



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 4

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

14 March 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

Order, please!

Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, on behalf of hon. Members, we would like to extend a cordial welcome to ten Girl Guides from the 73rd St. John's Company from St. Paul's School, and their leaders Ms Tilley, Ms Davis and Ms Nixon. The Guides are attending the House of Assembly as part of their work towards their citizenship badges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure to make an announcement today which is of tremendous importance in addressing our Government's commitment to the environment and our promise to preserve and protect the wilderness of our Province.

I am very pleased to inform the Members of this House, and the people of this Province, that the Government has approved the establishment of a wilderness reserve in the Bay du Nord area of that portion under the Wilderness And Ecological Reserves Act and an adjacent wildlife reserve in the Middle Ridge area under the Wildlife Act.

A Provisional Reserve in the Bay

du Nord area was established in 1986, and a credit to the former Administration, by the way, and the work they had done. The final reserve as now approved by the Government will have boundaries somewhat different than those of the Provisional Reserve. As recommended by the Wilderness and Ecological Reserve Advisory Council some changes to the reserve boundaries are being made in response to concerns raised during public hearings. The two reserves together encompass an area of approximately 3500 square kilometers, and that is adjusted down from 5000 originally, located in Southeastern Newfoundland. Within this roadless wilderness populations of moose, caribou, Canada geese, brook trout, and landlocked salmon, provide tremendous opportunities for outdoor enjoyment. Undisturbed waterways, such as the scenic Bay du Nord River offer canoeists and campers unforgettable experiences in one of the last remaining unspoiled areas on the Island of Newfoundland. Efforts to establish a wilderness reserve in the Bay du Nord area have been ongoing for most of the past decade. Ever since the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act was passed in 1980 the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council has worked tirelessly to see the area protected from development. The Advisory Council has steered the reserve proposal through an elaborate, and demanding consultation and public review process. Information sessions and public hearings were held to ensure local residents had ample opportunity to comment on the proposals, including the boundaries and management policies for the reserve.

I am very pleased that a number of

the members of the Advisory Council are present in the visitors gallery today to hear this announcement.

Now that the Bay du Nord is a full status reserve, it will enjoy the protection of the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act. This means that the area will remain in its natural state without any intrusions from forest harvesting, mining, hydro-electric or other forms of high impact development. Within the reserve people may hunt, fish, camp, hike and fully enjoy this truly great natural region of our Province.

The designation of a separate wildlife reserve in the Middle Ridge area is in recognition of the high mineral potential of this area. The regulations which will apply to the area will permit mineral exploration to continue but in a controlled fashion so as to minimize ground disturbances and impacts on wildlife.

The boundaries of both Reserves, plus the applicable management plans and regulations, will be published in the Newfoundland Gazette as required by the respective Statutes.

The Bay du Nord Wilderness Reserve and the Middle Ridge Wildlife Reserve will be managed by the Parks Division and the Wildlife Division respectively of the Department of Environment and Lands. Together they will ensure that the policies and regulations contained in the management plan are enforced. This will guarantee that the animals, plants, lands and waters of the Bay du Nord and Middle Ridge areas remain in a natural state for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and visitors to our Province to enjoy and

appreciate on into the future.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, this is an important matter. We hear the odd comment from the other side and I ask that they be quiet. They will have an opportunity to respond in due course.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
The designation of these reserves is a major step in protecting wilderness areas for the benefit of the people of our Province. Wilderness is an essential part of the social, cultural and natural heritage of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and, as our wilderness areas diminish, we recognize more and more how valuable these special places are. It is also increasingly recognized that wilderness protection in itself constitutes economic development. The activities associated with wilderness enjoyment give our people valuable business opportunities and can help support the economics of our rural areas. A recent survey undertaken by the Canadian Wildlife Service shows that 76 per cent of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians felt that maintaining abundant wildlife population is important and that 85 per cent of our people participate in one or more nature activities. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are committed to preserving their environmental heritage so that some of our natural splendours will be available for all time to cherish and enjoy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to thank the Minister for the copy of his statement. Because of the short time I had to look into the detailed statement, I will not, at this time, go into detail about it. I remember in the last Session of the House it was objected to by the Member for Fortune - Hermitage and I would be interested now, in hearing what he has to say about the Bay du Nord, Middle Ridge wilderness area and see if he concurs with the party that he wishes to join. Personally I believe he is going to be in the wilderness forever. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that the concerns of the residents of the area have been addressed and I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions that perhaps he could address at a later date. What happens to the cabins that are already in the area, and will a permit be necessary to enter the area?

I would also take advantage of this opportunity, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, to congratulate the Members of the Advisory Committee for their work and their perseverance in bringing this to fruition. I hope the Government has taken into consideration the objections of the people, and I also hope that the privileges of the people have not been taken away, but protected. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, and in conclusion, I hope because of the Minister's statement in which he seems to concern himself with the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that the same concerns are

orchestrated when Bill 25 is presented to this hon. House, and 7.2 is completely deleted. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that last year in the first Liberal Budget of this Administration the Government increased tuition fees at, I think, all of our post-secondary institutions by a whopping 10 per cent, the largest single increase in recent times. The House will also recall that last year the Minister of Education (Dr. P. Warren) established a Student Aid Advisory Committee which, as I understand it, made its report to the Minister in September past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, will he tell the House when this report, which was submitted to him in September past, will be made public?

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for his question. Yes, the Student Advisory Committee Report

was submitted to Government and, I am very pleased to say today, many of the recommendations have already been implemented or are being addressed. And I will make the report public. It is a very important report. And if he wants to indicate the kinds of implementation policies -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

When? When?

DR. WARREN:

After we have dealt with it in the Budget, we will release the report to the public, yes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that thirty students a week at Memorial University alone are approaching the Council of Students Union as hardship cases, seeking financial assistance, and in view of the fact that grant and loan components of the Student Aid Package have not kept pace with Government tuition fee increases, with inflation, for example, can the Minister assure the House, as he did in a Budget leak on Open Line this morning, Mr. Speaker, in talking about guidance counsellors - new guidance counsellors will be provided in the Budget tomorrow, he said - can the Minister assure post-secondary students in this Province today, the day before the Budget comes down, that their desperate needs, legitimate needs will be adequately addressed in tomorrow's Budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, this Minister and this Government are very concerned about equality of educational opportunity in this Province. And certainly we have reviewed and will continue to review the Student Aid Program. I am sure the hon. Member recognizes that the loan program is totally a Federal program. It has not been changed since 1981. We have contacted the Federal Government, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition has done the same thing. I hope he has written the federal Government on this and expressed disgust, not only that they have not changed the loan program, they have added a 3 per cent administration charge. Can you believe it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. WARREN:

The Provincial Government will do its duty. Wait for the Budget. Any announcement with respect to student aid may be made in the Budget. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what gall and what hypocrisy coming from a Minister who whopped 10 per cent on every post-secondary student in this Province, the largest increase in our history. What hypocrisy and gall!

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell the House this: Will the Government ensure that adequate financial resources will be made available to Memorial University this year to maintain the child care centre on the university

campus?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I could say that the hon. Member would have to wait for any announcement as to what Government's intentions are, but I will express some concern about early childhood pre-school at Memorial. My colleague, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, has had a proposal in his hands for some time and we will be exploring that. It is a very serious issue, and I can assure you we are concerned about it and we will do our best to help persons who have children and who are attending Memorial University.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Fisheries. In light of the provincial Government's plan to downsize and rationalize the fishery and, subsequently, shut down fish plants throughout the Province, can the Minister advise the House what direction his Department is taking with respect to fish processing licences in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there is a freeze on the issuing of processing licences. I think the freeze was imposed back in the days of the previous administration, when the

hon. the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Fisheries. Notwithstanding the freeze, of course, I understand he did issue, I think, four or five licences just prior to the 1985 election campaign. Nevertheless, the freeze is still on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did not become Minister of Fisheries until after the 1985 election. I would like to say to the Minister that in his case I believe it must be quick-freeze, because we all know that just a few months ago there was at least one new processing licence - maybe two, but I know of one - that was issued to a company in Cape Broyle, on the Southern Shore. So that is certainly not a freeze on processing licences.

My supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker: We have a number of communities in the Province which know their fish plants will be closing within the next short while. Will licences be kept for those communities that now have fish plants with licences attached? Will these licences be cancelled, or will additional licences be issued throughout the Province, even though fish plants are closing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the preamble to his question, of course, is incorrect. Well, not all together incorrect, but certainly the action taken by this Government in issuing a licence to the plant he referred to, on the Southern

Shore, can be explained, in that it was the result of an appeal. The Appeal Board met and on the basis of the information they had, and given the fact that there was some discrimination against that company during the previous administration - I think the Member for Ferryland will attest to that fact -

MR. POWER:  
No, I will not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
- the Appeal Board, in their wisdom, saw fit to recommend to the Minister that that licence be issued. With respect to the latter part of his question, certainly it is not the intent of the Government to close for all time some of the plants that, by virtue of the quota reductions, will be required to close. And I am sure that every effort will be made in future, when the stocks rebuild, to hopefully reactivate some of those plants.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a comment to the Minister. We know the details of the Cape Broyle licence as well, and I believe our information, as told to the people of the Province, was that the recipient of the licence was a legal client of the Premier's, when he was practicing law.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) the court.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, that is right.

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister. Has he recently, within the last two weeks, issued an additional processing licence, or is he seriously considering issuing an additional processing licence to the Trepassy area?

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, the comment made by the Member, insinuating that the reason behind us issuing a licence to Cape Broyle Fisheries was because the Premier, in his capacity as a practicing barrister, acted, that is not even worthy of comment.

The Premier has already stated, Mr. Speaker, publicly and in this House, that he had no knowledge whatsoever of what was happening there. Certainly he was not consulted by his former client, and he was not consulted by me. It was an action taken by me as Minister, on the advice of an Appeal Board.

With respect to the second part of his question, no, Mr. Speaker, we have not issued a licence to a plant in the Trepassy area. We have had an application. It is still under consideration. But, I can tell him now, there has been no action taken.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It is under consideration, is it?

MR. W. CARTER:  
Oh, we will consider it, at least.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is also to the Minister of Fisheries. In light of the concerns with plant closures mainly due to the resource, and part of the cause is certainly overfishing, is the Minister aware that we have a tremendous amount of overfishing going on within the 200 mile limit by Canadian boats, and I am talking about the area 3N0, where we have Nova Scotian boats, in the guise of fishing halibut, raping the cod while our own longliners, almost within sight of them, are tied up? Is the Minister aware that we are being kicked off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland by Nova Scotians? If he is, will he make representation to Ottawa to have observers placed on all these boats so that they can account for the fish, some of which is landed in Newfoundland, much of which is landed in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of that problem. In fact, I have already written the Minister a letter, and I will table a copy today, in which I have objected to the fact that other provinces are, on the basis of advice we are getting, abusing the privilege. I have expressed to the Minister my displeasure, and have asked him to undertake immediately an investigation.

I believe that not only must the regulations pertaining to the allocation of quotas and harvesting licences be done on a

fair and square basis, they must be perceived as being done on a fair and square basis. On the advice that I am getting, it is quite obvious that certain fishermen from certain other provinces are not respecting Federal laws and are, therefore, placing Newfoundland fishermen and Newfoundland vessels owners at a very grave disadvantage.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would appreciate it if the Minister would table the correspondence so that we can circulate copies of it.

I also ask him, is he aware that Clear Water Fisheries, in Nova Scotia, has now been given permission to fish part of its quota by using vessels under 65 feet, and, in turn, we end up with more and more small Nova Scotian boats coming into our waters and, once again, raping our stocks?

He mentioned that the best information they had was that the privileges were being abused. I do not think there is any doubt about that. From what we hear firsthand, they are not only being abused, they are being abused greatly; instead of a 90/10 halibut/cod catch, we have it 90 per cent cod and 10 per cent halibut, and all kinds of misreporting and misrepresentation of facts, and that, certainly, is going to end up raping the stocks on the Southern Grand Banks.

So I would ask the Minister if he would make sure that Federal Fisheries have observers on the



boats, the strongest kind of representation, to make sure that no more of these boats filter into our area to rape the stocks, as is presently being done?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, that is a decision, of course, that will have to be made by Fisheries and Oceans. But certainly I can say this to the hon. Member: If the Federal Government does not satisfy us that necessary steps are being taken by them to eliminate that rape of the resource, then we will certainly recommend to the Federal Minister and, in fact, make a very strong representation to him, that maybe observers be placed on those boats. If you cannot trust them to go out there and respect the laws, then it might become necessary to place observers on board these boats.

MR. HEARN:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

In light of the problems in the fishery generally, and especially the ones just highlighted, where I said we were being kicked off the Grand Banks by the Nova Scotians, our Grand Banks, the Grand Banks 'of' Newfoundland, o-f - the Federal people think the Grand Banks are o-f-f Newfoundland. They say 'f' on, we say o-f, 'f' off. It is the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. Ours!

Will the Minister be satisfied to set up a select committee of the House dealing with the fishery, as

we have asked in the past? Because of the seriousness, will the Minister now set up a special select Committee of the House to deal with the fishery problems and the crisis we are facing in this Province, especially the ones I just highlighted?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In the moment of joviality in the House, when the Member was making some references to off, and the fs in of/off, I just hope that I did not misunderstand and everything was parliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Be careful, Walter.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, were I not in this Chamber I would be tempted to put my own interpretation on the Member's question and maybe answer it accordingly. I am not sure what the question was, there were so many fs there.

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat again what I said a moment ago, that we are aware of what is happening. I had occasion, on the weekend, to go on board one of our mid-distance vessels and interview the Captain. In fact, at my invitation three of the Captains hired by the Province came to my office on Monday morning and were interviewed by my staff, and they gave statements concerning what they have seen happening on the Grand Banks.

On the basis of their complaints, and others - I have received complaints from fishing skippers from the District of my hon. colleague, the Member for Port de

Grave (Mr. Efford) - we have made representation, as the letter I have just tabled will indicate, to the Minister. Furthermore, that is not the end of it. I intend to follow it up, and if proper action is not forthcoming, then I can assure him that further action will be taken.

Did you mention a select committee of the House?

MR. HEARN:

Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:

I would be inclined to wait awhile and see what happens. Maybe if we do not get the desired action, then it might well be that we will have a select committee. It is something we will think about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

As the Minister is aware, Connors Brothers have indicated that they will not be operating the Piccadilly Plant this year. This is a plant that has operated continuously for a quarter of a century and is owned by the Provincial Government. I want to ask the Minister what the Government is doing to attract a new operator for the plant.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, yes, the plant in Piccadilly has been operated for awhile now by Connors Brothers. In fact, they are the fifth operator to have had a lease on that plant since 1979.

I should point out that between the period of 1979 and the present there have been five operators, four of which, of course, cancelled leases while the hon. Member's Party was in power, part of the twenty-four plants that were closed during that period.

Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with Connors, and the reason they have given for cancelling their lease, which was entered into, by the way, in January of 1989 - it lasted one year - was the lack of resource. I think they were projecting processing put-through of 3 million pounds a year, when, in fact, only a third of that was available to them. Consequently, the plant was not viable. As a result, they notified the Department that they would not be asking to have the lease renewed.

As soon as we received that information, Mr. Speaker, my officials contacted the Port au Port Development Association and are now working with officials of that Association to try and identify another operator. It is not going to be easy, because the plant - maybe I should not say this publicly, but I suppose the damage is done - is not what you would call a viable operation. However, if other species can be attracted, such as lobster, for example, and scallops and other type fish, it might well be that it will be viable. But certainly we are trying to find an operator who can move in there and make it

a viable operation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have just heard something which I think is the most amazing comment made by a Minister of Fisheries yet. He is trying to say the plant is not viable. As Minister of Fisheries, is he announcing to the Province now and telling everybody not to come because it is not viable? I have to point out to the Minister that the last operator had a shortage of groundfish, but that was a bad year in Port au Port. Very often, that can happen in any area. But the previous owner, Port au Port Seafoods, did not go out of there because of money; they made money in Port au Port, and they had a very good fishery there.

So, the Minister gets up and has admitted defeat. My question is, Mr. Speaker, is this the the Minister intends to attract people to the Port au Port operation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not much point in sticking your head in the sand and hiding the facts. By virtue of the fact that the hon. Member asked the question today, of course, almost compelled me to give the reasons why the plant is not going to operate. But certainly, yes, the plant did operate back in 1985. My understanding is that the operator at that time had a very substantial Government loan guarantee, and that is another story unto itself, which I will

not go into now, but I am sure gentlemen opposite know what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, it might well be that an operator can be attracted who will undertake other types of fish, for example, lobster and scallop and the plant will be viable. But, certainly, on the basis of the experience with Connors Brothers, it is not a viable operation. And the facts speak for themselves -- three million pounds to make it viable, one million pounds were available. However, there is another bright spot. Maybe with the plant in Stephenville gone into receivership, and the fact that there are no takers for that plant, it might well be that the resource from that area could then end up into the Picadilly plant, in which case, then, that could become a very viable operation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the Minister he is wrong again. Port au Port Seafoods did not get a grant because of their operation in Port au Port, they got their grant because of an operation in the Minister of Development's (Mr. Furey) District, and it was given at the last moment, to keep it open because of the fishermen. But they did not lose their money in Port au Port. Mr. Speaker, that plant is very viable, not only from the point of view of cod, but also from the point of view of winter flounder and lobster and scallop. And there is a way to save that plant.

But I want to ask the Minister,

since the Government has been so generous with the offshore plants, can he tell me the difference between a fish plant worker who cuts fish which came from a twenty-five foot boat and a fish plant worker who cuts fish which came from a one hundred and fifty foot boat? Why should one plant be put down and the other plant workers given subsidies? Why cannot the Minister just take this situation and go and try to find a solution to it? Because it can be found.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Let me tell the Member, as soon as I master the art of walking on water I will then direct my attention to multiplying fish, and maybe then we will keep the plant open. If the hon. member is against what we are doing for the towns of Trepassey, Gaultois and Grand Bank, let him say so. We are now endeavoring to attract an operator for that plant. The building, by the way, is owned by the Province. We own the facility and we are working with the Development Association, and I hope the member, to try and find an operator for that plant. But this is not the first time it has happened; this is the fifth operator in that plant since 1979. So it is not a new problem, but we are trying to solve it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of

Works, Services and Transportation. I would like to ask the Minister if he has been informed or advised of problems being experienced by the Gaultois - Hermitage ferry because of ice conditions over the last few weeks?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I will take the Member's question and I will get a full report and give it to him tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Minister that I have had representation from the Gaultois - Hermitage area saying that the ferry has only been able to make one trip within the last two weeks because of ice. They are very concerned about the situation there for a number of reasons. There are people from Gaultois who want to get to Hermitage and, consequently, to other parts of the Province. They are very concerned about emergency situations that might arise on the Island of Gaultois. So, in my supplementary, I would like to ask the Minister if he, instead of waiting until tomorrow to review the situation, would undertake to immediately have his officials get on top of this very serious situation on behalf of the people of that area, to put measures in place to address, first of all, the need to get people out of there in case of an emergency, and to try and get regular ferry service from Gaultois - Hermitage immediately?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, there is a contingency plan in place at all times to take care of any emergencies that crop up when we operate ferries. I will certainly give the Member a complete breakdown as to the number of trips the ferry has made in the last two weeks, and I have a feeling that he will again be tried in the balance and found wanting.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. There are some very disturbing comments, I would say to the Minister, coming from the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and, in particular, the Leader of NAPE, Mr. March, on the current state of labour relations in the Province. The real bone of contention, I would say to the Minister, is Bill 59, the designation of essential employees. I would say to the Minister that NAPE are saying that they have not been consulted on the final drafting of Bill 59 and I want to ask the Minister, is that a fact? Is there consultation? If not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I believe one of the concerns the President of NAPE has brought up

is the process which was put in place to prepare the legislation. I can take no responsibility for that, because it was put in place by the last Government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, is this what the Minister calls trying to create a favourable labour relations climate with the labour movement in Newfoundland and Labrador? Is the Minister aware of a back to work agreement that was signed by Treasury Board and the Department of Labour not too long ago, which stated that NAPE would be fully consulted on Bill 59 and on the drafting of any and all legislation? Is she aware of that back to work agreement? Is the Minister going to consult directly with NAPE, or do NAPE have to go through a Legislative Review Committee to make their views known on this particular piece of legislation, which affects them so directly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

NAPE has had a representative sitting on the Committee who put input into the legislation that has been prepared. They have also had opportunity to meet with me and my officials, at which time we apprised them of the legislation. They have had opportunity to tell me what they thought of the legislation, even though I did not show them the legislation formally within my office. And, yes, they will see it when it comes before the Legislative Review Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Minister she may not be deliberately deceiving or misleading the House, but she is certainly misleading the House, because NAPE have not been consulted on the drafting of Bill 59 and the final draft is in. The President of NAPE had a meeting with the Minister of Labour a week or ten days ago, and he was informed, at that time, that the final draft was in; the union had not been consulted in any way, shape or form. Now, I would say to the Minister, this back to work agreement, and I will show it to the Minister if she does not have it, says 'It is agreed that meaningful consultation will take place between the Unions representing the Public Service Employees and Government with a view to the development of Legislation'. Now I am going to ask the Minister once more, is she going to consult directly with NAPE, with the Newfoundland Association Of Public Employees, or will NAPE have to go before a Legislative Review Committee? Is she also aware of the fact that Clause 104 in NAPE's Collective Agreement says '45 days notice must be given to NAPE before any legislation comes before the House of Assembly?' Is she or is she not going to consult directly with NAPE?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

The consultation process which was set in place through that memorandum he was waving around in

the air over there, Mr. Speaker, has been honoured.

MR. DOYLE:

It has not been honoured.

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. In light of the fact that the new \$25 million ferry is being built for the run on Fogo, I wonder if the people of my District, Mount Scio - Bell Island, can anticipate the Beaumont Hamel now being made available to our run, subsequent to the ferry being built for Fogo?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for his question. It is the first sensible one I have had since the House opened, so if I answer it, there will be a reason for it.

As the people are aware, the contract is awarded for the construction of the first ferry for Bell Island, the one we are going to do and, of course, the delivery of the Beaumont Hamel is conditional on the second ferry being finished. So we are talking somewhere within a year and a half to two years before anything would happen in that line.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise because my understanding is that the time for Oral Questions has expired. According to what the table tells me, 2:47 is supposed to be the expiry time, is it not? Because if the Speaker has a different time than the table has, then there is a problem. The other thing I might do while I have the floor, if I might, is I would just explain what transpired just prior to the last question, and that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, he is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

It is not hard to tell Clyde is gone. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern rose from his seat to get a glass of water in the next seat. Your Honour recognized him for a question, but he was not standing to ask a question; we had other colleagues here in the front who were prepared to ask questions and were ready to ask questions. So in case Members opposite have any questions about it, I thought I had better raise it because I know there were questions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Relax, now. Just relax.

I just raised that for that reason, plus I would like to know what time is remaining in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I want to remind the hon. Member that we do not cut Question Period off in the middle of an answer. It is unprecedented. I have never seen it. If there is time for a question to be asked, the Minister is permitted time to answer, of course, unless the Minister drags on and on.

MR. SIMMS:

Which is what he was doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period had not expired. I ask the Minister to wrap up his answer.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, to come up with an accurate time as to when the Beaumont Hamel would be able to go into service on the Bell Island run is contingent on external forces, and I really do not know. We now have the new ferry for Bell Island, which should be ready this summer.

We are in the process now of signing a contract for the new ice-breaking ferry, which will be built for the Fogo run. Once that is completed, then, of course, the Beaumont Hamel must go in and have modifications made so that it will be suitable to take over the run to Bell Island. So, really, it is hard for me to give the hon. Member an accurate date as to when it should be ready. It is contingent on the work of the fish yard, or the shipyard, and I am sure we will -

MR. TOBIN:  
Try the fish farm.

MR. GILBERT:  
The fish farm was something like the Sprung farm that the fellows had. Do you remember that?

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it is a problem that will be settled, and I will have a more accurate answer for the Member, once we get the contract firmed up with the Marystown shipyard, as to when they will be delivering the second ferry.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Question Period has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West, on a point of order.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would be willing to grant leave to the hon. gentleman to let him explain to the House why the shipyard can build three trawlers in one year and it is going to take two years to build a ferry?

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:  
By leave? By leave? They are not starting it until January, 1991.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

On behalf of hon. Members, I would like to welcome to the House a delegation from the Council Student Union, Memorial University, headed by the President-Elect, Mr. Wade Brake.

I would like, for the benefit of hon. Members, to make a comment on questions in Question Period. Hon. Members may have forgotten, in the little break we had, some of the rules that we follow. I just want to make a couple of points with respect to the question, from Beauchesne, which says that the question must be brief, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation or debate. The question must be brief and a preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. About that I want to say that just about invariably, today, every Member on preamble got into making some response to the answer by the Minister, and we should refrain from doing that, because it makes it difficult for the Chair. If the Member makes a response, then the Minister, obviously, should be afforded some comment, too. That makes Question Period long and drawn-out and more argumentative and confrontational than it ought to be. Thank you.

MR. TOBIN:  
A good point, Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table before the House, the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1989, prepared by the Comptroller General's Department; the accounts of Crown Corporations, Boards and



Authorities for that same year; the Report of the Auditor General to the House of Assembly for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1989; and the departmental observations on the Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1989, prepared by the Internal Audit Division of the Department of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would like, under the authority of Section 28, Subsection 3 of The Financial Administration Act, table seven, special warrants as follows: From the Consolidated Fund Services, the sum of \$21 million, a lump sum payment into the Province of Newfoundland Pool Pension Fund on behalf of the Teachers Pension Plan; A warrant for \$325,000 to provide additional funds for the implementation of the recommendations of the Morgan Commission; A warrant for \$605,500 to provide additional funds for Consultant Services relative to the Hibernia negotiations; and a warrant for \$1,715,000 to provide additional funds for the Youth Employment Strategy Program. These latter expenditures are 100 per cent recoverable from the Federal Government. And two warrants from the Department of Justice; One for \$432,000 to provide additional funds for the Royal Commission into the administration of the Criminal Justice System, and one for \$5,806,000 to provide additional sums to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and another for the R.C.M.P. additional buildings, and some extra for legal aid, some of which, in the case of immigrants, is 100 per cent recoverable from the Federal Government. And another warrant from the Department of Social Services for

\$8,350,000 for basically social assistance home support care, refugees, and for the St. John's Youth Center. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I promised yesterday during Question Period, I would research some answers for the Member for Humber Valley and respond today. There were two questions that I gave notice for yesterday. One, is the rate increase of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro over one year or several. As the Member knows, there is no rate increase from Newfoundland Hydro at the present time. They have made application to the Public Utilities Board for rate increases extending over a number of years, so that will be dealt with by the Public Utilities Board. I believe they are applying for rate increases over three years. They have made reference to the P.D.D. subsidy being dropped and the fact that they would perhaps pick up the cost over 8 years for that, but that is something to be determined by the Public Utilities Board. The second question, why are Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro customers being charged a rate increase effective February 16, 1990 if the rate application has not been heard by the P.U.B.? As the Member knows, I believe he received a briefing from Hydro officials yesterday on this matter, that the increase granted was the direct result of an

increase granted to Newfoundland Light and Power. I will refer the Member back to an order in council in 1975, which ordered that the rates charged by the P.D.D of Newfoundland and Labrador to customers served by its integrated system be adjusted from time to time to conform with the rates approved by the Board of Commissioners of the Public Utilities for Newfoundland Light and Power. So it is a normal practice that has been going on since 1975.

### Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, under our rules at 3:00 we have to revert to Private Members Day, and the motion standing for debate today is in my name. So I wonder if the House will concur with my proceeding to present the petition in the normal way. If the Government wants to respond, fine. I mean to say, not to start at 3:00 necessarily, but to start at 3:05 or 3:07 or whatever. Is that okay with the Government House Leader?

MR. BAKER:

Does it have to be presented immediately?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes. I do not mind saying, Mr. Speaker, the petition is from the students at the University on tuition fees. It is signed by 2,126 students, and on their behalf I would like to present it. Is that okay?

MR. SPEAKER:

With the concurrence of the House, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition under Petitions.

Just to ensure that the Chair is clear, if we follow the normal procedure this will take up fifteen minutes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, with five for the Government and five for us.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, that could be agreed to.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Let us do five and five.

MR. SPEAKER:

Five and five, one speaker from each side, has been agreed to.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the Government for their concurrence here in being a little bit flexible with our rules.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today on behalf of 2,126 post-secondary students at Memorial University to present a petition to this House.

The prayer of the Petition, Mr. Speaker, is very simple: We the undersigned students of Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador hereby petition the House of Assembly in Legislative Session Convened to demand that the Provincial Government institute immediately a freeze on tuition fees at Memorial University.

Now, Mr. Speaker, students at all post-secondary institutions in this Province have been walloped

hard by both levels of Government over the last twelve months. It began, Mr. Speaker, when this Government, the Provincial Government in their first Budget, the new Government in their first Budget raised tuition fees by a whopping 10 per cent. We have gone back as have the students and done a lot of research and we cannot find the time in recent memory when a Government instituted a tuition fee hike of that magnitude. There have been 3 per cent increases, 4 per cent increases, even 5 per cent increases, but never, never, never Mr. Speaker, has there been a 10 per cent increase.

Then of course, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, the Government of Canada got into the act just a few days ago in their Budget by instituting a 3 per cent administrative fee on student loans. That is a shame, but Mr. Speaker only 1/3 as much shame as the shame that must fall on this Government, because Mr. Speaker you see 3 per cent is just a little bit better than 3 and 1/3 per cent of 10 per cent. So the shame has to be shared by the Government as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real shame of the matter here is this. The Student Aid Program, which has the grant component and the loan component, has not been significantly increased for a number of years as the Minister admitted today. I fully appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the loan program is Federal. I do believe though that the Provincial Government ought to be using its powers as a Government, using its office as a Government, to lobby the Federal Government to increase the limits under the loan program. But what can be done,

without any lobbying, Mr. Speaker, is the Provincial Government increasing its own grant component. That is strictly within the authority and the legal authority of this Government, this Legislature and this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we have thirty hardship cases a week, I understand, students going to the Council of Student's Union looking for financial support. We have students in this Province who can no longer afford the luxury of an education and we are talking about the future of Newfoundland and Labrador when we are talking about the education of our young people. We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, as a society, to have people say that they cannot afford to broaden their horizon to broaden their education. Mr. Speaker, I understand, for example, that Memorial University at their student elections the other day had the highest turnout of votes of any university in Canada ever.

So Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister and to the Government that the students are becoming more active. They are becoming more interested. They are becoming more concerned because both levels of Government, this Government here and the Government in Ottawa appear to be trying to solve budgetary problems on the backs of the students of this Province, and that is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker on behalf of the 2,126 people who signed this petition it gives me great pleasure to present the petition to the House, ask that it be tabled and referred to the Department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

DR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to respond to the petition.

One of the most exciting and interesting things I have done since I became Minister is to visit students in all parts of this Province in all kinds of institutions and not just Memorial University, and talk with them about the problems of getting an education in the 1990s. Mr. Speaker, they did not tell me of any great changes that were made in the Student Aid Program over the last few years. I asked them what has happened in the last five or six years and I must say, if there were changes made, Mr. Speaker, in the Provincial component, they did not know about them. I also asked about scholarships. I talked about the scholarship program recently and we have the same scholarship rate right now that we had twenty years ago. I said in the House one of my hon. colleagues got \$800 for an electoral scholarship twenty years ago and now it is \$600, so I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition what did his Government do to help students in this Province to get a better education? Let me tell you what we have done. We have gone out to find out what the problems are. We have received the report of the Student Advisory Committee and there was a member of that Committee who said to me recently, this is the first time that the report has been taken seriously. We have taken that report very seriously. We are acting on a number of the recommendations already. We have set up an appeal

committee. We have a public information officer. We are working on delivery of the system, to improve delivery, so that students will have more access to their files and know where their applications are. There are quite a number of things that we have done already to implement the recommendations of the Student Advisory Committee Report, and we are going to do more. I cannot tell the hon. Member what we are going to do tomorrow, next year, or in the future, but I can assure him that we want to ensure that every person in this Province who has the ability to get into a post-secondary institution will have the funds and the resources to do it. We want to decentralize post-secondary education in this Province so that the people will be able to go on and get an education. We are going to do that. It is the first "E" in this Triple "E" Policy of education in this Province. Mr. Speaker, on the freeze, I must admit and I must be frank with the House and with the students, I am not a defender of freezes. I feel it is better to work on the Student Aid Program and address some of the problems through Student Aid. When you freeze tuition all you do is you give the same benefits to the rich and to the poor and I am against that. I think those who have greatest needs should get more help than others.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:  
I do not think freezes are the way to go. There has been one Province in this country that froze its tuition fees, they have just lifted the freeze, and now in two year the Province of Quebec will have the same tuition we now

have. They are going to move it up. They had a freeze for a period of time and they agreed it was the wrong approach. They agree with us, that improving the Student Aid Program is the best approach to helping students.

Mr. Speaker, on the 10 per cent, I regretted the 10 per cent. The Government did it because we are in difficult times. Our tuition is still the lowest in the Country, or perhaps Quebec might be a little lower. Our tuition fees are among the lowest in the country. I can provide the statistics. They should stay low. I tell the students that as long as I am Minister I will try to keep these tuition fees down but the institutions decide on tuition fees. It is the university, it is the other colleges. Last year we did it but it is the institution that decided on increases in fees. My preference is to try to keep the tuition fees down, certainly, because our students do not have access to work, they do not have the job opportunities that other Provinces have - certainly keep it down. My preference is to improve the Student Aid Program rather than place a freeze so that those who have the greatest need in all parts of this Province will get the greatest ability to go on to post-secondary institutions.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Private Member's Day I now call upon the Leader of the Opposition to introduce and proceed with debating his private motion.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

On opening day I put down the following resolution on the Order Paper:

WHEREAS the Newfoundland and Labrador economy has worsened dramatically since this Government took office almost one year ago and unemployment has increased;

AND WHEREAS the economic diversification of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy is a worthy and proper goal for this Province;

AND WHEREAS the maintenance of rural Newfoundland and Labrador will depend largely on the fishery, notwithstanding economic diversification;

AND WHEREAS the Government has created an Economic Recovery Commission to which it intends to transfer all of its economic powers and its ability to influence the economic direction of the Province;

AND WHEREAS the Government has committed that it plans to bring in an economic recovery plan but to date has not done so;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House

(a) call on the Government to immediately produce its economic recovery plan for the consideration of the House of Assembly;

(b) express its concern about the centralization of power in a non-elected and unaccountable commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very positive straightforward resolution. It calls on the Government, in essence, to put its

plan for economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador before the House of Assembly. That is the nuts and bolts of what this resolution is calling for, for the Government to put its plan before the House so that the elected representatives of the people will have an opportunity to debate that plan. I cannot for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, conceive that any Member in this House would not vote for that particular resolution. It does not condemn the Government. It does not ask the Government to set up a select committee, does not ask the Government to spend money, does not ask the Government to do anything other than bring before this Legislature its plan, whatever it is, for economic development in Newfoundland and Labrador so that the elected representatives of the people can have an opportunity to debate and discuss that plan, ask questions about it, hopefully point out areas where the plan can be improved, hopefully make positive suggestions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the nuts and bolts of the resolution. And like I said I cannot think for the life of me that any Member of this House would not support that particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in the first preamble I made the statement that the economy of the Province has worsened during the past year. And, Mr. Speaker, nowhere do you have to look to find out that that has happened than at Unemployment Statistics, and I do not necessarily mean from month to month, say, from February to March, or September to October. These are important. But what is significantly important, Mr. Speaker, is any month last year,

with any given month this particular year, in other words you are then looking at a twelve month period. And if you look at September 1988 to September 1989, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in this Province is up 0.9 per cent. If you look at October 1988 to October 1989 it was up again 1.2 per cent over the same time last year. If you look at November 1988 to November 1989 it was up again 1.7 per cent, again a twelve month period, up over the same period last year. If you look at December, and this is a real startling one, Mr. Speaker, if you look at December 1988 compared to December 1989 the unemployment statistics in this Province were up a whopping 3.4 per cent. So over that twelve month period, December to December, up 3.4 per cent. January 1989 to January 1990, Mr. Speaker, it was up again, not as dramatic, but up again 1.5 per cent. And the latest figures, of course, are for February 1989 to February 1990, it is up again 1.4 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to the House is that there has been a dramatic movement upwards in people unemployed in this Province over every given month a year ago, December 1989, December 1988; January 1990, January 1989. Every given month there has been increases from as low as .9 per cent to as high as 3.4 per cent when you compare December to December.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Government says it has an economic development plan. The Government says it has it. Well if it has it all this resolution is asking, nothing more or nothing less, no more critical than that, critical in the sense of criticizing, all

we are asking is that the Government bring the plan to the House of Assembly. The Government bring it in here so it can be debated, questions can be asked about it, perhaps improvements made to it so we can get on with the job as a Legislature, Mr. Speaker. We can get on with the job of developing to the fullest potential the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And one of the ways to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to adopt fundamental Government policies in different economic areas. For example, in the fishery there was much made yesterday by the gentleman for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) about the all plants-open policy of this Party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we were to adopt an all-plants-open policy, or if the Government were to adopt it - we have already adopted it - that would be a significant plank in its economic development strategy.

What we saw here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I have to say, and I do not mind being criticized, that is immaterial, that is a fact of life, whether you are in this arena or some other, but what we saw here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, bordered, and if it was outside the Legislature I would say it differently, on a Member - because when a member comes to this House and presents information, we have no other choice as hon. ladies and gentlemen but to accept the validity of the information the Member presents. We can question it in debate. We cannot call the Member a liar. We can say the facts are wrong. We cannot say he is lying, though. These are things that we cannot do as

Members. In other words, when the Member for St. John's South brings in a list, we have no choice but to accept his list.

But, Mr. Speaker, it borders on deliberately misleading this House to present inaccurate information, to present false information, to try to get carried in the press, therefore, and once it is carried in the press, it becomes like the old fellow said, for then a kerosene oil fact, you cannot undo it. Once it is done, you cannot undo it then. Once it gets out and it is carried, you might get an apology in the last paragraph of page 39, but it never gets the big headline, Mr. Speaker. Once the lie is out, the lie is out. Once the truth is out, the truth is out, as well. But if it comes after the lie, it is much more difficult, if not impossible, for the truth to supercede the lie and to sink in. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what transpired in this House yesterday.

It is bad enough that a backbencher on the Government side produced the false information, misleading information, but it is worse again when the authority and the credibility of a Ministerial Office is added to it, as the Minister of Fisheries did yesterday when he got up and said: "No, no, my poor uninformed colleague from St. John's South is wrong. When the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Fisheries he did not close sixteen plants, he closed twenty-four." Right?

Mr. Speaker, let me have a look at the information the hon. gentleman - and I have to use the word honourable - brought to this House yesterday. This is part of the motion; we are talking about all

plants open as economic development, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at some of the information. B and M Fisheries, he says, in Twillingate was closed down under that rotten Tory Government, particularly under Rideout's leadership as Minister of Fisheries. What was B and M Fisheries in Twillingate, Mr. Speaker? A dried squid plant. Mr. Speaker, when have we last seen a few squid in Newfoundland waters? That is all it was licensed for, Mr. Speaker, a dried squid plant.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, let me tell the House that not only was it licenced as a dried squid plant only, but when FPI sold the Twillingate Plant to Beothic Fisheries, I think it was, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker; Beothic Fisheries needed some extra parking space for their employees and they bulldozed the building down. That is a nice example of plants closed down under our leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Baccalieu Fisheries, Grates Cove: Transferred at the request of the licence holder. Coastal Seafoods, Highlands: Does the Member know what that was? Does the Member know what a fishermen's pack is?

MR. MURPHY:  
I have no idea.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
A fisherman packing his own fish, in his own facility. That is what the Highlands licence was all about. Fisherman's Dock, Placentia: We have no recollection. I do not know anything about it, whether it was opened or closed or what. I do not even know if it existed, Mr. Speaker. Greenspond Fish

Processors Limited, St. George's: Issued a licence but never took it up, Mr. Speaker. Hindy's Enterprises, New Perlican: Secondary processing; sold and it is still owned by somebody. I do not know who they are, but it is sold.

Humber Cold Storage, Castor River Mouth: I do not know if that is what it is supposed to be. Castor River North or South or something, it is probably supposed to be.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
North.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
North, was it? Transferred to Barry's, which is still in operation, Mr. Speaker. Barry's Fisheries, or Western Co-ordinators, I think they are called now. Parsons Pond Seafoods, another one we closed down, was closed down for what reason? Under renovations. It is still under renovations, as far as I know, with a lot of financial support from the Provincial Government. At least it was in our day.

MR. SIMMS:  
Sad! Sad!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
About eight and a half years ago.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
About a year and a half or two years ago. Yes, that is right. Under renovations, anyway. I was down and saw some of the work myself, when I was up on the Northern Peninsula the last few months I was campaigning for another position, Mr. Speaker.

Conception Bay Seafoods Limited, Petty Harbour: Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of the Petty Harbour Co-op? The licences have



rolled over into the Petty Harbour Co-op, Mr. Speaker.

Phoenix Fisheries Limited, Black Duck Cove: Still owned and operated by Connors, as far as we can find out. Another great close down of mine.

MR. FLIGHT:

You are splitting hairs.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let the hon. Member go out and see the crowd at the Linerboard mill.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Port au Port Seafoods Limited: Closed today; it did not close and stay closed under our administration, though, Mr. Speaker. When they went bankrupt and walked out, we were able to bring in Connors Brothers. There is nobody going in there after what the Minister of Fisheries said today, that it is not viable. We found an operator, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Connors Brothers. Is there anything wrong with them?

Terra Nova Fisheries, Lethbridge: Nobody ever heard of Terra Nova Fisheries in Lethbridge. The Member for the District knows nothing about it, nor the former Executive Assistant to the former Member for the District. Terra Nova Fisheries is in Clarendville. We know that, Mr. Speaker. It is still operating. But we have never heard tell of Terra Nova Fisheries in Lethbridge. Fulford Fisheries Limited, Fox Island River: What was that all about? A buying licence for lobster and

scallop, Mr. Speaker.

Blue Cove Fisheries Limited: Under us, Blue Cove closed and reopened. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is open today, but under us it closed and reopened. Branch Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, closed and reopened, with a new operator, when we were the Government. I do not know if it is still operating today.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is opening again in the spring.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I understand from the Member that it will open again in the spring, as far as he knows.

What about the ones that are not in there, Mr. Speaker? Rose Blanche, Port aux Basques, all of those closed. Harbour Grace, St. Lawrence, every one of them closed, but did they stay closed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. We were a pro-active Government that went and found new operators. What can the Member say about that?

Now let us look at the other list, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What about New Harbour, Twillingate, Jersey side, Little Harbour?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can (inaudible) the hon. gentleman with the facts. Let us look at the other tainted little bit of information, Mr. Speaker, plants which have discontinued operations since April 1989, the magic date. Let us look at that.

The first one, Notre Dame Bay Fisheries Limited, Comfort Cove: Yes, it was closed. They did a deal with the owner, I understand, and it is reopened. I do not know how long it is going to stay open. I hope it stays open forever. But I tell you this, the deal this Government did with Comfort Cove Fisheries we supported, but that company was in far greater financial difficulty than was Universal Fisheries, which that Government would not do a deal with, Mr. Speaker. What is the reason behind that? Anyway, we will give the Government full marks on the first one. They did reopen Comfort Cove, so for that great fantastic job, I will give them full marks.

Now, let us look at the rest of their record. I guess it was the Member who did it. Let us look at the rest of the misinformation the Member spouted out yesterday. Superior Seafoods Limited, Stephenville: Closed, and still closed. Atlantic Ocean Farms: Closed, and still closed.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Closed by the Liberals.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Closed by the Liberals. Eastern Ocean Products, Lewisporte: Closed by the Liberals and still closed. Now, that was their list, Mr. Speaker, but I have a longer list than that.

MR. SIMMS:  
What an example of misleading.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Fermeuse: Closed by the Liberals; Riverhead: Closed by the Liberals; St. Mary's: Closed by the Liberals; Belleoram: Closed by the Liberals, and we have not heard a squeak out of the Member

for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Langdon). Piccadilly: Closed by the Liberals; New Ferolle: Closed by the Liberals; Campbellton Fisheries: Gone! Closed by the Liberals. They were looking for a loan guarantee but were turned down by the Government.

Ferryland: Closed by the Liberals; Grand Bank: Going to be closed by the Liberals; Gaultois: Closed by the Liberals; Jersey side: Closed by the Liberals; and finally - I do not know if I have them all - the dastardly deed of all done, perpetrated on the people of the Southside of St. John's, closing their groundfish plant, the legacy of the Liberal Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the true list. Every single fish plant that closed in Newfoundland and Labrador of which I can think, when we were Government and I was Minister of Fisheries, reopened, every single one, and out of sixteen I have here on the Liberal list today, Mr. Speaker, they have managed to reopen one; they managed to close down sixteen in eight months. I say shame on every Member over there.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And how many more are coming?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
How many more are coming? God only knows. How many more are coming, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Ask Dave Vardy.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Ask Dave Vardy. One hundred or so, he says.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Eighty-six (inaudible) Gaultois.

MR. SIMMS:

There is the difference.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is the difference, Mr. Speaker. So when that hon. Gentleman tries to go around the rules of this House to try to get out misinformation by twisting the truth, and if I were anywhere else but in this House I would tell the gentleman what he did, in fact, actually do. I cannot do it, because it is not parliamentary. But when a Member of this House does that it is for what, Mr. Speaker? To try to protect his own political hide. Because whether the press will carry it or not is immaterial.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, do you have something in Beauchesne that might be used to wax the larynx of the hon. gentleman?

It will eventually get out, and the truth will eventually sink in, and the 40 per cent of the people at the St. John's plant who are losing their jobs and their livelihood will finally know one day, because we will be saying it often enough, they will finally know one day that the Emperor of Newfoundland and Labrador, King Clyde, told the Federal Government that if there is going to be a plant closed in the NatSea chain in Newfoundland, it must be the one on the Southside of St. John's. He said it was dispensable, to use his own words. And what else did he say?

MR. MURPHY:

Where did you get (inaudible)?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Oh, I can tell you where I got it from. The hon. gentleman was not allowed in on the meetings; he does not know anything about it.

And what else did he say? He said, 'Oh sure, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with that? They can go to work as waiters in the Radisson Hotel, they can go to work in the Newfoundland Hotel. I am telling you, Mr. Demone, there is more opportunity for work in St. John's than there is in Burgeo.' And that is right of course, but he did not have the gumption or the gall or the intestinal fortitude to tell that to his Member, or to tell it up on Shea Heights two months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) on Shea Heights what you are quoting now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We were on Shea Heights.

MR. MURPHY:

You were not on Shea Heights.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has lost his marbles. Will somebody come and protect me? He has gone mad! The truth hurts, and the truth is simply this: That while fish plants closed down in this Province previously, they were not allowed to remain closed, even if we had to go and expropriate them to get our hands on them. How did we get our hands on Rose Blanche and Port aux Basques? By expropriation. They were not allowed to close down and stay closed. This Government, in eight months, has allowed 16 fish plants to go and has been successful in opening one. That

is the record of this Government. That is their record in Economic Development.

I understand the Premier opened the Newfoundland and Labrador Winter Games in Lewisporte the other day, which is rather unusual.

MR. SIMMS:  
We gave them to them.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Yes, we approved them for out there.

What I wanted to say is this, that it is rather unusual, because normally the protocol of those things is that the Lieutenant-Governor opens and the Premier closes. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier had to find something to open, because everything this Government has laid its hands on has closed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
That is the great legacy of one year in office.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I am sorry, Sir. I got carried away.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is the great legacy of this Government's one year in office, one opening, and that was an athletic event, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Furey.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition give his dissertation in defence, one can read two things into that. The first one is that he obviously did not enjoy the hon. Member for St. John's South's very articulate and intelligent speech yesterday, and the second thing you can read into it, Mr. Speaker, is that he has nothing to say about this resolution that he, himself, proposed and put before the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He has another twenty minutes.

MR. FUREY:  
He has another twenty minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with him in his silence on this resolution that it is basically a frivolous resolution at best, and a specious resolution at worst, because essentially what this Government has said is that is has told the truth to people. It said, we have inherited an economy that essentially is an economy built on a house of cards. You wonder why these cards are falling around the Island? We have been in power, Mr. Speaker, ten short months. The Opposition was in power for 18 full years. They presented budget after budget, plan after plan, economic industrial strategy after economic industrial strategy, and what we have inherited after 18 full years is essentially an economic house

of cards that is falling down around the new Government at no fault to the new Government, but based on the policies of the past 18 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, what have they said in this resolution? What do they say? They say, whereas the Newfoundland and Labrador economy has worsened dramatically since this Government took office almost one year ago - it could not get any worse, Mr. Speaker. What we inherited could not get any worse. And I will talk about that in a minute, because I want to trace the history and place on the public record the history of what has happened in the last 40 years, since confederation. It will not take me more than five minutes, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to say, 'Whereas the economic diversification of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy is a worthy and proper goal for the Province.' They agree with us that this is something worth pursuing. We thank them for their agreement in that recital. 'And whereas the maintenance of rural Newfoundland and Labrador will depend largely on the fishery, notwithstanding economic diversification.' They obviously do not understand what we mean by economic diversification. The plan we placed before Ottawa in August of last year to give lots of lead time was an economic plan of diversification in the fishery. It was not economic diversification notwithstanding the fishery, or the fishery notwithstanding economic diversification, the two are one. If communities are going to suffer, if plants are going to fold, we want to find ways to bleed and squeeze every single job

out of fish. We want to add value to it. We need that pool of wealth, that economic diversification fund to not just primary process. We are not just drawers of water and hewers of wood anymore. We want to value add to that fish, we want to take that fish from the water to the supermarket shelf, instead of from the water to the processing factories in Maine and across the New England States. That is what economic diversification means, and that is what we are saying.

They go on to take a kind of specious and sly and deceptive shot in the next recital at the Economic Recovery Commission: we intend to transfer all our economic powers and ability to influence economic direction of the Province to them. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. What we have said is we have put an Economic Recovery Commission in place. We have added the caveat, Mr. Speaker, that this Government does not have any magic solution to the problems of the inheritance of the last eighteen years, and that economic house of cards that is falling down around us. When you build a house of cards, the slightest breeze will knock the cards down and the domino effect happens, and companies will fall because everything was built on an artificial economy, everything was built on subsidization, loan guarantees, and prop-ups. Everything around that that Government touched was propped up, everything from the smallest fish plant to the great cucumber fiasco. It was all propped up. It was all artificial.

What did we say we were going to do? We were going to put a Recovery Commission in place. Mr. Speaker, the Members who sit on

this side, the Members of the Government, the duly elected Government of this Province will determine the economic direction of this Province, not the Economic Recovery Commission. They are advisors to this Government. I know it kills you to look across and say this is the Government but, like it or not, this is the Government. And whether or not you like what the advice of the Economic Recovery Commission will be, whether you dispise it, hate it, want to trample upon it, we will sift through their advice - but bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, they are advisors, they are only advisors - take the best of it, and implement from it what we deem as a Government, all of us, to be worthy of implementation.

Mr. Speaker, then they go on to say, ...call on the Government to put their economic plan in place. Now, any reasonable person would see that the final call from the transition of those recitals to the conclusion of this resolution, the conclusion is at best simplistic and at worse moronic. I mean, it is probably both simplistic and moronic. What did you want us to do, concoct a plan, lay it on the table like a chessboard and say, that is it, that is going to work, nothing else matters, this is it and we stand by this little plan, we will not alter it and we will not be flexible, we cannot do anything but stick with this plan? How foolish! How ridiculous! That is what you are used to. That is why you stuck with Sprung for two years. That is why it cost us \$24 million.

You cannot be obstinate, you cannot be stubborn, you cannot be inflexible. You have to deal with reality, the reality with the

economic house of cards that you gentlemen built which is crumbling around this Province, that we want to deal with by creating. You want our plan? Our plan is to create a positive, economic climate where businesses are not ashamed to take a profit, where they are not ashamed to invest in this Province, where Newfoundlanders can hold their heads high and be proud, and go to work with dignity rather than subsidies, loan guarantees and all those other foolish machinations of the previous Government.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a real credibility problem. He really does. When he talked in his speech momentarily about the economy he reminded me of the little story in the Globe and Mail yesterday. In the Globe and Mail, poked in past the editorial page, there was a little story of a Dutchman who was picked up in London yesterday for having cocaine in his possession, in his underpants. This Dutchman was brought before the courts for having cocaine in his underpants, and do you know what his defence before the courts was? Somebody planted it there. Now the credibility of that defence is probably equivalent to the credibility of that speech the hon. the Leader of the Opposition gave. When you consider that he crossed the floor from being a Liberal over to becoming a Conservative in 1979-80 and trace the economic consequences and I do not blame him singularly for this, but in ten years look at what has happened to the economy of the Province. Now do not blame him singularly. I said I would give you a little history lesson, and let me give it to you right now.

In the seven years concluding the Smallwood Government, from 1966 to 1972, the unemployment rate ranged, right across Newfoundland and Labrador, between 5.8 per cent to a high of 9.2 per cent, for an average unemployment rate, through the final seven years of the Smallwood administration, of 7 per cent. Now, think about that, Mr. Speaker. Think about that in this context, that when Mr. Moores took over, from 1973 right on through to 1979, we saw the Province's unemployment rate go from a low of 10 per cent, nearly double the lowest rate in the last seven years of Mr. Smallwood, to a high, Mr. Speaker, of 16.5 per cent. And the average unemployment rate when the Tories took power, from 1973 to 1979, was 14 per cent, double the last seven years of Mr. Smallwood. You have to put the economy of this Province in perspective.

Now, let us bring it into modern history, when some of you, on the coattails of Mr. Peckford's highfalutin fantasies of Hibernia, took your places in this Legislature. What happened then? Well, let us just look: 7 per cent under Smallwood in the last seven years; an average of 14 per cent for Mr. Moores' Tory years; along comes Mr. Peckford, who served in his capacity for nine years, and from 1980 to 1988, the Province's unemployment rate, right across this Province, averaged 17-1/2 per cent, which is nearly two and one-half times the average unemployment rate in the last seven years of the Smallwood administration.

So you can see how the economy, after 1972, started to go into a negative tailspin, and the leading economic indicators show that, Mr. Speaker. The Cross Domestic

Product slowed, unemployment grew, out-migration continued in record numbers, all through the Tory legacy of the eighteen years that they built their economic house of cards.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, throughout the first half of the 1980s, employment in the Province actually fell slightly, if you take the whole numbers of people throughout the Province who were working. From an average of 179,000 people working, it dropped to 172,000 for a 4 per cent decrease in the actual numbers of people working. Now, why do you suppose that was? My hon. friend from St. John's South pointed out yesterday, and rightly so, the numbers of fish plants and meaningful jobs that were taken right out of this economy by a government, an Opposition now, that claims to have perpetrated this famous all-plants-open policy. Well, he showed the truth of that. He pulled the mask back from that deception yesterday and showed the naked truth and the naked, awful reality of the numbers of plants whose doors were locked up by the previous Government.

Now, the hon. the Member for St. John's East (Ms Duff) laughs. She should laugh. She should laugh at the record of the party that she joined and be awfully proud of that Minister who was her father in that previous Smallwood Government that had a great record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Now, let us talk, Mr. Speaker, about 1979, onward through the reign of Mr. Peckford. What kinds of plants closed under that

regime? Let me count them for you: Baie Verte's asbestos mine halted production in 1981, under the Conservatives; Buchans closed in the early 1980s, under the Conservatives; Consolidated Rambler Mines in Baie Verte closed in 1982, under the Conservatives; cutbacks at Goose Bay in the mid to late 1970s, under the Conservatives; Wabush cutbacks of 1,600 - one thousand six hundred meaningful jobs were lost in Wabush from 1979 to 1983, most of them between 1982 and 1983, under the Conservatives, and guess who was president of IOCC.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Mr. Mulroney.

MR. FUREY:

I ask you to guess. It was a fellow by the name of Brian Mulroney who promised to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland, under the Conservatives. This all happened under the Conservatives.

You talk about the ultimate ironies, Mr. Speaker. Some years later, who was out knocking on doors for Mr. Mulroney, who closed down those jobs in Wabush? Those very Conservatives. Shame on them, Mr. Speaker! Shame on them!

Holyrood oil refinery closed in 1983, under the Conservatives; the Railway was shut down September 28, 1988, job losses in communities right across the Province, under the Conservatives; EPA moved out of Gander, dislocating hundreds of people, in April, 1984, under the Conservatives; Newfoundland Enviroponics, the great Sprung crusade, closed down, under the Conservatives; 1983, No. 7 paper machine in Corner Brook - you were the Minister - closed, under the Conservatives. In 1983, number 5

paper machine in Grand Falls closes under the Conservatives. In 1988, they get notice that ERCO will be shutting down its plant and moving out of Long Harbour, under the Conservatives. In 1980, two of the largest lumber mills in the Province in Bay d'Espoir and Goose Bay closed under the Conservatives. The Lake Group of Companies folds under the Conservatives. Four thousand plant workers and trawlermen are laid-off for vast periods of time under the restructuring because of high inventories, recession, high interest rates and general problems in the fishery, under the Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, IOCC knocks out 700 to 800 jobs in Schefferville - Labrador Mine under the Conservatives. Eagle Resources Limited are shutdown in 1985, under the Conservatives. J. Tyler Mining, barite, shutdown under the Conservatives. Advocate Mines, in 1981, shutdown under the Conservatives. Pullout of the Offshore Companies in 1985 of Bow Valley, Dominion Oil Fields, Suppliers Megabar, Barite of Canada, M and M Fabrications. Eastfield closes in 1988 under the Conservatives. The seal fishery is phased out in 1980, under the Conservatives. Newfoundland Hardwoods in Mount Pearl is shutdown under the Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would remind hon. Members that the Minister of Development has the floor and there will be opportunity for other Members to



enter into the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you another fascinating statistic, that is a sorry reflection and a dark shadow across that Conservative Government. The total value of unemployment insurance benefits increased by more than 120 per cent under that Government. From \$293 million into the economy on unemployment insurance benefits to \$651 million in 1987.

AN HON. MEMBER:

More people working.

MR. FUREY:

More people working he says. More people scratching for a living in seasonal jobs, less full time meaningful jobs, chasing your plan. They were chasing their economic plan and their economic plan was a 10/42 make work project. That was their economic plan.

So Mr. Speaker when they put this frivolous, nonsensical, silly, moronic, simplistic motion before the House, and talk about it for thirty seconds and then launch into a personal attack on the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy). What a great Member that Member from St. John's South. They should be so lucky to have a Member like that on that side. They should be so lucky.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

What is our plan, Mr. Speaker?

Our plan is to vote against this

stupid, moronic, simplistic, nitty-twitty, resolution that does not even deserve to be written on paper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing?

Well, let me tell you what we are doing. I will ask leave of the House to give me an extra twenty minutes so that I can really, fully flesh out what this Government is doing. And I will talk about it in four categories. By leave.

The first one I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to give you a summary of the Economic Recovery Commission's activities since they took office in September of 1989. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you the first one.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we budgeted for \$3 million in last year's budget and I am happy to tell the House that we have only spent \$900,000, well below the Budget, to their chagrin and to their surprise, and to their desperation. They wanted to attack that \$3 million, they wanted to attack it as our Sprung. Well I will tell them that we are \$24.5 million under the Sprung budget, so we have a long way to go yet before it becomes Sprung.

Mr. Speaker, what have they done?

This Commission has, and I hope you will give me leave, I hope you will do me the honour of doing that, Mr. Speaker, as it will take me a long time to get through all of this because what I wanted to do was that I wanted to -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to address the issue. What I am saying is -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, with all respect I still have three minutes. The clock started for me, Mr. Speaker, at 3:30, I have twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FUREY:

But you know I have twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

According to my time you started at twenty-eight minutes after.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Your Honour.

You will recall Your Honour that right after Question Period the House and the good graces of the Government gave leave to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout) to present a petition. Normally we start Private Member's Day at 3:00 o'clock, Your Honour. You know this to be true. So what we agreed to was five minutes out of the good graces of the Government to allow the hon. the Leader to present a petition because there were a number of

university students in the gallery and we said yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, what was allowed was five and five. The Leader took five minutes and the hon. the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren) took five minutes, which took us to ten past three. The hon. the Leader was allowed twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, of uninterrupted speaking time, and he spoke for twenty minutes from ten past to three thirty. And I ask Your Honour to give me leave to have the last three minutes so that I can at least do justice to the summary of the Economic Recovery Commission.

The Economic Recovery Commission's summary of events that I would like to put before the House and discuss, Mr. Speaker, in four sections, Major Initiatives, Enterprise Support, Policy Direction, and what they have done as NLDC Board of Directors to date. And, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if you would allow me to have my three minutes I can give the House a very succinct, sharp, focused summary of their activities to date, if you will allow my three minutes, Your Honour?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, what a charade! The hon. Member had twenty minutes to speak, he could have done his three minute summary during the twenty minutes that he took to talk nonsense and baloney. The fact of the matter is this House is run in terms of time by the clerks at the table. That is who

times the Members. This Member started speaking at 3:29 according to the clerks at the Table, his time has expired and Your Honour was absolutely correct. What the Member has done is nothing but an affront to Your Honour and to the Chair as far as I am concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SIMMS:

There is no point of order obviously.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. As I indicated the hon. Member started at 3:29 and his time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. TOBIN:

No! No! No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I can continue the list, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister. When the Minister was speaking he was referring to projects that closed, but I can assure the Minister that places like Come By Chance, and all of these have re-opened. But for the benefit of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development of the Province at that let me continue his record. The Minister of Development, Mr. Speaker, has seen

Notre Dame Bay Fisheries Limited closed, not open. Superior Seafoods Limited closed, not open; Atlantic Ocean Farms Limited closed, not opened; Eastern Ocean Products Limited closed, not open. Fermeuse, Comfort Cove, closed. Riverhead closed; St. Mary's closed, Belleoram closed; Ferryland; Grand Bank, Gaultois; Picadilly, Jersey'side; New Ferolle, in his own District, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Minister of Development has done since he assumed office ten months ago. The good thing about today and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, and I wish he was here to hear this because the message that we all got today is that the Minister of Development today actually did something without Doug House. Doug House, his boss probably wrote the speech, but to see the Minister of Development standing in the House and making a speech, finally making a contribution, Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to see that happening. I realize obviously that Dr. House, whom the Minister serves as an Executive Assistant, contributed significantly to his speech. But the fact of the matter is the Minister of Development, the Minister of shut down industries in this Province, Mr. Speaker, finally has come to his feet and made a statement. The Minister said - and I have made a few notes - that he was going to show us in ten years, what happened. What about, Mr. Speaker, what happened in the ten months since he became Minister of Development in this Province?

He talked about all the industry that has closed down. Let me say to the Minister of Development that I was extremely disappointed that, in his statement and speech, he did not mention the Marystown

shipyard, for which he has responsibility.

MR. FUREY:

You would not give me leave.

MR. TOBIN:

You had twenty minutes and it was not important enough then. Why should we give you leave now?

Now, Mr. Speaker, why did not the Minister tell us why the Government refused to provide a subsidy to the Marystown shipyard from the Ocean Industries agreement, whereby people in Marystown, Newfoundland, could be working, rather than people in Stavanger, Norway? Why did not the Minister tell us that, Mr. Speaker?

Why did not the Minister tell us why he has stood by, as Minister of Development, together with the MHA for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) and see Long Harbour closing down and people with U-Haul trucks, moving away? Why did not the Minister tell us that, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Member for Placentia did nothing.

MR. TOBIN:

No, it is not fair to say the Member for Placentia did nothing. Because, like the people from Long Harbour, he moved, too. So, he did do something, Mr. Speaker, he moved to St. John's while they had to move to the mainland.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Minister some of the statements that have been made in yesterday's local newspaper: 'Marystown Mayor Jerome Walsh said he is disappointed that everything designated for the Burin Peninsula now seems to gravitate to another

area.' What about that, Mr. Speaker? When the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor and the Council of Marystown had to take such drastic action as to have a page here in this paper relating to the way this Government have decided to scuttle the economic activity that has been taking place on the Burin Peninsula for the past ten or fifteen years. Why has this Government failed miserably in giving the same type of representation, the same type of development to rural Newfoundland as did the Peckford administration? Where is the commitment to the Argentinia area, or to the Mortier Bay area by this Government? Where is it? What did the Government do in terms of Hibernia development? What did they do? They took it out of Placentia Bay, Mr. Speaker. I have no difficulty in standing and saying it. And this Premier is more responsible for that than anyone else. And the Member for Placentia should join me in condemning the Premier, and represent the people who elected us, the people of Placentia Bay. That is what we should be doing. I know where it is going.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where? Tell us where it is going.

MR. TOBIN:

You do not know where the concrete platform is going to be built? Ask the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert). He knows everything.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is this Government basically out to scuttle Placentia Bay, both the east side and the west side? Why are they making such an attempt?

I was with a delegation from the Marystown shipyard union when the

Premier told them - and the Minister of Development was there, too - that if and when modules are built in Newfoundland, there would be one built in Marystown. I intend to hold the Premier to that commitment.

Why, on the 21st of September, last year, did the Minister of Energy write to the Federal Minister of Energy, saying, 'My colleagues in Cabinet now have had the opportunity to look at your proposal to delay the expansion of the Cow Head facility, and we feel, as a Government, it is only prudent to do so at this time,' Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is that type of activity taking place in Placentia Bay? Those are the questions I would like to have answered.

That delay, Mr. Speaker, in the Cow Head facility, in announcing the construction of the second ferry, the one, by the way which the Minister talked about today and maybe the Member for Bell Island might be interested in knowing that that ferry starts construction probably this time next year. Probably this time next year if we are lucky the actual construction will take place, so it will be another year. So why did they delay it for two years, Mr. Speaker, the construction of a ferry at the Marystown Shipyard to create employment there and provide a service to the people of Fogo and Bell Island? Why did this Government withdraw a Cabinet Paper dealing with the expansion of the Winterland Airport for over a year? Why has that type of activity been carried on by this Government to sabotage the economic development of the Burin Peninsula? Why did this Government refuse to provide a

subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard when there is \$10 million in an ocean industries agreement that expires within the next few days? Why did this Government refuse to provide a subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard for which the money was intended and the Federal Government was a willing participant to construct the shrimp trawler? As a result of that, there is in excess of 100 former employees of the Marystown Shipyard now working in mainland Canada. Is that what this Government is proud of? Is that what this Government is proud of, to see Newfoundlanders having to move away? We can go further than that. I wish the Minister of Works, Service and Transportation was here, Mr. Speaker.

Why has the Government taken such a callous, cold, mean, distasteful and terrible attitude towards the people on the Burin Peninsula? Why has this Government driven about 300 people in ten months from the Burin Peninsula to work in mainland Canada? Why have men and women and their children had to leave the schools in Marystown and move to the mainland? All because of the mean mentality of the Premier of this Province. There were 600 people working in the Marystown Shipyard when this crowd took over, Mr. Speaker, 600 people working in the Marystown Shipyard.

MR. HOGAN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
How many people do you have working in Argentia and Long Harbour after ten months? Mr. Speaker, he should hang his head in shame for the type of representation he has given. He would be a great ambassador for

Placentia Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Callous and cold.

MR. TOBIN:

Extremely callous and cold.

I know people who supported me in the last elections and people who supported that party in the last elections, who are now working in mainland Canada. And I feel bad for all of them. I feel somewhat embarrassed for the crowd who are now left home who had to go around and say that the Government was going to bring them all back, I feel bad for them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Peckford (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

I can tell you Mr. Peckford supported the Marystown Shipyard and Mr. Peckford negotiated a contract to supply the subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard and the Government that you support took it on them, stole it, robbed it. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker. They have robbed the right of Newfoundlanders to work in Newfoundland by denying them the basic right of a subsidy to build a shrimp trawler. That is what they have done, Mr. Speaker, that is what this Government has done. And I can tell the hon. Member for St. John's South that while the Government can scuttle -- while the Government can deny the right for the people of St. John's South the right to work in dignity that I will never -- I have never supported a Government that did anything to that type of people that I represent. If they did, Mr. Speaker, I would do the honourable thing and get out, and you should go too, Mr. Speaker.

Let us talk about the road work in this Province. I wish the Minister of Transportation was here. The letter is titled, Forget Politics, Think About Children, addressed to a Minister of this Government. Mr. Speaker, a very concerned mother wrote the letter for her children.

That is who wrote the letter and she is not to be laughed at, either, by the Member for St. John's South. It is addressed to the Minister of Transportation and says: ' For one moment, Sir, let us put aside politics and the different political parties of Newfoundland and converse as a parent. First you tell me how well your children did in school, how they proudly ran home after a quiz or a term paper to tell you of their good grades, how they walk to the school or bus stops each morning and how in winter they complain of the cold. How you proudly met the teachers on Parent-Teacher night to discuss their good grades and those courses in which they needed guidance. Now Mr. Gilbert, it is your turn to listen. Let me tell you how my children too, walk to school each day, how they ran home after a quiz to tell me how well they had done and how they complained of walking home in the cold winter months and let me tell you how abruptly it has ended at the very tender age of 14. When my children had to leave Petit Forte so they could go across the bay to Placentia to get an education, my children could not run home any more and I could not attend any more Parent-Teacher meetings, because my children are now at the age of 14 in Placentia attending school, coming home only at Christmas and Easter time. A four hour run through wind, snow and ice. Tossed around by the

cruel sea we so often experience in Newfoundland. I have seen my children walk off the boat and the excitement of coming home is no longer with them, just the desire to get home and in bed to recover from the nasty trip of seasickness, only to have to leave again in a few days to encounter this horrible dreaded trip to Argentia. Mr. Gilbert, you do not know the hardships because you come to Petit Forte in a helicopter. You are carried out on a clear sunny day, a very short ride. Mr. Gilbert, why do you not go to Argentia and ride across the Bay with my children. Sick from the sea, maybe you could comfort them or I wonder if they would have to comfort you when the sea tossed you around sometimes. For the sake of my children, the children of Petit Forte, I am asking you, Sir, as one parent to another, please, please Sir, let the road go ahead. Give us what we deserve and let us enjoy our children's education, not dreaded annual trips across Placentia Bay. Signed by Mrs. Florence Barry of Petit Forte. Now, Mr. Speaker, what Member opposite, can hold his head high and support a decision by the Minister of Transportation to take that money. \$500,000.00 it will cost the Province to build the road and it will cost them more to buy McNamara out of the contract. Is that something any Member is proud of, I am sure the Minister of Education is not proud of it, Mr. Speaker, he is not that type of man. The President of Treasury Board is not here, I am sure he would not be proud of it. Again, I do not believe he is that type of person. But how can a Premier of this Province, any decent, honourable, living person deny that right, when the Federal Government is paying the shot with

the exception of 1/2 a million dollars to build a 15 kilometer road to Petit Forte. Why, why, Mr. Speaker, are they being treated like this in Newfoundland today? I think it is terrible, that is not the only letter, there is another letter there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Will you read it?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes I will. Yes, and I can read it and not only that, I can say it. 'Concerning the road to Petit Forte I was very disappointed when I heard your voice on TV saying that you are not interested in having a road constructed to Petit Forte. I had a business in Petit Forte for thirty-two years and I knew your father, Mr. John Gilbert, all of those years. Your father did a lot of business in Petit Forte and he was well acquainted with the people, and was liked by all the people of Petit Forte. If your father was alive today, he would say: David, give the people of Petit Forte the road. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the sentiments of a couple of people down there and they are not to be smirked at either, by the Minister of Social Services. I take exception to those types of comments, because there are decent people over there who would like to see a road going to Petit Forte.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Mr. Dawe, then.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Dawe. Mr. Dawe started it and the contract was signed and the tenders were called before the Government changed. An agreement between both Governments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Talk about what you like but the bottom-line is it was done, Mr. Speaker. We can talk about roads. I will give him an example of another road in my District that we approved, down in Rock Harbour in my District where the people are deserving of a decent road. They are hard working people. They are deserving people. They go to Marystown to work. They go to Marystown to shop. They go to Marystown to do most of their business. The road to Rock Harbour was recommended by the bureaucrats and as a Cabinet we accepted it. Government changed, and what happened? The people of Rock Harbour were denied the basic right that was committed to them by a Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say it is a pleasure to rise today to speak on this resolution that has been put forward. I believe the resolution itself does not have a whole lot of substance but then again it is the right of the Opposition to put it forward. I think there might be some meaningful thought in hoping that with the Economic Recovery Commission, and so on, the economy will improve. The thought, I believe, is fairly negative in it, but again that is the right of the Opposition and they can carry that forward. I believe the ERC we have set up is new. It is an idea that has come about from the Royal Commission

that was commissioned by the former Government and we will now see some application of the ideas that were recommended by the Royal Commission. I think it is a new thing which I believe will have some positive results for the long-term benefits of this Province. We will require some patience and we will require some fortitude to carry it forward. I believe it is a very positive move by this Government. We will take some criticism for it in the short-term but in the long-term, I believe, we will be long-term beneficiaries of some of the things that will be implemented by this Commission and have been recommended to this Province for implementation. The ERC thus far has made some excellent progress and are looking at a new direction and, I suppose, a sense of putting together the number of Government programs under one office which will be beneficial to entrepreneurs of the Province. I believe it to be a very positive move and will help young people and other people in the Province who are interested in building businesses and helping the economy. One of the problems many people who are going to start a business have experienced is trying to get information about different applications and different programs that are available. If we can do anything to benefit this Province one of the things we can do is to make it easier for people to start their business and to be able to get the appropriate information. I believe that the work that has been undertaken by the ERC, the Economic Recovery Commission, will be a major benefit to this Province and I support the initiatives that have been taken by this Government, by the Wells Administration. Again, it is a



direct result of the Royal Commission that was commissioned and that was brought forward. I think some of the ideas that are there will work and some of them may not but we are not willing to just sit back and watch and do the same things that have been done before. We want to try some new things and that is what we are about and that is what we are at. I expect that we are going to see some very positive results down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Opposition during the last few days talk about the problems in the economy and so on and how come this Government has not resolved those problems yet. Some reality has got to set in here, Mr. Speaker. We have only been here ten months. I know we can be blamed for a lot of things and we are going to get the blame, mind you, but I think with that blame there should be a credibility in the criticism that is provided. I do not believe there is but in some instances there might be. I could name a few that have been aptly pointed out but on most occasions I think most of this criticism is not based on practicality. A lot of the problems that we are experiencing right now in this economy were not invented by us or were not dealt with by us yet. We are trying to deal with them now and we are working out plans to deal with them. You cannot solve problems overnight so I would say to the Opposition that they should, in their criticism, be somewhat a little more credible, and when they are putting their questions forward and their criticisms, have it tainted with a little bit of patience, and give us a chance. Because we are intent on fixing as many of the problems that have

been created and that have been allowed to go on by the previous Government. It is shocking, as far as I am concerned, to see what has happened to this economy over the last number of years, and to see it totally ignored.

Now I give credit to the former Government when they were there for making attempts to solve the economic problems. But they made attempts and their attempts obviously did not work as well as they had hoped. But we are going to try a different direction and a new one and I believe that one to be a much better one. I hope at the end of the four or five years or the next eight or ten, that we will be able to look back and say that this Government was able to meet those challenges and provide some good leadership, and provide leadership to the economic community, and to see a good and strong economy built in all regions of the Province.

We are trying to be fair, Mr. Speaker, to all regions of the Province. This Government is not the same as the former Government especially in the last number of years where you know, if you were not of the stripe of the Government Member, you would not get a look in on anything. So when I hear some of the Members opposite, not all of them, there are only a few, but I hear some of them over there talking about fairness and addressing the concerns of their Districts and so on. Mind you it is okay for them to say that, but some of the Opposition Members when they were in Government were the perpetrators of much patronage and other things that went on, you could not get a look in. I am a little perplexed, to tell you the truth, when I hear those comments

being made. Again, I think it is the question of the credibility of the criticism. As I have said, we are trying to resolve the problems and we are trying to put some things in place to get those problems resolved.

Also the Throne Speech that we brought forward, Mr. Speaker, highlights a number of things that we are hoping to do in this Session and over the next number of months. One of the criticisms coming forward was that it was a short Throne Speech of twelve pages. Again I think substance is there in the Throne Speech but again question the credibility of the criticism. If you look back to 1980 when the former Government was there, it was fourteen pages long. I can go down the list, there are many times when substance in twelves pages or ten or twenty or one hundred, is the most important thing. I believe this Government is finally going to get this Province moving and is on track to do that. Now mind you, it is a resource based economy that we have, therefore we are open to the marketplace in the world marketplace and the problems that are experienced there. They are out of our hands somewhat and that is why we have to diversify and prepare ourselves for other opportunities that are available.

The other main point is that the resource base sector is what we have to build on, and the fishery. We talk about diversification of the fishery, we mean not only building the base that we have in the fishery, the normal base and the normal processing, but to expand on that. Not to downgrade it or anything else. We want to expand on it. We want to build a diversified fishing economy,

fishing sector. We do not want to downsize it and everything else. We are trying to get an efficient system in place that gives a person an opportunity to make a decent living. If there is something wrong with that - I look forward to hearing what they are going to say about that - but I do not see anything wrong with it. So we are trying to create other opportunities, not just the ones that are there now, but to look outwards and try to create more. We are trying to do that. We are working with that and the Provincial Minister and this Government and Cabinet have put forward proposals to the Federal Government in trying to get some dollars to work with and create more opportunities. Because that is what we are all about, and that is what we have to be all about, because this Province at this point in history needs that very much. Too many things have been ignored by the previous Administration and we are going to have a look at all the different opportunities that are out there and to get people interested.

So I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to seeing these initiatives take place. When we go to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Hibernia talks are going well, or that the Hydro talks are going well, when we say that we will mean it. And if we say well, there is a problem, there is a problem. We will be up-front and we will say that.

When I think about the previous ten years in this Province and the dreams that were put forward, the dreams that were built up and the immense number of people, the great number of people who tried to build businesses based on the hypothesis that this thing was

going to go. Being told for sure that it was going to happen, Hibernia and so on. And seeing people lose their businesses over those years and all the speculation that went on. At least with this Government we are going to deal with the reality of them. Sometimes the reality may not be that good, but then other times it will be and at least people will understand and they can build from there. We have a major agenda ahead of us for the 1990s and I believe that it will be said down the road that it is a great thing and it is a good thing to see that this Party, that this Government was in power at this time and have set a new direction. We are going to try to deal with these problems that are presently being experienced in the fishery. We have problems with the pulp and paper industry which are not going to go away that have to be dealt with. But they have to be dealt with head on, and they have to be dealt with in a way, that at the end of the day here is the reality. We have to build on those bases that we have now.

Up until this time I concur with the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) on his point that the economy has been built on a house of cards. You wondered when the deck was going to fall and there are times, especially now when you see it falling around you and you are there trying to pick up the pieces. So given the period of ten months that we have been in Government trying to resolve the number of problems that we are experiencing, I do not think we are doing that bad. I think there is a long way to go. We are picking up pieces of the puzzle that were all over the place and need to be addressed but there are just too many things.

You can go on with a litany of things that were let go and the different industries that could have been started or need the initiatives, but unfortunately they never got off the ground. So what we are hoping to see for the benefit of all people of this Province, wherever they may live, we are hoping to see some new ideas and some new investments, I think, Mr. Speaker, in our people. Because I think it is important that we try to keep our young people here and try to get them involved in business opportunities and to look at creating business opportunities. And that attitude has got to prevail in the 1990s. We are in a global marketplace and if that attitude does not prevail we are going to be in much more trouble than we are now. So I think that is one of the things that this Government has undertaken with the White Paper on Post-Secondary Education - to try to get the post-secondary moving in that direction. And I totally support the White Paper put forward by the Minister of Education. I believe it to be an excellent document which again will help to address that one part of the process of a good post-secondary system which offers good educational opportunities to our young people. And I hope that we will see the changes implemented as soon as we can. Again the benefits will accrue to our people, Mr. Speaker.

Also when I look at the resolution, again it is fairly negative. I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants to see some good things happen. Now mind you we are not going to get a whole lot of credit for anything that will happen. We will get credit for the bad things and that

is understandable, but I only say to him that the effort will be made by this Government and by the people that serve in this Government to resolve the problems. And there is no easy road ahead, but then again there never has been. When you criticize the present Government remember we are trying to establish a track record. Now it is going to take some time, and we have a lot of problems to deal with, but when you go to criticize us, I mean if you are going to criticize us and you have been the Government for the last ten years the credibility of that has to be somewhat questioned. We all have thick skin I suppose in that sense when you are in Government, you know, the credibility of the questioning in the Opposition and so on is, I think, important. If they want to see some things happen and create some changes and to be a good Opposition, Mr. Speaker, because I think that is very important for the parliamentary process.

I believe that the ERC wants the outline of the changes that are coming to be announced in the next few weeks, and once the offices are set up and so on, a number of things are going to happen. Once these things occur and there is a sense from people that they can go and check out ideas and this Government will support those ideas I think then we will see some positive things happening.

But I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult in this environment we are in right now. We are dealing with the Federal Government, duly elected in 1988 for the second time, unfortunately, that is paying little or no attention to this Province, and paying little or no

attention to Atlantic Canada, and little or no attention to Western Canada. When you are dealing with a Government that is so bent on pushing us out further in the Atlantic ocean, you have to say to yourself - well, you cannot rely on them, so you have to say to yourself what can we do to help resolve the problems. It has to be noted that that Federal Government, of the stripe of the Opposition, who were helped to get elected by the Opposition here, is creating havoc and making it very difficult for this Province. If the present Opposition were the Government of today they would be dealing with the same Federal people and there would be problems.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There are a number of conversations going on in the Chamber now, and the level of noise is such that the hon. Member speaking cannot be heard.

The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your intervention, Sir.

But just to pick up my concluding remarks, we are dealing with a Federal Government that is so bent on pushing us so far out in the Atlantic Ocean and not having anything to do with building our economy, it is most disturbing, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with that, that we are dealing with a Government that is so bent on doing that, and we have to get the point across not only to Ottawa, but to Canada that this economy in Newfoundland and Labrador, if it goes, everybody benefits. We brought a lot with

us into this Confederation and it should be recognized by Ottawa and by the Prime Minister. He should not go out and defend a Government of Quebec who thinks, well, they do not know what they are going to do about confederation, they are not sure right now. The hon. Premier, he does not know, he wants to go around and look at their options, so they are not sure. And the Prime Minister of Canada who is supposed to represent all the constituent parts of Canada has decided, 'well that is okay for him to say that. That is okay, I do not mind. We are not sure what he means, you know.' What it says to me is we have a Prime Minister of Canada who is protecting one distinct society over all of the rest and is so bent on doing that that everything else is just going to be put by the wayside. It is extremely important for us to be an equal partner in this confederation because if we are not, all of the other things that we are doing right now, by trying to improve our economy, are only going to go if we are an equal partner. If we are not an equal partner, and if we are not recognized by Ottawa as being that and not going to get the necessary action from them, the results of what we do will be very limited. So it is extremely important that this Government make that representation to Ottawa like we are doing now, and that the debate that is occurring on the Constitution in this country - that has to happen, and it has to happen over the next few months, and it has to occur because this Province is as I feel and as many people feel, also a distinct society. And if we are to be recognized for the many things that we have contributed over the years to this Canada, if we are to

be recognized for that then it will be to our benefit. But what has been happening is that our economy is suffering and one of the reasons, one of the many but one of the major, is that this Federal Government is paying no attention to this Province and many other Provinces. And they have decided to ignore it based on the fact that they have only a few members - seven members from this Province and that is most unfortunate, and it shows, again, the weakness, unfortunately, of our present system. But I must say that when you are trying to build an economy, Mr. Speaker, and we are only at this ten months now, we are trying to deal with many crises that are occurring - not invented by us but invented by others, unfortunately, something that nobody can really share the blame for or have all the blame for, we will take some of it, but it is most unfortunate that the Federal Government of today, right now, is just not listening to what is going on.

I will support the Premier and this Government in attempting to get the federal people to listen to the concerns of this Province. It is extremely important for the economic diversification, the economic recovery of this Province, and I believe that the ERC is aptly named; economic recovery has to occur, and it will only occur if we go about it in the right manner.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all the efforts that have been put forward will be listened to by the Federal Government. I am somewhat skeptical. I hope to see a change in direction of the federal Government, maybe, a change of government, hopefully, in the near future. And that will, again, be

of benefit to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that I do not support the resolution by the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I would ask that more credible Opposition comments come forward. Thank you.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Grand Bank for leave to answer a question the latter asked me today, and they have given me leave. Is that alright?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we concur, of course, on the basis that the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes will be recognized when the hon. Minister is finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, the Member for Grand Bank asked me a question concerning the Gaultois-Hermitage ferry service and, because of the fact that I realized tomorrow is going to be a formal day and I will not get a chance to give the answer, the

Member and I agreed that I would try to get the details for him this afternoon. I will give it now.

Since the beginning of March, the motor vessel "Kimberly Christine" has provided scheduled service from March 1st to the 5th. On the 6th, it was out because of ice conditions and, on the 7th, it was back in service again. From the 8th to the 14th, the vessel has not been able to operate due to ice. Now, icebreaker assistance has been requested, but the vessel has not been available to date, and capabilities of the motor vessel "Kimberly Christine" to follow an icebreaker is suspect. The intake for the water cooling engine becomes clogged with ice, causing overheating; consequently, the engine must be shut down, intake cleared, making progress extremely slow.

Now, here, Mr. Speaker, is the alarmist part of the thing. I told the Member today that we had contingency plans in place and there was no problem. But in Gaultois, unlike most of the other places serviced by our intra-Province ferry, they have a twice-weekly passenger service provided by the "Marine Atlantic". The "Marine Packer" was there once with freight and the "Tavernor" was there twice with freight.

We have also instituted a twice-weekly helicopter service, Wednesday and Friday, to provide mail and drug delivery to Gaultois.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now!

MR. GILBERT:

Now we have no vessel available in the fleet to replace the "Kimberly

Christine" and, at this point, the situation in Gaultois is unlike the rest of the ones that are serviced by the intra-Province ferry, with the exception of the Ramea-Burgeo one, which is serviced by the "Gallipoli".

The status report is, every other area in the Province, with the exception of those on the South Coast, are serviced by the ferry, alone. But the alarm you were raising this afternoon, is really not there. There was no emergency. The situation was normal. And the kids who wanted to go out for some sort of a program on the weekend, we are making arrangements to get them out, too.

MR. EFFORD:  
What a Minister!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Now!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for St. Mary's  
- The Capes.

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

I almost would like to sit down to hear what the hon. Minister has to say. If I did not have something important to say myself, I would. Because he came in like a cat on a hot tin roof when the Member for Stephenville stood and was very upset that he could not get to speak. So, I am sure he has something extremely interesting. But we will wait, there will be another day.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the resolution, which calls upon Government to immediately produce its economic recovery plan for the consideration of the House of

Assembly.

It will be extremely interesting to see the plan when it is brought in, if it is brought in, because undoubtedly, one of the reasons why it has not been brought forth so far is that there is not a plan, there has not been one put in place. The good Government over there thought they would have blessings bestowed upon them from above, 'above' meaning Ottawa, and they could use all these blessings to disperse around the Province in their name. Unfortunately, because hard times have been fouling the relationships between the Province and Ottawa, such blessings are not forthcoming and, consequently, a little kink has been thrown into the Economic Recovery Plan.

If you look at the Commission, itself, the letters, of course, ERC, Economic Recovery Commission, ERC is perhaps a very suitable terminology to use, because one thing they have done is they have certainly irked the people of the Province by the way they have spent so much time and particularly so much money in producing absolutely nothing. I understand that the members of the team themselves, we have already seen some resignations, and I understand that we might even see more because they realize that it is futile to go about trying to develop a plan when they have absolutely no expertise or no money to do so.

I mentioned the relationships with the Federal Government and the Premier's stand on Meech Lake, which has gotten worse in the sense whereby he says we might end up joining the United States, or we might end up leading to the break up of Canada, Newfoundland

being the result or the Premier's stand being the result of the break up of Canada. It leaves one to think how serious a situation it is. Last year when the Federal Election took place, I remember some of the federal members, colleagues of the hon. gentleman, running around talking about free trade. Free trade was going to be the end of the old age pension, the end of the social assistance programs, the end of UIC. I do not hear them now going around and saying that if Mr. Wells does not change his stand on Meech Lake that we quite possibly will end up losing the programs that we have because there will not be a federal community in Canada. So maybe the gentleman should go around now ringing door bells and warning people that they had better get on to the Premier to be responsible in all of this.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not be trying to frighten them.

MR. HEARN:

I am not trying to frighten them, I am trying to be realistic, unlike your colleagues last year during the Federal Election when they went around crying wolf. You know as well as I do, that if this Country breaks up and if Quebec does separate, that is the start of the dissolutionment of the country. It is much more serious than the gentlemen opposite think it is at the present time.

However, as we only have a few minutes I would like to zero in on some economic misdevelopment in the Province. We have plants closing around us all over the place. What is the Provincial Government's response? They say they have one. They are the only ones who came in with a solution - some solution. They offered a

bribe to the companies, and from the sources within both groups, Government and companies, they say that basically a deal was worked out between the company and Government, so that Government would not object to the closing of plants, would not object vociferously to the closing of plants, particularly some plants, in lieu of keeping others open if they would keep them open for a prolonged period. However, if one looks beyond the money given to what it does, it extends the life of the plant for a year.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HEARN:

No, Mr. Speaker, Fishery Products International this year had guaranteed its workers it would keep the plants open for twenty weeks not sixteen. They had to keep them open for sixteen. They had told the plants, in the words of Mr. Young himself, they would keep them open for twenty weeks. So this Government this years has done absolutely nothing to help those people. But what it did do was to convince the companies to let them share in this twenty weeks so that they will look good politically. It was a tremendously smart political move. To let them look good politically you let them share in this weeks twenty weeks by letting them pick up four of these weeks, the cost of operation for four of these weeks. In turn, next year for the twenty weeks Government will pay sixteen and the companies will pay four. They say it is the same thing. It is not the same thing because the companies this year would have operated for twenty weeks without any Government help, and the conditions placed upon next year's



operation is that the TAC remain relatively constant because if there is a severe reduction in the TAC then everybody knows the Government will not have to put in money next year because there is no way that the plants can be kept open unless some other changes come in place. That aside, the unfortunate thing about it all, as has been admitted by the Minister of Fisheries, by the Premier publicly and just a few days ago again with the press, that they are not keeping the plants alive to try to find ways to prolong the operations. Whether we find out that the information that we have on the cod stocks is not correct, which quite possibly might be so, or whether we find other resources that we can use to keep the plants going - at least alive - for short periods each year, to keep them there so when things turn around, and they will - I agree with the Minister today, he said when, he did not say if, he said when the stocks rebuild because they will - and if we can keep the plants alive, we keep areas alive - that is what is so important. But that is not what they are saying. They are saying we will extend the life of your plant so that you can arrange to diversify. No plan to help them diversify, but you can arrange to diversify. As I say, a very smart political move, absolutely no substance, in an area where they could have done something to keep plants open and provide work.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HEARN:  
I only have one minute, Mr. Speaker, and I have a few more things I want to say before we get through.

In an area where the Government could have done something, they turned their back. I will not at this time, but I will get another time to explain the story and the history behind Universal Fisheries and why the Government did not assist the company that was not in the financial state that they try to portray at all, a company that had come in and created jobs and provided markets that no other inshore company had done. In fact, he opened up a lot of doors for a lot of other companies that have really piggy backed upon their operation. And now we have five plants shut down, areas in uncertainty and, of course, the Government is not in any position to do a thing about it. So it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. The time has run out because I understand on Wednesdays that I would continue, but I know that the Leader has a lot more to offer than I have. So Mr. Speaker, we will continue this because it is an extremely interesting topic.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to close the debate.

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

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
Say something sensible.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I do not have to say very much sensible to be way ahead of the hon. gentleman. I could stay over here and make signs and be way ahead of the intelligence of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, earlier when I introduced this motion today I spoke about Members and Ministers giving pieces of information - false information in many respects

- to the House of Assembly. Just before my turn came to speak for the second time today the Minister of Works, Service, and Transportation asked if the Opposition would co-operate and allow him to provide information on a question that was raised today during Question Period on the ferry service to the community of Gaultois. And in the spirit of co-operation we agreed and allowed the Minister to provide the information only to find that the Minister had not taken his seat or run from the House, whatever he has done, that again, the House and the people of this Province are not being given the true information, not being given the proper information, not being given all of the facts. The Minister, Mr. Speaker, at the end of his remarks says, 'and there are students,' I believe it was, 'coming out of there on the weekend, and we have made arrangements to get them out.' Mr. Speaker, the people of Gaultois made arrangements with F.P.I. to have a trawler bring them out.

That kind of information, Mr. Speaker, that is misleading! It is wrong! The Government has not made any - that is what is wrong with what the Minister said - the Government has not made any arrangement to get those people out. The Minister wanted to give the House the impression, and the people of the Province the impression, that they made arrangements to provide the transportation. They have not. The people themselves through their own resources, through their own initiatives and with the co-operation of F.P.I. got a trawler to take them out.

MR. GILBERT:

On a point of order!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, when the Member is attempting to mislead the House, and he is trying to make cheap points, as his colleague from Grand Bank was today when he stood up as an alarmist and said the people of Gaultois were having a problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the point of order?

MR. GILBERT:

Now the Department has been in touch, as I outlined what we have done, there is twice weekly passenger service. There are some kids in Gaultois who want to get out for the weekend. My Department is currently talking to FPI, because they have the only vehicle there -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I am -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

They have the only vessel there that is capable of doing this so they are going to take it out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. I believe the hon. Member is trying to explain a point, but there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely right there is no point of order. All the Minister is trying to do, and I do not mind that, but all he is trying to do is to get a few minutes taken off the few minutes that I have left.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is truth of the matter and I hope and I am sure that the people of Gaultois will know that the truth finally had to be squeezed out of the Minister and he is an awful thing to squeeze I can tell you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say in the few minutes I have left I want to make a few comments on the people who spoke in this debate today. Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey). The Minister of Development to have the gall to get up and talk about economic development in Newfoundland and Labrador. The gumption, Mr. Speaker, to talk about economic development in Newfoundland and Labrador when that Minister in this Government has presided over the dismantling of anything relating to development in that very Department. They have allowed, Mr. Speaker, any development lever, any economic

lever in that Department to be transferred out to the non-elected Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what they have allowed to happen, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Dr. House and the Economic Recovery Commission, the unelected Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the person, Mr. Speaker, that has not yet after ten months been able to point to creating one single new initiative in Newfoundland and Labrador. And then that Minister, Mr. Speaker, has the gall to get up and talk about what closed or what went on in the past, what closed down in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Buchans mines.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Buchans mines. It is so far back, Mr. Speaker, you have to get into ancient history to even come to any understanding, Mr. Speaker, of what he is talking about. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development did exactly what he does best, and that is retreat to his former occupation of an actor. The former occupation of the present Minister of Development was an actor. I give him an F as a politician and as a Minister, but I give him an Academy Award as an actor, because he deserves it. He used to be called Drama School Chuck, I have been told, but he likes to be called Charles J. those days. In the old days it used to be Drama School Chuck, I was told.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is backupable.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Backupable, yes. Sure, it is a good Newfoundland word. There is nothing wrong with it. It is a good word in White Bay. I do not know about inside the overpass and stuff like that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that was the contribution made to this very significant resolution by the Minister of Development, the Minister you would think would have the economic plans ready to bring before the Legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was the contribution he made.

Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting, as well, to listen to the other Government speaker on this resolution. I said one time last year in this House, Members might recall, that it is very, very unfortunate, in my view, that the only veteran, the only returnee in the 1989 election from the 1985 election, in the Liberal caucus that got the royal order of the boot, was the Member for Stephenville. That Member was the only veteran returned to this House of Assembly in the Government caucus that did not get his reward. He should, Mr. Speaker, be in the Cabinet of this Province. He deserves to be there. After the brilliant dissertation on the economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador the Member made here today, Mr. Speaker, he deserves to be in the Cabinet. But, Mr. Speaker, he did one thing wrong. The Member for Stephenville did one thing wrong in his, so far, five or six year political career, or whatever it was, he had the integrity, he had the audacity, he had the principle, he had the nerve, when the emperor was looking for a seat in the House of Assembly and asked for

Stephenville, asked the Member to resign so he could run in the by-election, he had the audacity to say no. That is exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador knows, and the Member for Stephenville is now paying the price.

MR. EFFORD:

There is a speech for a leader to be making.

MR. SIMMS:

It is a good speech. What would you know about speeches, anyway?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have to laugh at the Minister of Social Services. Our memories are not that short, I suppose, that we do not remember the days of the Minister of Social Services over here, the old night crawler himself. He has the nerve to talk about the quality of a speech, after we spent years listening to the dribble which came from that hon. Gentleman.

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Full marks, Mr. Speaker! There is no trouble to know that the Leader, the Premier is not here. The credit for the result of the election lies solely on the Minister of Social Services.

Well, I have heard tell of egos in my day. Maybe one of those days the Minister of Social Services will have the good sense to stand up in this House and tell us about the appointment of Beaton Tulk in his Department. The Premier says, qualifications. Qualifications my eyeball!

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

You should be happy. You should be happy. If not, you would still be over here and we would be over there. So you should be patting me on the back every day, I say to the Minister. I did you a great service.

Mr. Speaker, I was enchanted, interested in listening to the Member for Stephenville talk about the real need for Newfoundland to become an equal partner in Canada. I wonder how often we have heard politicians of all political stripes, and most Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, talk about the real need for Newfoundland and Labrador to become an equal partner in Confederation. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the hon. Member for Stephenville is going to say to his constituents and what the Government is going to say to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador when there is not a Canada in which to be an equal partner?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not be silly.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do not be silly, Mr. Speaker. Do not be silly. Go talk to your Liberal friends about being silly during the last Federal Election campaign, when they fear-mongered their way through 50-odd days of an election campaign in this Province. Go talk to them and ask them for some advice. I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more wound up in the economic future of Newfoundland and Labrador, there is nothing more part and parcel of the future economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador than the

question 'Is there going to be a Canada to be part of?' That is a fundamental question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. yuppies down in the corner, they can laugh today and they can laugh for the next forty-odd or fifty-odd days that are left between now and the 23rd of June. They can laugh and laugh away, Mr. Speaker, but when this country starts to come apart at the seams, as it will - alarmist you can call me if you like, I will gladly wear the label - but as this country starts to come apart at the seams, as it will, then let us listen to this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker, talk about the economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador, when they do not have the 60 per cent of their budget that is transferred in one form or another from the Government of Canada to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fifty-five.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Fifty-five, is it?

Let us see what the Minister of Finance will do in another year or two, Mr. Speaker, when they have to find funds to pool into a Newfoundland and Labrador Unemployment Insurance Program, \$600 million or \$700 million a year. Let us see them talk out of that side of their face, Mr. Speaker. When they have to find funds for medicare, when they have to find funds for old age pensions, when they have to find funds for family allowances, let us hear this crowd then talk about their economic development plans for Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And, Mr. Speaker, they can shout, they can moan and they can groan and they can do all they like, they can shout from every rooftop today and be as popular as they wish, but as sure as I am standing here, the magic date for the future of this country is June 23, 1990.

Whistle as you march past your graveyard to join the United States of America. Whistle at that. Mr. Speaker, this resolution today is vitally important, and the Government has said no. This resolution called for the Government to table their economic development plan for this Province. This Government, by voting against the resolution, is saying to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador today, heading into their second year in Office, 'We do not have one. We have not developed one.'

Mr. Speaker, The Evening Telegram, in an editorial last week, March 12, "Fine Words But No Plan." That is not the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. Fine words but no plan. "If the Liberal Government of Premier Clyde Wells has a plan to save the fishing industry, an absolutely superb job was done at concealing it in last Thursday's Throne Speech." That is the assessment, Mr. Speaker, an independent assessment. Heading into their second year in Office, the Government has proven once and for all, in the first week of a new Session, that they do not have a plan to bring before this House.

They hide behind the coattails of Dr. House, they hide behind their own Sprung project, Mr. Speaker, as it will be seen to be over the

next 3 or 4 years. They hide behind the coattails of Dr. House, they have not created one job yet, they say one thing to business people they get into luncheons around this Province - how do they get them in there, Mr. Speaker? Do you know what I was told the other day? I was told the other day that the people from the Economic Recovery Commission went to a certain town in this Province, not very far from St. John's, phoned seventeen, eighteen or twenty people before they left and wanted to know if they would come and have lunch with them, and gave each of them a cheque for \$35 each to cover the cost of lunch. Now that is economic development in Newfoundland and Labrador, a cheque for \$35 for coming to lunch with representatives of the Economic Recovery Team. When the people turned up, they were given a cheque for \$35 for coming to lunch with officials from the Economic Recovery Team. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the plan of this Government? Is that the real change the people of this Province expected, Mr. Speaker? Is that the only way they can get people in the business community to come so that they can pick their brains? What is the point of Mr. Braites Commission?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was flabbergasted when I was told that. And people said, 'It is true. I have the cheque. I can show it to you.' Imagine, Mr. Speaker, inviting people to come to lunch to pick their brains on how to develop Newfoundland and Labrador and then you insult them - you can pay for the lunch - by giving them a \$35 cheque. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is the extended

MR. SIMMS:

Who signed the cheque? Was it signed by Clyde personally?

adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m., which day will be Budget Day.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, it was signed personally by Dr. House, I suspect. He has all the signing authority he needs, I understand.

MR. SIMMS:

He runs the whole show, yes.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Who gave the taximan (inaudible)?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not know. They might have given him 250 bucks, if you had anything to do with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development -

MR. MATTHEWS:

He did not pay by credit card?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, he he did not pay by credit card.

The Minister of Development, Mr. Speaker, has had his department torn out from underneath him and given to an unelected commission which answers only to the Premier, yet is still unelected, and I believe the people of this Province have every reason to fear for the economic future of Newfoundland and Labrador. And that, Mr. Speaker, coupled with the uncertainty in this country at this moment, makes for a very, very uncertain future indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the resolution was defeated.

MR. SPEAKER:

This House at its rising is