is an overcapacity of processing in Newfoundland and Labrador. Well, it was that same Ottawa mentality, Mr. Speaker, that ten years ago was telling us that northern cod would be 400,000 tons by now. We all know what the reality is. But it can be 400,000

tons in seven or eight or ten years time, and it is therefore vital that every last fish plant in this Province be kept open, even if it is for only three or four months of the year rather than the seven or eight or ten they might be used to. Because if that does not happen you will see the Government of Canada - and it will happen unless this Government digs in its feet. I know, I have dealt with them - participate with the Government of this Province in closing down whole communities, and we cannot, Mr. Speaker, allow that to happen.

This resolution is non-political. There is not a political word in it, and I do not intend to inject a political word in the debate because it is too important. But the bottom line, the most important point is simply that unless the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador demands an all-plants-open policy, we will see whole communities close down in this Province. And I do not think we should do that. I do not think we have to do that, Mr. Speaker. Fish is a renewable resource and if it is properly managed, it will build back, it will come back. With a proper management regime, the numbers will increase as the years go by. Therefore, we must ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador communities that depend on the fishery are there when that happens. So it is vital that there be an all-plants-open policy, and it is more than vital that this Government go on record publicly as demanding it. Because Ottawa will run over you as sure as you are here, unless you are going to dig in your heels and not allow it to happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect

the Government today, or any day really, I am not that naive, to lay the details of what it is proposing to Ottawa to deal with the crisis in the fishery on the table of the House. That is not what the resolution is asking, Mr. Speaker. The resolution is not asking the Government to negotiate in public, it is not asking the Government to tell the House the details of what it has proposed to Ottawa, but it is asking the Government to give us the principles of the action plan that it has put forward to the Government of Canada. Is an all-plants-open policy a principle in that action plan? If it is not, it should be. Is retention of the resource-short plant program a principle in that action plan? Is the principle of access first to Newfoundland and Labrador to the use of northern cod a principle in that action plan? All I am asking the Government today is to tell us what the principles are. I do not want to know the details. I do not expect the Government to give us the details. It would not be right for them, when they are negotiating an intergovernmental agreement with another government to make the details public. But I do expect the Government to give us the principles. It is important, Mr. Speaker, for the future of this Province that we know what the principles are, and one of the most vital principles has to be this all-plants-open policy.

Another Government in Ottawa, a few years ago, tried to run roughshod over this Province and over the then Government of the Province and close down plants right, left and centre. We stood firm and we fought them, and I think we did the right thing. I

hope this Government will do the same thing over the coming months. I hope this Government will stand firm and fight, this Government will stand firm and say no, we are not going to willingly participate with you in a plan that will see whole communities, whole plants closed.

The other important principle the Government should address today in the debate on this resolution - not the detail, the principle - is whether or not this Government is prepared to participate with the Government of Canada in a large downsizing of the number of people involved in the fishing industry. I do not know, but I believe the numbers are - what? - 29,000 or 30,000 people full-time and part-time who are presently participating in the fishery. Some of them earn all their livelihood from the fishery. Some of them do not earn so much from the fishery, but they earn part-time; they make up some of their income from the fishery. I think the Government of Canada would be anxious to have the agreement of the Province to downsize the participants in the fishery to perhaps 10,000 or 12,000 people. I believe the Government of Canada would want to do that, and it will happen again unless this Government is prepared to dig in its heels and say no, we are not going to participate in that kind of venture because we believe what is needed is proper management. Then the 29,000 people who are in the fishery will be able to earn more of a decent living from it.

We also need from the Government more detail on this so-called LIFO principle, last in/first-out. LIFO, I believe, it is referred to by most people. We need to know

has the Government done its homework on what that really means to Newfoundland and Labrador? Has the Government done its homework on what it means to Carbonear District, what it means to Trinity - Bay de Verde District, what it means to Harbour Grace District, what it means to Districts on this side of the House? Has the Government really done its homework? I know what the plan is. I know what the goal is. The goal is to try to get non-Newfoundland participants out of the northern cod fishery, and that is an understandable and a supportable goal. But will you achieve that goal by following the LIFO principle, last in/first out. Harbour Grace was one of the last in in the northern cod fishery, so will Harbour Grace be out if the Government of Canada adopts this LIFO principle?

The Resource-Short Plant Program was one of the last users in the northern cod fishery. If LIFO is accepted, does that mean that all the resource-short plants in this Province lose their access to Northern cod? Does it mean that Quinlan's in Bay de Verde, and Woodmans in New Harbour - there are thirty plants altogether, I believe, all over Newfoundland and Labrador, does it mean that those thirty lose access to the 16,000 tons of northern cod they have right now? What does that mean to the work force, Mr. Speaker, in those communities? And is the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador prepared to tinker with and allow the Government of Canada to tinker with, in a very meaningful way, the lives of thousands of people in hundreds of communities in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, the goal might be laudable. The goal of having all

non-Newfoundland participants in the Northern cod fishery taken out is a worthy and laudable goal, but in trying to achieve that by accepting or recommending the LIFO principle, what are we doing? Are we sort of cutting off our nose to spite our face? That is what I want to know. And despite the numerous questions we have asked in Question Period in this House over the last two or three weeks, we yet cannot seem to get a firm understanding from the Government of how Harbour Grace will be affected, or how Old Perlican will be affected, or how Bay de Verde will be affected. We have not gotten that information.

And it is so vitally important, Mr. Speaker. This Government must be in office now long enough to know that there is this mentality in Ottawa that there is something radically wrong with the fishery in Newfoundland, and Labrador and, therefore, it has to have radical surgery, and one of the radical pieces of surgery is that somehow that inefficient, that old, that decrepit inshore fishery has to be done away with.

Mr. Speaker, if you attack the inshore fishery and the inshore allowance in Newfoundland and Labrador, then you will be fundamentally changing 500 years of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am not prepared, as one public figure in this Province today, to stand by and let that happen. It will happen if this Government does not dig in its heels and tell Ottawa to go jump over the moon, if they have to. To hell with them, Mr. Speaker! This is our livelihood. This is our Province. There are thousands of people who can expect to make a good living from the fishery if it is properly managed. It is

management we should be interested in. We should damn those who were participants in the improper management of the resource for years. We all have to take our responsibility for it. We were all misled. We were all led down the garden path. The present Minister of Fisheries, when he was the Minister of Fisheries in the 1970s, and rightly so, was preaching plant expansion, harvesting expansion in Newfoundland and Labrador, because he was given numbers that we were all given in those days, which said northern cod will soon be up around 400,000 tons sustainable yield a year.

Now we know what has happened, Mr. Speaker. It just did not come through. It was a pipe dream. It was pie in the sky. But that was a management problem and we should not try, in my view, to solve a management problem by forcing people out of the industry, by forcing plant closures, by forcing communities to uproot and resettle. That is not the way to solve the crisis in the Fishery. What we have to do, on the other hand, is make sure that we help those people bridge that gap over the next four, five, or six years, that there are Government programs that will keep people in Gaultois, that will keep in Ramea, that will keep people in Little Harbour Deep, that will keep people in Fleur de Lys, so that when the resource builds back, as it will if properly managed, there is an economic activity for them to go back to, and there is an economic activity for them to earn a livelihood from.

The last point I make in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, this non-political, non-partisan resolution, is I do not know why

it has escaped us for so long. I have done some checking across the Country and in places like Saskatchewan, for example, where agriculture is the most important industry, you will see a Standing Committee of the Legislature on Agriculture. In places like Alberta, where it is energy or hydrocarbon resources, you will see a Standing Committee of the Legislature on it. But in this Province, Government after Government, us included, never had the foresight, which was very, very bad, we never had the foresight to establish a Standing Committee of this Legislature on our most important industry, the Fishery. I believe a Standing Committee of this Legislature could be important to the Government and important to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in keeping an eye on the most important industry that we have in this Province. Of course we are political, we belong to political parties, but it is not uncommon in this Legislature, and others, for us to agree and to work together, to rub shoulders together, in other words, to do what is right. We can do what is right in this House, Mr. Speaker, and one of the things we can do for the most important industry that we have in this Province is to establish a Standing Committee of this Legislature on Fisheries, so that the Minister will, at all times, have the views of not only his own colleagues but also the views of his colleagues on this side of the House. I think that is important. I believe the Government should do it.

The resolution is meant, not for the Government to negotiate in public, I do not expect that, but the resolution is meant for the Government to put its principles

on the table; tell us the principles of the action plan you have presented to Ottawa. Do not tell us the details. I do not expect them. I have no right to expect them. But tell us the principles. Then, once we know those principles, the people of this Province will have an idea of whether this Government stands firmly behind the fishery as we have known it for 500 years, or whether this Government is going to participate with the Government of Canada in carrying out radical surgery on the Fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. member an assurance right now that the present Government is totally committed to building a strong fishery sector in this Province. The unfortunate thing about it is, in light of the current resource crisis it will take longer and it will be much harder to build the kind of dynamic fishery we believe the Province needs in order to sustain the number of people who depend on it for their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the resource is in a very serious crisis. We know that once the Harris Panel Report has submitted its findings to the Federal Government and once the Federal Government has made known its intentions with respect to the 1990 total allowable catch, we know that the total allowable catch will be reduced certainly no higher than 190,000 metric tons as opposed to 235,000 this year and 266,000 last year, which

represents a loss of 76,000 metric tons from 1988 to 1990. Now, Mr. Speaker, that represents a very substantial quantity of fish that was being used by the plants in past years to keep their plants in operation. We know why the problem happened. We know that. I am not wishing to attribute motives or to point fingers, but we all know that because of poor management on the part of the Federal Government their assessments of the stocks going back a number of years have been incorrect and, consequently, the fishermen of our Province and the people of our Province are now called upon to suffer for the mistakes of the Federal Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, that has being done, so there is not much more we can do about it. What is in the past is in the past, but hopefully we can learn a lesson from it. But given the fact there is a crisis looming up, Mr. Speaker, considerable action has been taken by the Province to better respond to the problem. For example, in February of 1989 the Federal Government established the Northern Cod Review Panel, and the mandate of that panel, which is referred to as the Harris Panel, was to consider the scientific advice provided by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans since 1977 on northern cod stocks, the current state and size of the stock, and to make recommendations on certain key issues.

In April 1989, the Federal Government established a Cabinet Committee, Chaired by the Right Hon. Joe Clark, to assess the problem and to recommend measures to alleviate the social and economic impacts of the quota reductions. A parallel committee of senior Federal Government

officials, The Task Force on Northern Cod, Chaired by Mr. Ken Stein, was also established at the same time to address this matter.

Then, of course, the Province swung into action. In July 1988, the Province established a parallel structure to work jointly with the Federal Ministerial and official committees. The Provincial Ministerial Cabinet Committee is Chaired by the hon. the Premier, while the official's committee is Chaired by Mr. David Vardy.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard charges from the other side, in recent days, that we are not responding adequately to the problem; we have been accused by Members opposite of just sitting around and doing nothing while a crisis develops in the fishing industry that will have the effect eventually of disrupting a lot of lives in Newfoundland and causing untold hardship for a number of people.

Mr. Speaker, back in July month we appointed a task force, headed by the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, the very competent David Vardy, former Chairman of the Fisheries College, the Marine Institute. Recently, Mr. Vardy was seconded to that task force position on a full-time basis. Mr. Vardy, Mr. Les Dean, who is my Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Fred Way, who is the Assistant Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and a team of highly qualified, totally committed young Newfoundlanders now form part of the response team that we have in place to work with the Federal response team to identify the problem and to identify ways and means of responding to the problem. I am happy to report to the House, Mr. Speaker, that

certainly, in my view, both committees are working well together. They are putting together some very interesting programs, they are identifying areas where diversification can occur in the economy, they are looking at the possibilities, for example, of secondary processing, the possibilities of a better utilization of otherwise underutilized fish, and they are undertaking, Mr. Speaker, a study into a whole wide range of areas where, if in fact they prove to be successful, the economy will be vastly improved.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are taking the problem very, very seriously. In fact, we have done all that can possibly be done about it in the short time we have had at our disposal.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member makes reference in his motion to the all-plants-open policy. Well, of course, it is a very, very popular position to take. It is a motherhood position - all plants open. He does not make reference to the fact, nor does he address the fact that come 1990, the very least we can expect under all headings will be a reduction of fish resource in excess of 100,000 metric tons. Now, if the fish are not there, how can we expect the fish plants to remain open to process it? The hon. Member talks about spreading it over, and maybe rather than having all of the fish processed in two or three plants, spread it over all of the plants and have them working for two or three months. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have any thought at all of trying to do something with the fisheries in this Province what we must do is bring it up on a professional level, and bring it along where Newfoundlanders,

Newfoundland fishermen, will be able to enjoy the lifestyle to which I believe they are entitled - certainly one that will far exceed what they have been used to. We are going to have to make some pretty hard, fast, and tough decisions over the next few months in the fishing industry, and in Government. Very tough decisions. And if it means forcing the big companies to keep all of their plants in operation, as desirable as that is, and if it results in those companies being placed in a position of becoming so unviable or un-economic that their very existence is threatened, then we have to make a decision as to what we want to do. Force them into bankruptcy maybe, or to do what is best from a corporate point of view.

Now, the hon. Member might mention the possibility, probably, of Government subsidies, that has been said, I have heard it - subsidize the plants to keep them in operation. He must be aware that would certainly trigger countervailing action on the part of the U.S.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, very much so, and it has happened. It happened in the salt fish business some years ago, but it was caught in time. Certainly that possibility is very real, and then, of course, we are left with a situation where there will be a countervailing tariff placed on our exports into the U.S. equal to the amount of subsidy being given to the plant in question. So it is not a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, of demanding that all of the plants be kept open, irrespective of the economics. It

is certainly not a simple matter to suggest that the Government subsidize the plants in order to keep them open, given the fact that lurking in the background is always the danger of the American countervailing tariff. And like he said, if that were to happen, then there would be a very adverse impact on the whole fishing industry.

For our part, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to wait until the total allowable catches have been announced, and that should not be too much longer. I am told that the two large companies, F.P.I. and Nat Sea, have still not fully decided exactly what they intend to do in terms of their over all management plan. I am told they have to wait, as we do, to get the final word from Ottawa as to exactly what the 1990 total allowable catch will be. And that makes sense. How can a company come up with a definitive management plan without knowing exactly how much raw material they are going to have to work with.

Now I have no doubt that they have looked at various scenarios. I am sure they looked at the scenario of 190,000 TAC and exactly how that would impact on their operations. I am sure they have looked at other scenarios that would impact on their operation, and it might well be that in the back of their minds they know roughly what will have to be done if and when either of these scenarios that they are working on materialize. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we have no idea yet, exactly what the total allowable catch will be, and we have no idea as to what extent it will impact on the two major offshore companies.

We have taken a strong position in this Government with respect to the amount of fish being caught off our shores and taken to Nova Scotia, especially by National Sea. We certainly do not relish the thought of having National Sea vessels catching fish off the Funk Island Banks or some place in the 2J, 3KL area, and passing St. John's and Burgeo and Arnold's Cove, and landing that fish in some plant in Nova Scotia. That is certainly not acceptable to us, and we intend to do everything we can to ensure that that will not happen. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of scenarios that can be put in play that would have a bearing on the Government's decision in that respect. We base our claim on the principle of adjacency, economic efficiency, historic usage and resource dependency. When we talk about adjacency - the adjacency argument, of course, has two dimensions - legal and economic. The legal aspect was reflected in Canada's position in the Law of the Sea Conference discussions leading to the extended jurisdiction. The economic argument refers specifically to the economic efficiency of harvesting fish. Canada sought extended fisheries jurisdictions for two purposes, Mr. Speaker, to bring under the authority of a single state the responsibility for conserving and protecting the Fisheries resource, and two, to restore to its coastal fishing industry the principle right of access to the resource.

Adjacency, Mr. Speaker, was the centerpiece of the Canadian argument in the Law of the Sea Conference and the coastal communities of Newfoundland were the centerpiece of the Canadian adjacency argument. It makes all

kinds of sense that fish being harvested on the Funk Island Bank be harvested by people who are living in areas adjacent to that area. They must have first call on that fish.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, on which we base our claim for having the major part of the Northern cod, is that of economic efficiency. Again, it makes all kinds of sense, when you are catching fish on the Funk Island Banks, or the Northern Grand Banks, or in the 2GH area, it makes all kinds of sense, both from an economic point of view and from a quality point of view, that that resource be landed at plants near the area in which the fish was being caught. That is a natural advantage and is one that we feel we have every right to expect to be able to take advantage of.

The other principle on which we base our claim is on the historic usage. For a number of centuries now enormous landings of cod from the Northern reaches, from the Northern waters, have dominated the Newfoundland fishing industry. I am told that in some peak years, many, many years ago, as much as 300,000 metric tons of cod fish, ground fish, were landed from the northern waters by Newfoundlanders and that, of course, establishes our right to the historic usage principle.

Mr. Speaker, if these four principles are adopted, then I believe Newfoundland has a very strong case for having all of the fish, or certainly the major part of it, landed in this Province. Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about our position on the Resource Short Plant Program. Another principle,

of course, that can be applied to convince Ottawa that Newfoundland has prior right to all of the Northern cod, especially in this period when stocks are declining, and when our plants are operating vastly under-utilized, under-capacity. Another principle, of course, would be the last in/first out principle, and that means that last into the industry in this case, will be the first out, and that of course, would preclude Nova Scotia from having great access to the resource. In fact it would reduce their potential landings from 23,000 tons, which is what it is today, this year, to about 8000 metric tons, under that principle, thereby effecting a savings for this Province of about 15,000 metric tons. As the hon. Member pointed out there are some down-sides to that principle. Namely, of course, that if you apply it across-the-board, last-in first-out, the Resource Short Plant Program was one of the last programs in. The mid-distance quota was one of the last. The otter trawl quota was one of the last in, so quite conceivably if you carry that principle through to a final conclusion, we would see that Newfoundland could very well end up losing three of those very important allocations, although we would be having a net gain from Nova Scotia of something like 15,000 tons. That is just one of many options, Mr. Speaker, that has been looked at. The thought is that if we could recover that much fish from the Nova Scotians, then it might well be that we could re-allocate that fish back to some of these programs, once we have control of it. But that is only one of many scenarios that is being studied by the response teams in order to alleviate the problem.

We have a number of problems, one of the main problems, of course, concerns the depleted resource in the 2J-3KL area. We all know what has happened there. We know that the fish stocks are vastly overfished and that, for whatever reason, it requires now probably two to three times the effort to catch half as much fish as what we could catch a few years back.

There is also a problem, of course, on the Nose and Tail of our Grand Banks. Therein, of course, is one of the big problems, because there we are dealing with an international organization known as NAFO, the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization, who have complete say in how those stocks are managed. NAFO, of course, is made up of a number of European countries including, member nations of the Economic Community in Europe, and a number of other countries that are not part of the EEC.

Unfortunately, while NAFO intentions, Mr. Speaker, are honourable, there are countries within their jurisdiction that choose to ignore the quotas that are established by NAFO. In fact, I believe, last year either Spain or Portugal, I am not sure, or maybe both, exceeded the NAFO allowable catch by twelve times. They just completely ignored the scientific assessments made by NAFO, and the quotas established by NAFO, and went their merry way plundering the resource as if there was no tomorrow, and in so doing, contributed greatly to the problems that we now are facing in that area, and, if unchecked, problems that I believe will eventually spell the doom of the southern grand bank fishery.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are many problems facing the fishery. Then, of course, we have the St. Pierre bank fishery, the Canada-France fishery and boundary dispute, where Canada has had to give France some badly needed allocations in order to get them to the bargaining table. That is costing the fishermen on the south coast dearly. Then, of course, we have the other equally serious problem facing the fishermen in the Gulf area, where the stocks have been depleted now to such an extent, that the fishermen who fish in that area have just about given up on it. So there we have four major problems in terms of the harvesting sector of the industry. We have the 2J+3KL Northern cod, we have the Nose and Tail, we have the Canada-France 3PS problem, of course, then we have the Gulf problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we work together, and do the things that need to be done, these problems can be resolved. I have confidence in the Federal Government in that I believe that they are going to come through with very substantial assistance to help respond to the program. I believe that in cases where maybe it will be necessary to close fish plants, where there will be displaced fishermen and fish plant workers, I hope and I have every reason to believe that the Federal Government will recognize its responsibility and will provide the necessary funding to do what has to be done in that area to head off a catastrophe, that will otherwise occur if no such action is taken. The hon. Member, I think, mentioned the need to reduce the number of fishermen, I believe he said he hopes that the Province would not support any such endeavors on the part of the

Federal Government. Mr. Speaker that again is not being totally realistic or totally honest.

MR. SPEAKER (Walsh):

Order, I remind the hon. Minister that his time has expired.

MR. W. CARTER:

Alright, give me a minute, to clue-up. Mr. Speaker we know that it would be living in never-never land to expect that the reduction in the fish stocks that we have to contend with, will be adequate to sustain the number of fishermen that are currently trying to derive half a living, not a living but half a living from the industry, consequently, I believe that we are going to have to make some tough decisions in that respect, and maybe reduce the number of fishermen, maybe remove or reduce some of the part-time fishermen in the industry. Certainly if that is necessary then we are going to have to make sure that the necessary diversification take place to ensure that those people who are displaced, through no fault of their own, will be given the opportunity to get another job and to earn a livelihood. Mr. Speaker my time is just about up. I will only ask the Opposition to be reasonable and not to play politics with this very serious matter, not to play politics with it. To suggest that we not make any changes in the industry in terms of the number of plants, the number of fishermen, I think is playing politics with it. If we continue to follow along that line, then we are going to have another two or three hundred years in this Province nurturing a fishing industry that is not able to provide a decent living for the people that are engaged in it, and I frankly do not want to see that

happen. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker in view of the fact that this matter is of extreme importance obviously, and Members on both sides I think want to speak to it, does not provide a lot of time with even twenty minutes, even though that is less than the normal time. Could we agree perhaps on a ten minute speaking time limit and ask the Speaker to enforce it so that we could get three or four speakers, perhaps.

MR. BAKER:

Yes Mr. Speaker we agree wholeheartedly. It gives more people a chance to express their opinion, and even if they take eight minutes, we will not mind, but we give the Speaker direction to cut it off at ten.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will accept the recommendations of the House Leaders for both sides, and remind subsequent speakers that their time limit will be ten minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. LANGDON:

Mr. Speaker I support the resolution put forward by the Opposition House Leader today, calling for a Standing Committee to

discuss the fishery in this Province. When I listened to the Minister of Fisheries, a few moments ago, saying there was no need for the Standing Committee because of the different proposals and studies and initiatives put forth by the Provincial Government. As I was going through, I thought about this particular scenario for the people of Fortune - Hermitage and I see impending disaster. We are talking about more than failure in the fishery in my area, in my District it is personal disaster, and the name of the community, Mr. Speaker, that has come up quite often today is the community of Gaultois. I do not know if the Government is privy to any information regarding that community or not, I do not know. Mr. Speaker, that community of about 800 people is an island in Hermitage Bay, and the people in that community earn a living one hundred per cent from the fishery, and if that particular fish plant in that particular community closed, then it would mean the death of that particular community. There is no doubt about that whatsoever. I honestly believe and - not playing partisan politics or being partisan in any way shape or form - I do not see anything, and I agree that I am not one of the legal minds of this Province, but I do not see what you can put in Gaultois to give the people alternative employment. I do not see it in Hermitage and I do not see it in Coomb's Cove, and I do not see it in Wreck Cove and I do not see it in Belleoram. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is an alternative for these communities in that District. And if we were to close the community fish plant at Gaultois, if we were to close it at Harbour Breton, if

we were to close it at Belleoram, if we were to close it at Hermitage, we would, there is no doubt about it whatsoever, have a complete resettlement along the south coast, and that part of the Fortune - Hermitage District would cease to exist. That is the problem facing us, Mr. Speaker.

I was listening to the president or the acting president of National Sea a few days ago, it might have been yesterday on my way home from the House of Assembly, saying primarily the same thing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) was saying, that we cannot expect these fish companies to share the resources around the Province and not to expect plant closures. The fact is these are private companies, they have shareholders and the main aim of these people is to make profit. If we forced them into bankruptcy - then what? We would go through the same scenario as we had before. I honestly believe that there is more to it than that, because we are talking about, as I said a moment ago, the livelihoods of people.

Mr. Speaker, last week Newfoundlanders were proud of the Premier of this Province when he went to Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LANGDON:

- and took on the Prime Minister of the Country. One of the editorials said 'He took it on the chin' - and so did other Premiers. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has to show his mettle as well in the Province, and let us not forget that. It is not only on the National stage that the mettle has

to be shown, it has to be shown here in leadership.

We are facing in this Province a disaster that we have not seen since Confederation. And I am probably wrong in that, but I stand as an emotional person today, because the people in my District are affected as many other people are across this Province. And I said when I sought election - I did not promise the people all kinds of tangible things - but I promised them concern, and I promised them compassion. And I believe, at this particular stage in this Province, that we need someone who has compassion, to address the needs of the people in this Province - compassion. And the peoples' concerns in my District are mine. I am not in the House of Assembly looking for a halo. I do not want one. But what I do want from this House of Assembly is to let the people in my District know that I do represent their concerns. And their concerns are my concerns. I am not inventing concerns so that I can look good. We cannot play with people's lives. I go into a house in Hermitage and I go into a house in Gaultois and the person says our income this year was \$7,000. Well \$7,000 is better than no dollars, and to uproot these people and send them to Ontario with no skills - to put them in Toronto where a house is going to cost \$300,000 - they cannot survive in that kind of an environment. I am probably out in left field in this, but I honestly believe that the people of this Province think the same way.

You see the thing about it is there has to be, as I said a moment ago, compassion. I read an

editorial in The Evening Telegram some time ago that said 'There were too many teachers in the House of Assembly. There were not enough lawyers and there were not enough doctors to discuss and carry on the needs of this Province.' I do not know who wrote it and I do not care. The only difference is that with a few more courses at university I could become a doctor or a lawyer or whatever. I could do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LANGDON:
Because I do not have a number of degrees yea long behind my name does not mean that I do not have the people's interests at heart, and that I do not know the needs of this Province. I could not care less about that, because it does not matter. The needs of the people have to be addressed and we can never forget that.

There was a quip from across the floor the other day: 'If you are so much concerned, why did you bring a private resolution to the floor asking for improved student aid?' Improved student aid is what it is all about in this Province, is it not? Is it not helping young people? If we educate our young people, then they can fill this Legislature and do a better job than I can. That is what it is about. I thought that was important, and the fishery is important. It is important to the people of this Province, and let us not play politics with it.

If I were with these people over there I would call for a Standing Committee, because I believe we are going through a crisis in our time that we have never seen

before. I do not care how silly I look or how silly I am, that is not important. It is the people of Fortune - Hermitage who are important to us. And I do not want any quips from the Member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, he has done that already today. Be serious! Take it seriously, because it is serious business. We are not looking at animals, we are looking at people's lives and the matter of uprooting them. That situation is very important. If it is not important to you, you should not even be in the House!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GRIMES:
A point of order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is not even in his seat. He cannot raise a point of order.

MR. GRIMES:
I have to go over there.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Exploits.

MR. GRIMES:
I am hesitant to interject, because I do find, as on a previous time, a week ago when the Member spoke so eloquently, that there are a lot of points with which I agree. However, I do find that it is very difficult for me to sit here, two weeks in a row, and have a person lecture Members of the House of Assembly with personal viewpoints, and not address the Chair and speak to the issue. I would ask that the Speaker instruct him to stick to the issue, stop lecturing Members

in this House, and address the concerns properly, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The hon. Member is a rookie in the House. He is not impressing the Premier one little bit. He is not going to get into the Cabinet by raising these spurious points of order. It is foolish! The hon. Member is speaking. He is sincere, probably giving one of the most sincere speeches I have ever heard in this House, by the way, and it does not fit the hon. Member's personality to be interrupting a Member who has only ten minutes, by agreement that we have just reached. The Premier, in a moment, has ten minutes to go. How will he like it if we stand up and interrupt the Premier all through with silly, foolish points of order? Sit down, boy, and do not be wasting people's time! You need a lecture.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order.

The Chair sees no point of order and asks the Member for Fortune - Hermitage to please continue.

MR. LANGDON:

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to lecture people as to what they should do in the House. But, when you are addressing a serious problem and you hear barbs coming across the floor, you tend to become emotional. You might sit in your seat and be cool as a cucumber, but when the people of my district are affected, I get emotional about that and I cannot help it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LANGDON:

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we were talking about fairness and balance, and I was thinking about the community of Gaultois. They applied for, I think, a \$3,000 grant for a playground. I do not know how many of you have ever been there. There is not even a swing for the kids. I would not know where you could put one. The community is facing serious problems. Only a few days ago, I learned there are no roads done in the District and the Department of Transportation expects the people to shoulder the cost 60/40 even for the roads they have to walk on. As their Member in the House, I really do have concern for these people. I believe that community was neglected by the Peckford administration, the Moores administration and the Smallwood administration. None of the three have treated that community as they should have done. And I cannot stand here representing those people without being emotional. Back there in Gaultois today they are thinking about their future. I do not know if they are thinking of their plant as being one of those to be closed or not. But it is a very serious concern. And it is the same thing all over the Province.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would, as I said earlier, support the Leader of the Opposition in requesting a Standing Committee to study the Fisheries. It does not mean that we are going to have all the ideas brought in tomorrow, but it will, over the long run I think, give impetus to a very important industry in this Province. As far as I am concerned, it is number one and it will always be that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sorry to say that we cannot support the resolution as proposed. There are some aspects of it that we can clearly recognize. I support properly addressing the concerns that are addressed in it, but I do not agree with the proposed response.

The first recital, 'WHEREAS the fishery is the Province's most important industry' - of course it is. I cannot quarrel with that. 'The fishery is now facing a major long-term crisis.' Of course it is. We cannot quarrel with that. We have been saying that and recognized it a long time ago. 'And WHEREAS it is vital that any Government response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open policy.' I do not know about that. I do not know that that is the right solution. We are going to wait to see what happens and what the companies propose and how the companies propose to deal with this problem. Then, together with the Government of Canada, we are going to take a look at the circumstances that exist in the Province and determine what action, if any, the Government should or should not take in that circumstance. I cannot necessarily agree right at this stage that that is the right course. It may or it may not be.

Then the resolution goes on to say, 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government immediately inform this House of the basic principles of its Action Plan to

address the fishery crisis that it has proposed to the Government of Canada.'

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, if I could have a Page, to table in the House immediately, as the thing requests, the basic principles outlined in the Action Plan that the Government has put forward to the Government of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why did the Minister not do it?

PREMIER WELLS:

Because I am going to do it. I am the Chairman of the Committee. I am the Chairman of the Special Committee of Cabinet that we created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

There is no problem. Do not worry about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No? No?

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, we addressed this problem long before the Opposition apparently recognized that it was a problem. That is the difference between them and us. Four months after we addressed the problem they are coming along now to the House with a resolution, essentially grandstanding for the public of this Province, putting on this grandstand show that it is necessary for the Government to immediately inform the House of its Action Plan and that we establish a Standing Committee of the House. Well, let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what was done and when we did it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Meech Lake.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will talk about Meech Lake tomorrow, if hon. members want to talk about Meech Lake. Is that what they want, to have a debate on Meech Lake tomorrow?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

This asks the Government to report what it has done and I will report what we have done. Before this House adjourned last June we had this concern addressed. We put together a Committee of the Cabinet - the Minister has already referred to it. The Federal Government named a Committee of the Federal Cabinet, headed by the Right Hon. Joe Clark. We put together a Committee of the Cabinet to respond to this problem, and we did. We responded immediately. The document which I have just tabled was put together during July of last year, of last summer. That is four months ago, four months before the Opposition stood in this House to make a grandstand display on the Fisheries. Well, this action was taken four months ago. We met on August 23 with the Federal Government, highlighted these concerns, told them of the dimension of the problem, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, the political friends -

MR. SIMMS:

That is all new?

PREMIER WELLS:

No, that was tabled in August 1989. At a meeting with the Federal Government, that document was tabled. The political confreres of the hon. Members opposite were horrified, they were

shocked, that we had had this work done. We caught them flat-footed and unprepared to address the problem that had really been of their creation.

MR. SIMMS:

They talk about stocks and they talk about (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

They are shocked out of their shoes, Mr. Speaker. They do not like what they hear.

We addressed this problem and brought this to the attention of the Government and said, now Government of Canada, it is necessary to sit down with us and develop a plan. They said, do not release that. We were going to release it the next day to the media; come back here, hold a press conference and release the position the next day. They pleaded with us not to do it. 'Please, do not do it!'

MR. SIMMS:

Who did?

PREMIER WELLS:

The Federal Government, the Federal Cabinet Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being the accommodating kind of Government that we are, not stubborn, or intransigent or anything, as is sometimes suggested by the other side, being the kind and considerate accommodating people that we are we agreed we will not do it for three or four weeks to give you a chance to catch up with us, but we warn you we cannot leave the people of Newfoundland and Labrador exposed without this information for long. We must provide this in fairness so that the people concerned can make their decisions when it is

necessary for them to do so, or when it is more advantageous for them to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, three or four weeks later they still were not ready. Finally, on October 5, we said to them we cannot wait any longer. We are now going to release this information. They were upset. They did not want us to do it. They still wanted us to hold off. But, Mr. Speaker, we persisted, and on October 5 we called a major press conference and released that information and, at the same time, released this executive summary which I will also table, if the page would just allow me to quote from it for a minute. During that time we set out a number of proposals that we had developed then and put forward. They are spelled out. 'We want to make sure that a response program would provide short-term compensation and income support. Even in the short term this element should be used to foster the longer term economic diversification objective. This could include more imaginative and creative use of large sums paid out in unemployment insurance payments.'

So, we said to the Government of Canada, look, there is an opportunity here to try and do some good out of this terrible disaster that we are facing. You know that you are responsible for this problem. You know that you have to deal with the consequences and provide the funds. You put up the basic funds to meet with this problem and identify the amount, and then we, the Province, will look at it and develop a plan. We will work with you. We will put in some additional funds, even though we are not directly responsible, Federal Government.

It is your responsibility. We will join with you and put in some additional funds and you put in additional funds, and we will try and make the best of a very bad situation for the economy of Newfoundland, and try and give the people who have had to rely on the fishery, because they have had no other economic alternative, an alternative. That is our basic principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here I am going to give some plaudits to the Federal Government, to the Right Hon. Joe Clark, to the hon. John Crosbie, and to other ministers who are concerned, and to Ken Stein and the members of the task force. They responded well once we made the thing public. Up to that time, they had not been responding well, and we had not been receiving a good response. But once we held that press conference on October 5 and made the issue public and put forward a proposal, I have to say, and I give fair credit where credit is due, the Federal Government has responded in a very responsible way, and I express, on behalf of all Members of the House I am sure, our gratitude for the manner in which they have responded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

May I ask the Premier where he held his press conference on October 5? Was it here?

PREMIER WELLS:

In the Collective Bargaining Room in this building.

MR. SIMMS:

And you tabled these documents then?

PREMIER WELLS:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I am sorry.

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, I made them public in the news media. The House was not in session on October 5.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what I mean, you released them publicly to the news media, these same documents.

PREMIER WELLS:

Released them publicly, yes. I think that is right, yes. I know most of it was released publicly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

No, that is exactly my point. There is nothing new in it. I am just answering the question that was raised, what are the principles outlined? - that the hon. Members opposite have not seen since July. How could they know? They did not even look or read. These are their defects, their deficiencies, so we outline these now.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) months before.

PREMIER WELLS:

That is an easy thing to say now, once you realize this had not even happened. I do not know where the hon. Members were in October that they were not even aware that this had occurred.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what I just asked you, if this was something new. But it is not.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, since that time we have been working diligently with the Federal task force, and the Provincial task force that we have established has been working diligently, and I think the Minister of Fisheries will confirm - I have only got one minute, so I had better finish fast - that both committees have worked well, that we have new proposals that are not here yet but are proposals for consideration, and that we do not feel that it is in the best interest, at this stage, to discuss them here without working them through completely with the two Task Forces first. But there are a variety of proposals that have come from the Federal Government, some that have come from us, and I am sure they do not want us to make them public right at this stage, until we are both in a position to do so.

Mr. Speaker, beyond this we cannot say anymore at this stage, except I do want to say that a standing committee of this House would, in my judgement, only impede the very effective work that is being done by those two task forces. And though, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition may have good intentions, this idea of a standing committee to deal with this problem is not the right course to follow. I would sooner leave it in the hands of the two Task Forces. I thank hon. Members for giving me ten minutes. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I am very disappointed that the Premier has decided to have his caucus vote against a select committee of this House. One of the things the Premier did, both as Leader of the Opposition and since he has been Premier, is try and improve the decorum, the infrastructure, the influence of the Members of the House of Assembly so that it is on a more professional basis, so that it performs the democratic role which it is supposed to perform. All we are asking for in this resolution, which Government Members are going to vote against, is that we as the duly elected fifty-two representatives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador be allowed to have some input, in the form of a select committee, to see if we can help resolve what everyone is now acknowledging is going to be a crisis in the fishery, a crisis in rural Newfoundland.

On the one hand, yesterday we had the concurrence of the Government, the support, a cordial relationship, that on Private Member's Day the Opposition could bring in this Resolution. The real substance of the matter is that a select committee of the House could, over a period of time, possibly assist. The Premier thinks that it may compound the issue, make it more difficult to find solutions. I think that shows an awful lack of faith in the democratic process, that we, as the fifty-two persons elected in Newfoundland and Labrador, could not, between all fifty-two of us, find one or two ideas that maybe the bureaucratic committee or the Cabinet committees would not have thought of. We talk to fishermen, we talk

to plant workers every day of the week, and maybe there are a few ideas that we might find that somebody else does not have. I am disappointed that Government Members are not going to vote for the select committee, but, again, I am not surprised.

Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed as are many persons in Newfoundland and Labrador, not just on the Opposition side of this Chamber. There is a crisis in the Newfoundland fishery, there is a crisis in rural Newfoundland, the likes of which many of us will not have seen. I have spent almost fifteen years in this Legislature, and I suspect the next few years are going to be the toughest that rural Newfoundland has seen. When I listen to the Minister of Fisheries, who keeps saying that we are going to have - and in this document itself, one of the policies your Government is putting to Ottawa says we need a Federal Response Program. There is no mention of a Provincial Response Program - a Federal Response Program.

One of the second elements of these principles is 'fisheries operational considerations and management measures to rationalize and increase the efficiency of the fishing industry.' What does that mean? Does that mean less plants, less plant workers, less fishermen, bigger dragnets, factory freezers, more people unemployed? Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the Minister of Fisheries, and even when I listen to the Premier, I think, yes, the Premier has a firm grasp of his position on Constitutional Rights and Constitutional Accords and Meech Lake, but when it comes down to the nuts and bolts of Newfoundland, when it comes down

to the fishery, I really do not believe that Members Opposite have a full grasp of this problem. The Minister of Fisheries gets up today and says that we have too many people in the fishing industry. We are going to find altered employment.

Some of the Members here on this side of the House today, and some who are not here, spent ten years in Government. I know I did. We tried to diversify the Newfoundland economy. We were not all dummies. We were not here to fill our own pockets. We tried to do the best for Newfoundland, and to diversify Newfoundland's economy is a very, very difficult situation. Mr. House, head of the Economic Recovery Team, acknowledged last week that it is going to be very, very difficult. But the Minister of Fisheries today says that we have too many people in our most labour intensive industry, the fishery. We are going to have to find alternate employment for them. We already have in Newfoundland - what? - it used to be 15 per cent, since the Government took over it has gone up to 17 per cent, almost 18 per cent, 18 percent of Newfoundland's work force today cannot find a job. If you add the number of persons who are discouraged and are no longer seeking gainful employment, who are simply living on the roles of social welfare or other social programs, the real effect may be 28 or 30 per cent. And that is what Members opposite would be saying if they were over here, that the real unemployment rate is not 17 per cent as Stats Canada says, it is really 28 or 30 per cent.

So, all of a sudden, we are going to rationalize, make more

efficient our most labour intensive industry. What does that mean? We cannot find work for the 17 per cent that are unemployed now, but all of a sudden we are going to add to that by 5 per cent, or 6 per cent, or 10 per cent, and somebody is automatically going to find jobs for them. The reality is, and I know it is often the function of oppositions to create panic, to create an aura that things are disastrous because the Government should be changed, but I will tell you, as I said, I have been here for 15 years representing Ferryland, and what is happening in my riding is going to substantially change the direction of that part of rural Newfoundland, maybe forever.

When you look at the Cape Pine problem, with 500 or 600 workers in Witless Bay, when you look at Universal Fisheries that is very likely going bankrupt, when you look at the possibility of closing down National Sea Products, where many of my constituents work, or closing down the plant in Trepassy, you have a whole area in Newfoundland where there are no minerals, where there is no forest industry, where there is limited tourist potential, limited opportunities to diversify, what are those people going to do?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Move.

MR. POWER:

Move is very likely the only alternative that many of them will have.

Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations what training programs were being considered, what were being implemented. The most sensible

answer she gave me, after the second or third question, was that it was not her mandate to either be involved with the causes of unemployment or, in the case of solutions, for retraining. And I really have to wonder if this Government has a grasp of the fishing problems that are about to take place in Newfoundland.

If we end up with massive unemployment, no retraining programs, an economy that is very difficult to diversify, all we can have is hopefully get enough travel agents to send a lot of Newfoundlanders to some other part of Canada, or some other part of the world. The fishery is the core of many parts of rural Newfoundland, if not the core of Newfoundland itself. All businesses depend in some way on what is developed in the fishery.

The proposals: We have not had a chance - I have not had a chance, not having seen this document before - to really see what the Government is saying, but I find an awful lot of it is rhetoric. It does not have concrete proposals, it does not have reactions to assist individuals, to respond to their individual problems in the fishing industry. It is nice to rationalize, to make the fishing industry more efficient, but when it comes down to the reality of making a day-to-day living and paying your bills, an awful lot of fishermen and plant workers have a lot of trouble with that.

I am really not sure that the Newfoundland Government should not look in a very radical way at restructuring the fishing industry in Newfoundland. What happened in 1980 or 1981 when, I guess, all those small companies were going

bankrupt and we had to restructure the deep sea fishing industry? We took all the debt, we converted it into Government equity, we allowed those companies to become very strong, and when they became very strong, they sold off a lot of their shares, paid back both the Federal and Provincial Governments some of the debt that was owing to them, and eventually they became very efficient companies.

Why is that not being considered for the inshore processing sector? Why do we have to let inshore plants go bankrupt when it was not right for FPI.? Why is there a bias? I find, when listening to the Minister of Fisheries in particular, the last in/first out proposal is a bias against inshore Newfoundland. It is a bias in favour of the offshore.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, that is who is going to get it, the offshore.

MR. POWER:

The offshore are going to get the fish. The way to rationalize and make efficient the Newfoundland fishery is to close down inshore Newfoundland, get another four or five big factory freezers, go out and catch all the fish you want, employ 4,000 people or 5,000 people instead of 30,000 people; you have a very efficient industry, you have a couple of large companies that are extremely profitable, and you have 20,000 more people unemployed in Newfoundland.

All I want today in speaking to this Resolution, which is a reasonable resolution, is to allow the Members of the Legislature an active participating role in trying to find a solution to a

great crisis in our greatest industry. To say that we are not going to have that solution means, Mr. Premier - and I have to say I took exception yesterday and I take exception today, as well - that this is going to be a political football. We, on this side of the House, and you and your Cabinet colleagues and Government backbenchers, have no choice. And we, on this side of the House, have every right to continue to bring up the problems in the fishery. That may embarrass the Government on certain days, it may make the Minister of Fisheries' job tough, or the Minister of Development's job tougher than it is to diversify the economy, but as Members for fishing Districts and as an Opposition, we have no other choice but to keep bringing these problems to this Legislature and to the public of Newfoundland to see if we can find solutions. And I, for one, am not going to apologize to anybody for serving my constituents well.

Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do with the fishing industry? Is it all going to be blamed on the Federal Government? Is the Federal Government the only form of Government in this Country that has to solve this problem? If it is, I can only advise the Premier - and I will say this: I learned a lesson at one time when I was Minister of Agriculture and I was trying to get an agricultural agreement. My predecessor had tried for several years to get \$8 million for a 5-year agricultural agreement. I went as Minister of Agriculture to a meeting in Ottawa to try and get \$5 million for us, and it could not be done. The Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan happened to be the Premier of Saskatchewan, and he

was looking for \$1 billion because they had had a crop failure in Saskatchewan in one year - \$1 billion for Saskatchewan -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

And he did not blink an eye.

MR. POWER:

He did not blink an eye. The Canadian Government really came in, I guess to the Western farmers who were in some real plight, with a substantial amount of money.

In my final comment - I only have a minute or so left - I will say to the Premier, who did do an excellent job last week representing a certain point of view, very eloquent in constitutional matters. I do not agree with all he said, but I do agree that he did an eloquent and excellent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

He has gotten the attention of the Canadian Prime Minister, the Parliament of Canada and all of the other Premiers in Canada. I will say, besides pushing for Senate reform, Constitutional reform, while you have the attention of the other political leaders in Canada, let us really push once and for all to try and resolve the fishing industry problems in Newfoundland.

PREMIER WELLS:

The first thing I mentioned.

MR. POWER:

It is the most important issue in Newfoundland. I would ask the Premier, on future occasions when select committees are recommended by this side of the House, to look at them for what they are: they

are part of the parliamentary democratic process, they allow duly elected members to take part, they do not necessarily form government policy, and government does not have to initiate any recommendations made by the select committee. But they do allow us to be involved.

I can only say in closing, Mr. Speaker, I know we only have ten minutes. There are a lot of suggestions I have about the fishing industry. I can only say to the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries and the Government, that you had better really get ahead of the game when it comes to the fishing problems in Newfoundland, because the next three or four years could be disastrous for many parts of rural Newfoundland. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering out loud here. I have listened to fisheries debates in this House, by way of the media and other arrangements and other methods, I suppose just about all my life. I look over across and I can remember some year and a half or two years ago when the other Government dealt with the question of the fisheries in Newfoundland. I remember when the hon. Frank Moores dealt with the fishery question in Newfoundland, and when Joey Smallwood had to do with the question of the fishery in Newfoundland, and now Clyde Wells has to deal with the question of the fishery in Newfoundland, and I can honestly say, and being quite sincere, that this is the first

time in the history of Newfoundland that a comprehensive look is being made at the fishery in Newfoundland, right now!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

I am amused. I do not understand it. I am sure if I used words like 'damn and too hell with that crowd in Ottawa' someone would bring me up on it and say, those are not the right words to use in the House of Assembly. I heard that a few minutes ago from the other side, from the Leader of the Opposition, and I was amazed. I do not know where I am. I am beginning to wonder what Government is in Ottawa. Because if he is damning Ross Reid and he is damning John Crosbie, my God, where are their priorities in regards to the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and of Newfoundland? Where are they? I do not know. I am lost on this one.

For some reason or other, this particular group have turned on the people they have elected in Ottawa. And I take exception to the Premier, because he did get up and thank Ross Reid and John Crosbie when I had it written here prior to him saying it. You took my notes from me, Mr. Premier, but I will let you away with it this time. And I will be serious. These particular gentlemen, along with Mr. Siddon and along with the Prime Minister of Canada, are taking a serious look at the fishery in Newfoundland. Now we are being asked to sidetrack that process, we, on the Government side, are being asked today ignore the fact that this Government has put together a task force from the Cabinet, we are being asked to

forget what the Federal Government is doing and the promises and commitments they have made to us in regard to changing the fishery in Newfoundland, and to form a new committee of a bunch of people from the other side of the House who, for the last seventeen years, have done anything with the fishery but destroy it.

Let me reveal to you some of the destruction you have done. And I am serious about this. Just this past week I sat down with a plant owner in Carbonear, Fred Earle, a man who has not had five cents from the Federal Government or the Provincial Government in loans or grants, and I listened to him tell about the hundreds of millions of dollars that were given, hand-fed to companies around this Province in the last twenty years and 90 per cent of them are where? Down the tubes! Gone! Good money.

I sympathize with St. Marys's - The Capes and Ferryland, because they are in trouble with their major fish plant up there. But I say this and I say it in all sincerity, and maybe I will be held responsible for saying it, but if the fish plant we are referring to up in that area cannot survive on their own, they do not deserve to be there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, boy, oh, boy!

MR. HEWLETT:

That is small liberal!

MR. PARSONS:

Glory be!

MR. REID:

I have looked at numerous fish plants in this Province - and this is not the policy of this Government, I am saying it myself

- that over the past seven or eight years have gotten as high as \$7.5 million, and \$8 million and \$9 million and \$10 million in loans and guarantees and everything else. Now, gentlemen, basically what that is saying to me is that there are a number of plants in this Province that cannot survive without government help. If an industry, any industry - the hon. the Member for Grand Falls, I wonder what would happen tomorrow or next year if there was no more pulp wood to be cut in the Grand Falls area? I wonder would the Government go out and keep the Grand Falls mill open and give them millions of dollars just to keep people working? I am sure they would not.

MR. POWER:

We do spend millions of dollars planting trees.

MR. REID:

I am sure they would not do it. You know they would not do it. Sure they spent millions of dollars planting trees. And that is exactly what the Federal Government of Canada is looking at now with their TAC, their Total Allowable Catch, and what this Province agrees with. I am sorry, I am upset over all this today. I am not necessarily speaking on behalf of this side, I am speaking as a person, as the Member for Carbonear. I listened and I agree with some of the comments you are making, but I cannot for the life of me understand how you, Mr. Rideout, can get up after being Minister of Fisheries for all the years that you were -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The hon. Member.

MR. REID:

The hon. Member, excuse me! I

cannot understand why a man like yourself, who comes from a fishing area and was Minister of Fisheries and was Premier of Newfoundland, who sat for so long and did absolutely nothing only pump - throw, I suppose the word is - good money after bad. In a lot of cases in this Province, that is what you did.

Now, let us take the other side of it, because they are going to tell me to sit down in a few minutes. I agree with what you are saying, but I also say this: What is the difference in a person being unemployed in Carbonear and Burgeo? What is a difference in a person being unemployed in Harbour Grace and St. John's South? What is the difference? Absolutely none. As the MHA for the District of Carbonear, I have the responsibility to look after those people. I am going to look after them. Whatever I think I need to do to look after and help those people, I am going to do it. I am going to impress it upon this particular Government Task Force, that they have set up, and your hon. colleagues in Ottawa, Mr. Mulroney and the rest of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking in favour of the resolution. I cannot do it because as far as I am concerned it was brought to this House purely for political reasons and for political reasons only. It is an indication that the hon. Members in the Opposition are admitting that they were complete failures when dealing with the fishery crisis over the last seventeen years.

We are in a position right now, and thank God the people in Ottawa who are on the Task Force, John Crosbie, Ross Reid and a few more up there, are trying their best.

I can honestly say that they are trying their best to come up with a decent proposal or plan to offset the impact in the Newfoundland fishery, and I thank those gentlemen for it.

I cannot and I will not accept the fact that our hon. Members on the other side can condemn every Government regardless of what it is, PC or Liberal or whatever. We have reached a threshold now where the hon. Member for Twillingate, Walter Carter, and a number of other men have to make a decision and take some direction.

Why is it, I wonder, hon. gentlemen, that we cannot reach or we cannot promote our fishery and develop it as say at least, not to the extent that Iceland has but close to it? Why has there not been an approach to the fishery in Newfoundland over the past 50 years, 60 years, 200 years or 300 years, so that we can utilize every possible thing that is coming ashore? What is the answer? I do not know. I do not think, to be quite honest about it, that we as a Government can depend and rely on Ottawa to manage and look after and cater to our whims, every time we get in trouble with the fishery in Newfoundland.

I do not agree, Mr. Speaker, with the Resource Short Plant being cut in any way and I will stand on that by principle. My plant in Carbonear, and I can speak on behalf of the Member for Harbour Grace, as well as the Quinlan Brothers Plant in Bay de Verde, would be severely affected if there was any cuts in the Resource Short Plant. I do not want to see that. I would have to say, quite honestly, that I would have to - if this Government decides to or

if the Government in Ottawa decides that there will be cuts -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! oh!

MR. REID:

- then I will have to convince and try to argue the point. I would have to fight with my Government, Mr. Speaker, to try and encourage the Federal Government to do it.

I do want to make one final comment, Mr. Speaker. Without the Resource Short Plant fish in our area of Conception Bay North we are going to lose an average of three work-weeks. At any given time, Mr. Speaker, in any year in the last five or six, three work-weeks would mean that there would be a serious number of people in the Carbonear area that would not qualify for unemployment insurance.

I do want to make another comment. I was surprised to read and listen to a member of the Fishermen's Union recently make a comment about the reduction in the Resource Short Plant. I did not know why the union would take a stand against the fishermen of Newfoundland and the fish plants in Newfoundland, in regards to the Resource Short Plant, but I found out. I found a statement on the RSPP cod distribution for 1989, and I have it here Mr. Speaker. I found out that out of-

MR. SPEAKER:

The Member's time has elapsed.

MR. REID:

Why did you not notify me? Could you let me finish by leave? I think you would be interested in this Mr. Rideout.

MR. SPEAKER:

One minute.

MR. REID:

One minute, thank you.

I found with amazement ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, that there are thirty-two plants in Newfoundland that avail of the RSPP and only thirteen of them are unionized. It certainly answers the question, does it not? I take exception to the fact that the union are leaving all those people, those other families in this Province, out in the cold, with their stand as it relates to the Resource Short Plant. And I certainly do not agree with it.

To finish up, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the resolution, and I have outlined basically, my argument, that there are enough people now in this process to help straighten out the matter, and I do not think another particular group from each side of the House would serve any purpose. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before the Chair recognizes the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, I would like to remind Members of the House that unparliamentary language is unparliamentary language, no matter how it is used, even in examples. I realize the examples were being used with reference to speeches that were made before, but I would like to remind the House that even as examples, we would not wish to hear the words anyway.

The Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

I stand in support of the resolution submitted by the Leader of the Opposition.

When I hear the rhetoric coming from the other side, I thought today perhaps we would have an unbiased, non-political debate on an extremely serious issue. But, seeing the complete lack of understanding emanating from the Government benches, it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, we face the crisis now looming.

Today, for me, seems to be history repeating itself. About seven and one-half years ago, I first stood in this Legislature with a few grave problems. There were seven fish plants in my district, one deep-sea and six inshore plants. The deep-sea plant was one of the ones supposed to be closed under restructuring and five of the other six were closed. Four of those were bankrupt. And, not with the help of the Federal Government, but with the leadership of the Provincial Government - of which I was then a Government Member but not a Member of Government - with the help of the Government, the deep-sea plant was continued and has been a success story ever since, until now, and five of the other six plants - six of them, actually; one had problems down the road and was in and out - but five of the six were opened up and have continued to operate, without any Government money, I might add, until very recently; without any Government money, just on the belief that jobs could still be created in rural Newfoundland,

despite the fact that the Federal Government, which have control over all fishing issues once you step off the beach, were saying to us, 'You have too many plants, too much freezing potential in the Avalon, and consequently, you will get no support in relation to any kind of programs to get your plants reopened.

These plants were reopened and provided around 1,400 jobs, seasonal, albeit, to a degree - anywhere from fifteen, perhaps, to thirty-five or forty weeks, which is not too bad - seasonal, perhaps, but 1,400 jobs that were not there three or four years before. But the main thing was they provided a market for every tomcod that was caught in the area. All of it, also, was processed right in the area creating those jobs.

Before that, leading up to those early years, 1982, 1983, for two or three years the fishermen year after year have been throwing away their catch during the summer, and some during the whole year. They sold only when somebody came in and offered to buy, no steady market. Many of them dropped out of the fishery. There was nothing left except welfare, and we are right back to that state today in our own area, by being ignored by this present Government. We have the deep-sea plant, which is one of the ones with its head on the block, as everyone knows, and we have at least two of the inshore plants that could easily go down. And, what happens next year, Mr. Speaker? Fishermen do not have a market, the plant workers and people involved in the spin-off do not have jobs, simply because we believe we have too many plants and too many people in the fishery. We asked for a Action

Plan. What is our plan of action? We see there is not a plan of action from this Government. There is a list of requests to Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What happened for seventeen years?

MR. HEARN:

Yes seventeen long years when fishermen sold fish and plant workers worked and we do not apologize for that. What is the rationale behind the plan over here? Close plants. You are a fisherman. And, what do we do with the people? Do we retrain them? We certainly have not made any plans for this the Minister told us yesterday, and if we do, for what do we train people? We are outport people with outport ways, and God bless them, because they live around the Province because of the fishery, and now you are telling them that their way of life is going to die because you have absolutely no interest in and no understanding of the fishery. Do not tell me that the Premier understands the fishery. When he got up to respond to the resolution, he showed that he has absolutely no concept of the fishery. He looks upon it as a business. He has absorbed the Fishery Products, National Sea philosophy. Let us get rid of some of our plants and let us have a few super plants, bring all our products into those super plants. We will give full employment to the people in selected areas of the Province. If you and I were in business and we were running these companies undoubtedly we would be saying the same thing, because our Board of Directors would demand that we would be saying those things. Governments are there to help people and not to help private companies,

consequently we have to look at keeping plants open. The Premier says it cannot be done. The Minister of Fisheries has started to take back water from his original stand, oh, we might have to close plants. There is no reason why we should close plants. If the quotas are cut back then it means the hours of operation can be cut back. Six months work in rural Newfoundland is a tremendous amount better than no work at all. If the companies decide that they are going to close the plants anyway then let this Government go to Ottawa and demand that quotas be left with the plants that they leave up in the air. If National Sea wants to close the plant down here on the Southside, let the Member convince his Premier to go to Ottawa and demand that the quota that they have used the last few years, or that section of quota, stay there, because if National Sea backs out maybe somebody else will come in, but who is going to come into the plant here, or who is going to come into the plant in Trepassey if there is no quota? Nobody. National Sea here in St. John's have 500 or 600 people involved and jobs are at stake, but the city still goes on. A small percentage of the population becomes unemployed, some of whom might be able to be absorbed into the great employment opportunities that are here.

Gaultois, Ramea, Harbour Breton, Trepassey, plants close and communities, not only communities, but areas die. There is nothing else. It is the only source of employment and if these plants close areas die. The young people move out, the middle age people have to go on welfare because they have no choice, and hopefully the older people can retire. That is

what we are looking at. If any of these plants close we are then killing areas of the Province. If that is what the Premier wants, if he wants everybody to move to St John's, to Gander and to Corner Brook, and set up some major institutions, factories, or maybe the Minister of Development was away encouraging people to come in and start some major industries to provide jobs that we so badly need. But if anyone thinks that we can take all the fishermen, fisherwomen, and plant workers, who are involved, and move them into selected areas and employ them, well then we are living in a dream world, as we have experienced in the past. There is a way we can keep them employed. The inshore fishery, hopefully, will not be drastically affected. We cannot afford to lose the middle-distance fleet. We cannot afford to lose the Resource Short Plant, and if we do the Member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), who just spoke through his hat for ten minutes, the Member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Crane), the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) with Argenticia, the Member for Trinity North (Mr. Hynes), Bellevue (Mr. Barrett), Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), the Member for Ferryland (Mr. Power), myself and others, are going to be affected because many of these inshore plants operated mainly on this fish. The inshore fishery alone can keep them going somewhat and at least provide minimal employment while we are waiting for the resource to build. It is great to tackle the long term picture. It has to be done. But today we must keep our plants open and immediately we must get programs in place, and this Government should be moving on it, to make sure that people live through this Winter to be able to go to work in the plants

next year.

We have a duty in this House, but the way has to come from the Government side. The first thing we must do is educate the Premier and the Members over there who are going to be just as affected as I am, educate your Premier to the fact that there is a rural Newfoundland. It was there years ago, it was the first settled part of the Province. It has to remain, it can only remain if the fishery lasts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly an unusual circumstance, I suppose, in a sense, that a Member for St. John's would get a chance to rise in this House and address what I feel is a very important resolution. There are parts of that resolution I would concur with, Mr. Speaker. But there are other parts of the resolution that I certainly could not concur with.

To use the word 'crisis', Mr. Speaker, is, I suppose, in today's society a word that we associate with havoc throughout the world and, I suppose, we can also use the word 'crisis' as it applies to our number one industry in Newfoundland, namely the fishery. Now where did that crisis start and when did that crisis start? I think we could sit here for many

long days, and long weeks, and months and talk about the fishery from the time of Cabot's landfall and, I suppose, that is when it probably started, up until the present day, and we could find the good years and the bad years in the fishery.

It is only a week or so ago, Mr. Speaker, that I read a log from an Edward P. Murphy, who happens to be a great uncle, who fished in Battle Harbour all his life with his brothers, and it showed that in 1902 the fishery was in havoc, it was a disaster, and he had no idea how he was going to pay his crew on the Bertha May which was the schooner -

MR. TOBIN:
The Bertha May?

MR. MURPHY:
The Bertha May - how he was going to pay the people on his schooner who were constituents and from St. Mary's Bay, Riverhead, St. Mary's - 1902.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:
Now there was no talk of tide, no talk of water temperatures, and no talk of all the things that we hear day in and day out. But the fishery failed them. But we understand today, Mr. Speaker, why the fishery is in crisis. It is because, Mr. Speaker, simply because, we have not paid the long range goal, the un-actioned plans, the attention that should have been paid to the fishery over the last probably thirty, forty or fifty years.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was not today's Government that sat with the new fish company after the

Russells, and after the Monroes, Fishery Products, Bonavista Cold Storage, and all of these companies fell into receivership five or six years ago. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout) has full knowledge of this whole structuring of the great Fishery Products, when they were gone. There were thousands of millions of dollars put in and it was obvious that the Federal Government through Mr. Crosbie and other Members were very supportive to the new FPI concept and they had to take the TAC and make it reasonable for this majestic new fish company to function and stay alive.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Did you support him?

MR. MURPHY:
I certainly did, I certainly did support him, in a sense of reality but not in an unreal sense, because one thing that we have not done Mr. Speaker, and I say this to you in all honesty, the fixed gear fishermen in this Province have not lost any of their total allowable catch, in essence. Now we have a new fleet called a mid-water fleet, that came into being four or five years ago. I think it was four vessels licensed under the Leader of the Opposition, I think, last year or the year before, and they had in their plans to license two more for 1989. So what we were saying in essence Mr. Speaker is, now here we are in a situation with a total allowable catch beyond itself, to satisfy the new company, because of the lobby and the push and the shove, and nobody in their mind at that particular time would have thought for one minute that there was any realization to the total allowable catch in 1990 being less than 200

million, down to 190, that is the perception of what it will be in February of this year. I would suggest the crisis could have easily been solved, not now, Mr. Speaker, but years and years ago, if somebody had paid attention to the best scientists who were ever involved in looking at the Newfoundland fishery, the fisherman, the inshore fisherman, the offshore fisherman, and I often wonder and I totally concur with my hon. friend for Fortune - Hermitage, and I know he speaks sincerely, but what really is upsetting is that if you brought seventy-five trawler captains into this House today and sat them down and ask them one by one to stand on their feet and tell you why the fishery is in crisis, they certainly could. The Opposition now wants, and I want to read the hon. Leader of the Opposition's Resolution 'therefore let it be resolved that the Government immediately inform the House of the basic principles -- and it goes on and he says that the House immediately establish a Standing Committee', so basically what the Opposition is saying is give us an opportunity to be involved in 1989 with what we could not do for seventeen years prior. But is that right or wrong, you had seventeen years. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, he and his Government had seventeen years, not as a Standing Committee, but as a Government of the Province to represent the people in the fishing industry in this Province, and you neglected that duty. Now you want a Standing Committee, you neglected the duty. When you turned around and you gave -

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair would probably seek some direction here from both House Leaders. Normally debate would

have ended at twenty to the hour, allowing the mover the remaining twenty minutes. Bearing in mind that both House Leaders agreed to ten minutes, ten minutes, I am seeking direction, as we have bent the rules somewhat. Is the bending still continuing? If that is the case the hon. Member for St. John's South would be finished, if it is not, the Chair seeks some direction. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Just for clarification I must confess we did not think about this particular point when we made the agreement, but certainly it was not our intention to take away the movers right to close the debate as the rule says, that was not our intention. Although we did not specifically address it. That was not our intention. Having said that, the hon. Member has gone five minutes beyond his time because we would normally have had to adjourn at twenty to. He started a couple of minutes before that. So, how much time does the hon. Member have, he only has a couple of minutes left. I guess anyway does he? So he has only got a minute left anyway so rather than interrupt him any further, let him finish off.

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The crisis is a crisis. There is no doubt about the crisis, there is no doubt about the fact that every Newfoundlander has to be concerned about the situation that exists in this Province on the

15th day of November 1989. But I would honestly say to you, Mr. Speaker, in this honorable House, that it is the responsibility of this Government to change that thinking, but it is not the responsibility of this Government to accept in total that crisis. And this Government has set and planned, as we already know this afternoon from the Minister, from the Premier, from the hon. Member from Carbonear, that we have had an opportunity to look at the dismal situation that the Fishery has found itself in, and set a course of action - there is a course of action, a sound, solid, sincere course of action.

Mr. Speaker, you know, the sadness is that the hon. Members opposite who started this resolution with a sincerity to help change the crisis in the fishery, are now doing exactly what they were accused of doing. Playing partisan politics, playing partisan politics with the people - not only the people in your district in Placentia - West, not only with the people in Grand Falls, but the people all over this Province. Mr. Speaker, without question the resolution has merit, but not enough to be supported.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not as good as Art's speech boy, not as good as Art's speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced or gave notice of this resolution yesterday, and I very, very carefully, made sure that there was nothing of a political nature that would be provocative in the resolution.

Now despite the best efforts of the oppositon to do that, all we have heard right from the Premier through every speaker from the other side today, has been a political diatribe. That is exactly what it has been, and there is nothing political in that resolution, there is nothing partisan in that resolution, it was an attempt to have an open and honest debate on the crisis facing the fishery in this Province today. And what does Government do with it, Mr. Speaker? They take it and they tear into it in a political fashion, with the Premier's lead.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that the real face of this Government was not unfolded by the Premier or by the Minister of Fisheries, the real mind-set and the real face of this Government on fisheries matters was spelled out in graphic detail in this Legislature today by the hon. gentleman from Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, let me say to that hon. gentleman that if it had not been for loan guarantees provided to Earle Fisheries by the previous Government, he would not have that industry in his town today.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is the case, Mr. Speaker, where loan guarantees worked, where the company was in a terrible financial position but they were able to work their way out of it by Government helping them, by Government participating with them. And by Government doing that, they created permanent jobs in the District the hon. gentleman represents, and they created an opportunity for fishermen in Labrador to be able to sell their fish to that Company and dozens and dozens of other companies we gave loan guarantees to. That hon. gentleman has the unmitigated gall, Mr. Speaker, and the face of a robber's horse to get up in this House and say, 'Let them close. If the plants are in trouble, let them close.' Now, that, Mr. Speaker, was said quite clearly by that hon. gentleman here today. And let the word go out to all parts of this Province that the real policy of this Government when it comes to sustaining people in the fishery is, if they are in trouble, let them close. That is what this Government is all about.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what he said. That is what he said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what he said.

MR. SIMMS:

That is the Government's position on the fishery.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier got up with a great deal of fanfare

and tabled a document in this House a few minutes ago. Let me say to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that he did not have the intestinal fortitude, even though he made the document public to the media - we got his press statement, because you get that from NIS, but we did not get the document from the Premier. We did not get the document by the Government sending it to the official Opposition. We got the document from other sources, not from this Government. Let me say to the Premier, thank you very much for your co-operation. Where is the openness and co-operation when it comes to that? The Premier made a great to-do, then, about openness and about letting the Opposition know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution today, even though it will be defeated, has been fulfilled. The purpose was to try to get on the public record, in debate in this House, the position of the Government. We have been asking questions about it, we have not been getting the answers, but today we got the Government's position.

Now I have known it for quite some time from my sources in the industry and in other places, but today we got it on the record. And here is the Government's position in dealing with the present crisis in the fishery.

MR. SIMMS:

As clear as a bell.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is as clear as a bell, Mr. Speaker. I listened very, very carefully to the Minister, in particular. The Premier did not have anything significant to say, but the the Minister, in

particular, had a lot of significant things to say in his remarks. And here is the Government's position: First of all, the Newfoundland Government agrees with closing down plants.

MR. SIMMS:
Absolutely!

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is the first position.

MR. SIMMS:
Position number one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, it is not.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
You said it! You said it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
And the Member for Carbonear said it.

MR. RIDEOUT:
The Member for Carbonear said, what is the difference if an individual is unemployed in Carbonear or St. John's or Burgeo? But what is the difference in Gaultois, Mr. Speaker? What is the difference in Ramea? What is the difference in Little Harbour Deep? What is the difference in dozens and dozens of other communities around this Province? The difference is simple. There is no other economic activity. That is the difference!

MR. SIMMS:
Right on! That is the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
There is other economic activity in Carbonear.

MR. SIMMS:
The boys are now shaking their heads. Make up your minds!

MR. RIDEOUT:
There is other economic activity in St. John's. The plants should not close down -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:
- but the fact of the matter is there is other economic activity. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, that is there first principle. They have agreed, and they have told the Government of Canada that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will support closing down plants. That is what they have told the Government of Canada. That is their first principle.

The second principle, Mr. Speaker, that we have on the record today is that the Provincial Government will hop in bed with the Government of Canada and tinker around, and fatally tinker around with the inshore fishery as we have known it in this Province for 500 years. That is the second principle we got out of them today. That is part of their action plan.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Government is

prepared to sell down the drain, despite what the Member for Carbonear had to say, the resource-short plant program.

MR. SIMMS:

Is that true or not?

MR. REID:

It is not.

MR. RIDEOUT:

They are prepared to see thirty-two communities in this Province - they have told the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, I say to this House today, the Newfoundland Government have told the Government of Canada they have agreed with Richard Cashin that they are prepared to take the fish from the resource-short plan program and give it to NatSea and FPI. That is exactly what they are prepared to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Premier can shake his head all he likes. That is what the Minister said in this House today. And I know, Mr. Speaker, and other people in his Province know, that this Government have said to the Government of Canada they are prepared to see the resource-short plant program scrapped if the fish comes to Newfoundland, but comes to FPI and NatSea. So, so much for Bay de Verde, so much for Harbour Grace, so much for Quinlan Brothers, so much for Woodmans. Where are you going to get the fish? You are going to take it from those communities that are already resource short and you are going to give it to the corporate giants of the fishing industry in this Province. That is the principle the Government have articulated to

the Government of Canada.

MR. SIMMS:

Shame! Shame! Shame! No wonder they do not want a select committee.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we saw the real face of the fisheries policy of this Government today, not articulated by the Minister or the Premier, but articulated inadvertently, I would say, to this House - articulated inadvertently - by a private Member. And the policy is not to try to keep people in Gaultois employed in the fishing industry, the policy is not to try to keep people in rural Newfoundland employed in the fishing industry, the policy is that it is ineffective, it is inefficient, there is trouble with it, there has been trouble with it for the last 500 years, let us do major surgery now. That is the policy that this Government has gone to Ottawa with: Let us do major surgery on the inshore fishery now.

MR. SIMMS:

Into the sixties.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And you are going to see as a result of that policy, Mr. Speaker, - oh, sure, they will get the Federal Government, that much maligned Federal Tory Government, they will get them to throw in a few hundred million dollars, along with a few bucks of their own, and they will try to put a microchip factory in Gaultois. That is what they will try to do, Mr. Speaker. They will try to develop something in Newfoundland and Labrador that is foreign to this Province, and it is not going to work. It is not going to work, Mr. Speaker - another rubber factory, another

hockey stick factory.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Cucumbers.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Cucumbers. Yes, cucumbers. That is what they will try to do, Mr. Speaker. Any Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, that is worth its salt would recognize that there is a temporary - it might be long-term, it might be 5 or 6 years - resource shortage. That is the nub of the problem. There is a temporary resource shortage. Now what do you do when you are faced with that situation? Do you make the conscious, callous, cold, hard decision that you take advantage of that temporary problem to restructure fundamentally the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador? That is the position the Government has taken. They have fallen into a trap that is as old as the 40-odd years we have been part of confederation, and that is the Federal Government, Liberals, Tories. The Federal Government has always wanted to do something major with that ineffective, inefficient, inshore fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and now they have a Provincial Government that is willing to jump into bed with them; they have a provincial Government that is willing to discuss plant closures; they have a provincial Government that is willing to tinker around with resource allocations; they have a provincial Government that is willing to take the money.

They have to do something with this Economic Discovery Commission they have set up, Mr. Speaker, which has discovered that it will now need \$5 million a year for about ten years to do something.

They have to feed that creature; they do not have the money to feed it themselves, so one of the ways to feed it is to get the money from the Government of Canada because there is a crisis in the fishery. That is what the Government is up to, Mr. Speaker.

Well, today the cat is out of the bag. Because of this debate, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will now know today, before this evening is over, that the Provincial Minister of Fisheries said he is not prepared to support an all-plants-open policy. He said that categorically.

MR. W. CARTER:

I did not say that.

MR. SIMMS:

You did!

MR. TOBIN:

You did so. You did so.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is in the record. It will be printed tomorrow. He is not willing to do it. He also said, Mr. Speaker, that he is not prepared to use any Government funds to subsidize in any way plants staying open and staying in the fishery because it might be countervailable. Mr. Speaker, he said that, absolutely! If you go to your major market and make the resource argument that we are talking about here today, it might not be so countervailable. The Minister of Fisheries has not tried that yet. The Government of Canada probably has not tried that. What this Government is prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, is sell the inshore fishery down the drain. They are prepared to jump into the large corporate boardrooms and take fish from the

Resource-Short Plant Program and give it to the larger companies so that they keep Mr. Cashin happy, they keep Mr. Young happy, and they keep the investors and the shareholders of FPI and National Sea happy, and the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador can go down the drain.

MR. SIMMS:

Make no wonder they do not want a select committee.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is no wonder they do not want a standing committee. It is no wonder they do not want a watchdog, Mr. Speaker, made up of members of both sides of this Legislature. It is no wonder they do not want that, because they do not want people to know what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, come December it is going to be too late. The total allowable catch will be announced in February for northern cod. The Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland will announce their bombshell about Christmas Eve. Around Christmas Eve they will announce the bombshell that will change forever the face of rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour of the motion, please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion, please say 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

In my opinion, the 'nays' have it.

MR. SIMMS:

The 'ayes' have it, I think.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Division. Call in the Members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion, please rise:

Mr. Doyle, Ms Verge, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Power, Mr. A. Snow, Mr. S. Winsor, Mr. Langdon, Mrs. Duff, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Warren.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion please rise:

The hon. The Premier, (Mr. Wells), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. W. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of the Council (Mr.

Baker), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), the hon. the Minister of Health and Minister of Social Services (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Penney, Mr. L. Snow, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), Mr. Grimes, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. Murphy, Mr. Short.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The vote is seventeen for the motion and twenty-four against. I declare the motion lost.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at two of the clock.