



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 35

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

16 May 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before proceeding to Orders of the Day I would like to, on behalf of all hon. Members, extend a warm and cordial welcome to the public galleries today to fifty Grade 11 students from the Eugene Vaters Collegiate school here in St. John's. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Sid Stacey.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I would also like to rule on a point of privilege, the matter that was raised by the Member for Humber East yesterday, and in ruling on that point of privilege I would like to quote an appropriate section from Beauchesne, Page 12, Paragraph 27. I am sure hon. Members have heard it before but I am sure they would probably like to hear it again. "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House." I have done so accordingly, and have read very closely the remarks made by the hon. Member, and read the newspaper article to which she referred, and I must say that I find there is no prima facie case of privilege. The hon. Member took advantage of an opportunity to explain the circumstances which gave rise to the situation, to explain what happened with respect to the newspaper report and the events that took place here in the House, as an hon. Member will do from time to time. It is not a point of anything. I think we have referred to it rather

frivolously sometimes as a point of clarification. She was taking advantage of an opportunity to explain matters.

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Minister of Education. Does the Minister feel it is wrong for a school board to use a secret ballot in making a board decision which affects the public it represents? If the Minister believes that is wrong, will he direct the Bay of Islands - St. George's - Burgeo - Ramea Integrated School Board to hold a second vote, this time an open vote, on the future of S.D. Cook and St. Michael's Schools in Corner Brook?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I gather this issue in Corner Brook has been ongoing for some time. Four years, I have been told, they have had some discussions about school closing, and I gather there are some activities in the Corner Brook region this morning. I have been briefed on these. I do not know if the hon. Member is right. I must check with my associates to find out if it is improper for a board to have a secret ballot. I have to consult on that issue.

But I have been informed and apprised of the issue in Corner Brook. I have met with the representatives of parents over the last two or three weeks, I have listened to them, I have told

them what the legal situation is. The legal situation is that boards have the authority and the responsibility when it comes to constructing schools and closing schools, and that they have an obligation to follow the school closure procedures of the Department. I have been informed by officials in my Department that that board has gone through the appropriate procedures in this process. It is my hope this impasse which has been reached will be resolved in the best interest of all concerned in the next two or three days.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister must know, The Schools Act requires that school board meetings be open to the public as a general rule. Would the Minister not agree that it follows voting must be open? Is the Minister not responsible for seeing that school boards comply with provincial legislation? Is it not time for the Minister to stop mouthing platitudes and show some leadership, get into the fray, take risks? And, in this case, go to Corner Brook and meet with the concerned parents, as they have been asking him to do for weeks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I fully understand what the law says with respect to school boards. Many meetings are open, but it is my understanding that school boards have the authority to have closed meetings and to make decisions in accordance with their by-laws and their constitutions. I will check

their constitutions to see what they say in that regard.

As for getting involved, I must make it quite clear that there are dozens of schools being closed around this Province. I meet with parents to listen to them. I want to ensure that all the guidelines the Department of Education has with respect to process, all of these are followed. But as to getting involved in this kind of debate, it is a school board responsibility and it is my intention to abide by what the law says in this respect in this Province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am calling on the Minister of Education to see that school boards comply with provincial law. This Minister has talked repeatedly about being proactive in promoting interdenominational shared operation of schools. The time for action is now. Will the Minister become personally and directly involved with the parents in Corner Brook to promote to the Integrated and Roman Catholic School Boards their shared interdenominational primary/elementary schools in all neighbourhoods of Corner Brook as the solution to the education crisis there?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, this Government is going to promote interdenominational sharing in all parts of the Province. We are attempting to study that issue with great care, we are meeting with the churches, with the school

boards, with other organizations which are interested in this, and in due course, perhaps sooner than later, we will announce some policy initiatives in this regard to promote interdenominational sharing throughout the Province. We believe that you can retain the integrity of the denominational system and still promote greater sharing, as we have done in Bay de Verde, on Fogo Island, in Pasadena, in Labrador and in other areas already.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to do that as a policy. But as I indicated earlier, I am not going to exceed my - and the hon. Member must have the background. I don't want to get into the four-year controversy and her role and the role of others in this. The hon. Member, who was Minister of Education, must know what the law says in this regard. I am not a lawyer, but I know precisely what the law says and I am going to ensure that the law is followed in this regard. I am not going to get involved in the issue, that is the authority of the school board, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Sit on the fence. Sit on the fence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, a few months ago, with great fanfare, announced the Liberal version of job creation for the '90s and I think it was entitled: The Employment Generation Program. In view of the fact that the unemployment rate for April is up a full 1.4 per cent over the same month last year, and in view of the fact that the unemployment

rate for the last eight months, with the exception of March, has been up each month over the previous year, won't the Minister admit that this Employment Generation Program has been an absolute and total failure, and when is she going to bring in a program to stimulate employment opportunities for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms. Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I am being asked the same question my hon. critic asked the other day, and my response will be more or less the same. But, first of all, before I get to repeating that response, let me say that this Government had a very difficult task when they sat down to develop the Budget. And, as I have said before in this House, certainly it was no one's desire to see the Employment Generation Program come to an end. But we did have unwelcomed news from Ottawa. As much as all hon. Members on the other side hate to hear that, I mean, it is a fact of life and we have to deal with it. We had to look closely at our priorities, and that program was one of the ones we had to put a cap on. That is all there is to it. Everyone in Cabinet was sorry that that decision had to be made. And, as I have said before, I am sure if down the road monies can be found, it will be put into that program or in some other employment initiative.

The program was not a failure, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible at this stage, actually, to say whether or not the program was a failure. It was a very innovative program. It

has not been done anywhere else in the western world that we know of, and we will only be able to tell whether or not the program was a failure when we have gone through the sixty week period and see if people have remained in employment. Actually, we might get a bit of an idea this summer, when we see if the employer will pick up the 100 per cent as we hoped. If they do not, then we will know that the program was not a success. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, even if the program was not a success, and we have no way to know that, I think it was a very important initiative and showed our Government's commitment to the people of this Province in getting them into some sort of a long-term job commitment, and not just into this short-term business which has been an absolute plague to the people of this Province, and a plague on the economy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, for a Government that is running a Budget surplus, the Minister made a very startling statement in the House on May 1. Let me briefly remind her of what she said. She said 'There are no new monies in this Budget for the Employment Generation Program. There will be no new Job Creation Programs under that particular Budget heading this year.' This is what the Minister said for a Government that is running a surplus on current account.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in the period July to December 1989, 7,606 people moved out of Newfoundland and Labrador, a full 788 more than moved in, in view of that fact, what is this

Minister and this Government doing to stop the flood of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to the mainland, and to live up to the Premier's commitment to bring them home instead? What is she doing, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to clean up a mess that was left here by the former Government, and, believe me, it is quite a mopping up operation.

Mr. Simms: You are doing some job, no mistake!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: Sorry, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, 7,606 people leaving this Province between June and December of 1989 is a mess of this administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Now, mop that up, I say to the hon. Minister. Now, when is the Minister going to have the fortitude to go to her Cabinet colleagues and demand some money for this program, either that or do the honourable thing, scrap it and take it on the chin like any elected politician should, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, my

goodness! I do not know why anyone would get so upset about that. I have said this Government is committed to having people employed. We are doing everything we can. As I said the other day, we are putting money into long-term programs. There is the Minister of Development, just arrived, one of the key figures in this, a key figure in our long-term goals to getting most of the people in this Province employed.

I can say once more to the Leader of the Opposition, if it will make him feel any better, that he need not get so upset.

Mr. Rideout: (Inaudible) a lot to make me feel better.

Ms Cowan: We are monitoring, we are being careful, we are trying to spend money in a judicious way, balancing the needs of those who are currently unemployed while trying to build the economy so that their long-term needs for employment will be met at the same time. It is not an easy job, but it is one which we relish and look forward to seeing reach fruition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, Mr. Speaker, but before I ask it I would say to her that one of the reasons why we are getting upset - if she was one of the many thousands of people in the Province who were unemployed, she would be upset too.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Economic Recovery Commission has a mandate to create

employment, I would like to ask the Minister what the reaction of the Commission has been to such a small amount of money, \$2.9 million, being made available for job creation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: His question to me was, I understand, what the Economic Commission - how they reacted to me?

Mr. Doyle: What is the reaction of the Economic Recovery Commission (inaudible)?

Ms Cowan: The Economic Recovery Commission is connected with the Department of Development. They do not report to me. I know they are much in favor of employment generation programs. How they feel about this one in particular, I have no idea.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is absolutely unbelievable, that the Minister of Employment is reacting in this way. On Monday past, Mr. Speaker, Hansard records the Minister saying, and I quote: "My Department and the Government is always monitoring the employment figures. If we come to a stage where we see a need for some sort of employment creation program, then we will act upon that." Now, the unemployment figures have been released and, if the Minister does not know, we will tell her, they are just about 19 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member now is in, I think, the second or third supplementary and should know -

Mr. Simms: No, the first.

Mr. Doyle: First supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: First? Well, in any event, he is now making a speech and should avoid getting into a long preamble.

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just quoted what the Minister said, that if we come to that stage, she will create some kind of employment program. Now, the unemployment rate has been released, 19 per cent, almost. Has the Minister now come to the stage where she sees the need for some job creation, employment top-up, or some sort of employment creation program top-up?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: There will always be, Mr. Speaker, in this Province - not always, I should say there will be a need for this type of program.

Mr. Doyle: (Inaudible).

Ms Cowan: Yes, of course, I see a need for it. I am aware of the hardships and so on that people are suffering in this Province. But what the Opposition does not seem to understand, and there are none so deaf as those who do not want to hear, is the fact that we are trying to meet this in a sensible manner. I just stated a few moments ago that we have to do two things: one, we have to build

a strong, viable economy, which is a responsibility of all Ministers in the Cabinet and, at the same time, we have to provide short-term relief to those who are being affected at this time. It is a delicate balancing act. We do not have enough money to do it in the way we would like to do it, as you well know, because you sat over here and wrestled with the same kind of dilemma.

The time will come when, hopefully, we will not be able to have these kinds of debates in this House, but it is not going to be an easy time, or it won't come quickly. But, believe me, this Government is committed to employment programs, and when the money is there, we will put it into it.

Mr. Rideout: There is no money in the Budget. How can you stand there and mislead?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister we did wrestle with the problem, but we didn't reduce it from \$7 million to \$2.9 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

I remind hon. Members again, to my right, that we are not supposed to debate the answers. Hon. Members are doing that repeatedly, and not only debating, but then going into a preamble.. So I ask hon. Members to co-operate, please. They know that is not the rules of the House.

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister please indicate to the House of Assembly if the Economic Recovery Commission has approached the Department and the Minister and strongly recommended to the Minister that in view of the devastating unemployment rate we have in the Province now, just about 19 per cent, have they approached the Department or the Minister, or both, and requested that additional funding be placed in the Employment Generation Program immediately?

Mr. Simms: A good question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: I think this man thinks he is clever.

Some Hon. Members: He is!

Ms Cowan: No matter what I say now, he is going to jump on it. If I say they have not been there, he will say, 'Why haven't they been? It is their job.'

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: And if I say they were, well, then, he will make something out of that as well. I would tell the gentleman that my conversations with the Economic Recovery Commission are simply conversations between that group of individuals and myself, or the Premier, or the Minister of Development, if they should wish to know. They are not to be shared in this forum with you.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member for Fogo.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

I have recognized the hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Since this is National Tourist Week and the Province is attempting to promote tourism as an economic catalyst, and the present Employment Generation Program, to a large extent, does not address the problems of the tourist industry in Newfoundland, will the Minister immediately implement a program to create employment in the seasonal tourist industries in this Province?

Mr. Simms: Good question!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Furey: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

Mr. Furey: With the hon. Minister's indulgence, Mr. Speaker, tourism questions are usually directed -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: To the Tourism

Minister, I would have thought.

Mr. Furey: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that the hon. Member asks about tourism during National Tourism Week.

Mr. Tobin: I have never seen him so (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please!

I ask the hon. Minister to take his place.

When a question is directed, any Minister can stand and represent the Government. Even though an hon. Member might identify and specify a certain Minister, the obligation is not on that Minister. Any Minister can stand and answer for Government.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

Mr. Furey: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) that is all it is. No confidence.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Furey: Mr. Speaker, they do not like to hear good news. Since this Administration has come to power, tourism has grown by 8 per cent. Mr. Speaker, last year, because of the policies of this -

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) totally out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Speaker will analyse after Question Period if it is. But to my knowledge there is nothing out

of order, any Minister can stand and answer a question on behalf of Government.

Mr. Simms: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: What we are seeing here requires an intervention and a point of order to be raised, because clearly what is happening, the question was directed to the Minister of Employment about her job creation program. Now, is Your Honour saying that despite the fact the question was asked to that Minister, about her job creation program, the Minister of Fisheries can get up and talk about fisheries, or the Minister of Tourism can get up and talk about tourism? This is really going a bit too far, in my view, and it makes a whole folly of the Question Period itself.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I think Your Honour is absolutely right. If we check back through Beauséjour we will find that the Minister who answers the question is the Minister whose area that particular question falls under. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in the last few days, and I have been worried about this during Question Period, is that Members opposite do not seem to realize this fact. They have been asking for instance, the Minister of Finance, questions on all departments simply because the Minister of

Finance read the Budget. What they do is use this as a little trick to try to pretend a situation exists -

An Hon. Member: This is her program.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) job creation program.

Mr. Baker: It is your point of order and I am responding.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

A point of order was raised by the Opposition House Leader to which I listened. Now, the hon. the Government House Leader is speaking to the point of order, which he is entitled to do. The Chair is about ready to rule, but I would like the Government House Leader to finish on the point of order.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out that the Opposition is using this kind of tactic to try to pretend, for instance, in the last few days, that they could ask the Minister of Finance questions about any department, and then somehow pretend that he was incompetent because he could not answer questions about the Departments of Education, Fisheries, and all other Departments. Mr. Speaker, because they are trying to create a false impression, using these tactics in Question Period, I think it should be pointed out to them exactly under which conditions Ministers answer questions. Now, in this particular case, a question as to whether the tourism industry had need of some kind of special program applied to it is a

question that is quite properly answered by the Minister responsible for Tourism. I think it is quite obvious and I think the Opposition should be directed to pay more attention to Parliamentary rules.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Opposition House Leader makes a valid point in terms of when a question is asked to a particular Minister about that particular Ministry. Clearly I heard the Member refer to Tourism, and in that event the hon. the Minister of Development stood. Of course the Chair has no other choice but to recognize the Minister who stands, because the Minister might not stand at all in terms of answering the question. One would hope that every Minister would make an attempt to answer questions, but, again, it clearly states in Beauchesne that a Minister standing answers the questions for Government.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

Mr. Furey: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, last year the tourism industry experienced an 8 per cent growth. We think that is very positive. Mr. Speaker, that accounted for \$387.6 million out there into the economy. When the hon. Member asks what did that do with respect to jobs? Well, it created 14,000 full-time jobs in that sector of that industry right across the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he asks what programs are in place to enhance job development and to enhance the tourism industry? Well, when he asks that question, I guess a the real question that has to be asked is what did that hon. Member do in

his capacity as one Member in this Legislature to ensure that the Conservatives in Ottawa will sign a new tourism agreement for Newfoundland? What has he done to do that?

An Hon. Member: Nothing.

Mr. Furey: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House and tell hon. Members that this Government stands ready, has stood ready for the last ten months, to sign a new third-generation tourism subsidiary agreement with Ottawa immediately.

Mr. Speaker, what will this new money do? Well, what kinds of things will this new money do?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Furey: It will help us to enhance our visitors service centers, it will help us to upgrade our national and historic parks, it will help us to create employment for young people coming out of the universities and colleges, so that they can continue their education. That is what this Government is committed to do. We are committed to job creation in the tourism industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you talk to anybody -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Sit down! Sit down! Don't you know the (inaudible) of the House?

Mr. Simms: What a farce!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Hon. Members will know that when

they get into questions of policy, what the Government will do, that gives hon. Ministers the chance to carry on and speechify. And this is what the hon. Minister is now doing. We would ask hon. Members to please try and fine-tune their questions so it does not give Ministers that kind of opportunity.

With respect to long answers, that has come before. I have studied the answers in this House for a long time, and I can tell hon. Members that in this kind of question Ministers have gone on and on. But I do not want to permit that. I would like the Minister to finish up in less than fifty seconds, please.

Mr. Furey: Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, I say to you and I say to hon. Members, that this industry is on very solid ground. We had an 8 per cent growth last year. We, ourselves, Mr. Speaker, are projecting another 5 per cent increase in this industry this year. The Canadian Tourism -

An Hon. Member: This is total abuse.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Furey: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair gave the Minister the chance to clue up his question, and the Minister just took advantage to repeat what had already been said. I am going to go back to the Member for Fogo for his question.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Applications continued to be approved as of early as April for the Employment Generation Program, while many submitted much earlier have been labelled as pending. Can the Minister explain why this is so? And are the applications recently approved from the slippage fund, targeted for Liberal Districts?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: He asked three questions, and I am afraid I did not get them all. It is difficult when you hear three. I did hear the one about would the money be going to Liberal Districts. The money will be going to areas in the Province where there is a high rate of unemployment. That is simple and easy to say; not as easy to do because, unfortunately, some of the Members, and some of the Members interestingly, from that side of the House, who were so critical of me when I dropped their program a while back, I thought they would be rushing out to sell it in their Districts.

The Member for Port au Port, one of the strongest critics of the fact that we decided to not continue with the program, five applications from his District. Because I felt the man was sincere, I went right away and said, 'Let us see what is here from Port au Port.' Five!

Mr. Simms: How many did you get from Grand Falls?

Ms Cowan: I did not look at Grand Falls, because the Member for Grand Falls had been very gracious

and had not made a big fuss.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, my question, as well, is for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, although these days she should be known as the Minister of unemployment. Let me say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that because of the lack of action, or the inaction of this Government, and particularly the Minister of Development, who does not know where the Marystown Shipyard is, because this Government has done absolutely nothing for the Marystown Shipyard, that if it was not for the three vessels under repair for the Federal Government, there would be no work there.

Now we have hundreds of people who have left the Marystown area to move to the mainland, there are hundreds more who are unemployed at this present time, can the Minister tell me how many projects were applied for from the District of Burin - Placentia West, and how many have been approved?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Ms Cowan: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: I did not realize how much I got under their skin yesterday, but it really must have been bad.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) under anybody's skin, including the thousands unemployed.

Ms Cowan: The gentleman raises a point on how many applications came in from his particular District. I do not have that information in my head. I would certainly be glad to have a look and provide that to him at a later date. I certainly do not know how many applied from each of the fifty-two Districts. I just remembered the five from Port au Port, the highest unemployment in the whole Province. That is the one I remember.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees**

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: As required by Legislation I wish to table the Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency financial statements dated March 31, 1989, the Livestock Owners Compensation Board financial statements dated March 31, 1989, and the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation financial statements dated April 2, 1988

0 0 0

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to provide a little additional information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The Minister of Education is on Answers to Questions for which

Notice has been given?

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to add a little to my earlier question. I said I did not know, but since I answered the earlier question, I have additional information I could provide. Do I ask for leave for that? I would like to ask leave to provide that additional information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

This is Answers to Questions for which Notice has been given. If notice has not been given, then the Chair is under no authority to allow anybody to speak, unless the Minister gets leave of the House. So if the Minister has leave of the House - I don't even know if all the Members know which question the Minister is referring to.

Dr. Warren: On education, I said I would check something out for the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: To an earlier question in Question Period. Do you have information you could table?

Dr. Warren: I have a note here.

Mr. Simms: We would suggest the hon. Minister table it, and we can get on with the order of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister does not have leave.

Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Still, perhaps the Minister of Education could speak to the Member for Humber East, because this is Private Member's

Day.

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

I have recognized the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs for Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given. And I wonder if hon. Members on both sides of the House, please, would make sure that it is orderly enough for the Minister to proceed.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to table a list of additional projects that were approved and funded under the 1989/90 recreation capital grants -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Would the hon. Minister take his place, please. The Chair is not familiar with where this is coming. This is Answers to Questions for which Notice has been given. The Minister, it seems to me, should have stood up under C, Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

The Hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, my office checked with the Clerk's office, and under item E, we were asked to do it right here under this part of the agenda, rightly or wrongly.

Mr. Baker: If I could straighten it out, Mr. Speaker, for you.

I understand that this was the topic of a question some time ago, I do not have the date, and the Minister said that as soon as it was available, he would check into it, and would present it to the house. And in that context, he was doing it under Answers because it did come up in Question Period and was asked for in Question Period.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Well, Mr. Speaker, we see the kind of game now that the Government is playing. We saw a witness of it today in Question Period when they made a mockery of the entire Question Period, and tried to salvage the reputation, I suppose, of the Minister of Employment. Now we see the Minister of Recreation - because everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, under Answers to Questions, the Opposition does not have an opportunity to respond to it. He could have done it under Ministerial Statements or table it under Reports. And he would not do it under the proper heading, not Answers to Questions, but Ministerial Statements.

Mr. Walsh: (Inaudible) day.

Mr. Simms: I am sorry, the moose from Bell Island has something to say?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, under this particular heading, this Minister did not take notice of the question. He should do it in the proper fashion and not try to play games and pull the wool over the eyes of the people by doing it here, so that the Opposition cannot even respond to it. Do it under the proper heading - have the courage to do it under Ministerial Statements.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I point out to hon. Members when they are rising under this item they should refer to the question that was asked, when it was asked, and then proceed to give the answer. Because the Minister announced that he was announcing certain projects, and the Chair had no idea what this was, okay.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Private Member's Day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Private Member's Day - the hon. the Member for LaPoile.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this debate, this Private Member's Resolution, which was placed on the Order Paper earlier this week to introduce a resolution into the House. I would hope that with all the Province watching us today, and the people throughout the Province who are in the various Districts concerned within the resolution, on the south, southwest and west coast of the Province, that these people will all realize that we are all in this together as citizens of the Province, which

has been so hurt by the fisheries crisis.

Mr. Speaker, prior to reading the resolution back into the record, I want to call on all Members here today, of both political parties, and independent Members as well, to support this resolution. It is one that is not written in a partisan manner. It is a resolution which is certainly timely, with the difficulty that the fishermen and the plant workers on the south, southwest and west coast of the Province are currently experiencing, with the May 15 expiration of the fishermen's qualification period for benefits in the winter fishery.

Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to re-read the resolution into the record and it reads as follows:

WHEREAS the Inshore Fixed Gear Fishery on the South, Southwest and West Coast of the Province have experienced dismal catch failures over the the last several years; and

WHEREAS Inshore Fixed Gear Fishermen and Plantworkers in the areas in question find themselves in very difficult circumstances; and

WHEREAS these Fishermen and Plantworkers have called on the Federal Government to provide financial assistance to meet their immediate circumstances; and

WHEREAS the recently announced Federal Fisheries Program made no reference to the plight of these Fishermen and Plantworkers; and

WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has made repeated requests to the Federal

Government to address this serious problem;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House expresses its dissatisfaction over the failure of the Federal Government to respond to the needs of Inshore Fixed Gear Fishermen and affected Plantworkers in said referenced areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Honourable House calls upon the Federal Government to immediately implement a financial assistance package which adequately addresses the immediate economic difficulties of fixed gear fishermen and plant workers along the south, southwest, and west coasts of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first I would like to set the tenor for this debate. I want to get away from the partisan aspect of blame. This is not a matter that will allow anyone to assess blame for blame's sake. It is not a partisan matter, it is not a PC or a Liberal problem. In truth, I guess, by being Members of the House of Assembly, by participating in the democracy that we experience in Canada, the democracy of our provincial and national institutions, and our respect for international law, we are all a part of the problem. We all become a part of the problem, so therefore the correlation to that being that we are all to blame.

The people who are affected by this problem, Mr. Speaker, expect more than partisan politics, they expect more than the pettiness that we can sometimes bow down to in here. The pettiness that brings us down into the gutter at times and it does not have any

place in this kind of resolution.

Now, I think we have to look at the inshore problem not just as a problem within itself. The inshore fishery in this Province, and again the inshore fishery anywhere, is not something that can be looked at in isolation. It certainly is affected by the offshore, it is affected by international law of the sea, and it has a certain amount of a global perspective. The solution we are looking for here today has a local element, but we cannot put the offshore and other things out of mind, we have to take them all into account.

Now, I want to deal with certain, I suppose, immediate aspects of this. In the short term these people need help now—these people that I speak of. I hear stories regularly of cars being repossessed. I had a discussion with a finance company this morning who said that in my District alone, notwithstanding other Districts represented by other hon. Members here, there have been in excess of a dozen cars repossessed to date in the past couple of months, and it is mainly because of the fisheries crisis. As well banks have noted a very marked decrease in business activity in the area because of this crisis, and it is the kind of thing where - it was mentioned to me last evening and it was very upsetting to hear that children at times are even - because of their parents suffering financially - having to go to school at times without lunch for lunch time. The school, at times, provides the lunch at no cost to the students whose parents cannot afford it. And this is a desperate situation, Mr. Speaker. It is the kind of thing that the Minister of

Fisheries and the Federal Government should address and should have addressed when they first started dealing with the fisheries crisis, but it has been ignored. They have been ignored, they have only been given a token mention in the Atlantic Provinces Fisheries Adjustment Package.

Now, of course, the medium and long term is being addressed in other areas of the Province. We have the diversification packages that have been brought in for the various communities involved, and these have been put forth as medium to long term. The medium term, of course, is the planning for diversification, the planning for setting the people involved in the fishery up, so that they have an alternative source of employment and so that they will also be prepared when the fishery comes back. But we also must look at the long term, and the long term brings us to the overall management of the fishery as well as the long term economic affect of economic diversification on the Province.

Now, another thing I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is the interdependence, of course, of the inshore and offshore, as I referenced earlier, it was the topic of Brundtland in the United Nations report - I will just find the name of it here - the U.N. World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by the former Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Harlem Brundtland, commonly referred to as the Brundtland Report, and the interdependence is stated in that report in the following phrase; it says that 'the oceans are marked by a fundamental unity from which there is no escape.' And, likewise, the different parts of the fishery are

linked by a unity, the inshore to the offshore, the global environment question, global warming, the environmental pollution problems, are all linked together so it can't be looked at just by itself, in isolation.

Mr. Speaker, the representations that have been made by the Province to date are quite extensive. It is a matter that I have been bringing to the attention of the Minister of Fisheries, to the Premier and, in general, to our caucus, and also, at times, to the House in various speeches.

The Province has worked hard trying to get the Federal Government to address this problem, and they are continuing to work through correspondence and also through the various meetings that are taking place daily between the Federal Department of Fisheries and our own Department of Fisheries.

I understand, the Minister of Fisheries will be speaking in the debate today, so I will not deem to speak for him on that, but I also note that the Premier, in his correspondence to the Federal Government, has called the crisis in the inshore fishery on the south, southwest and west coasts a disaster. That was in his letter on April 3rd.

When I heard rumours there would be no response to the fishery on the south, southwest and west coasts in the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment package, I wrote Mr. Valcourt to ensure he understood the magnitude of the problem in the area and also that he would realize the people out there were in dire straits. I would like to quote from my letter, Mr.

Speaker. One thing I did note was that 'the people of the southwest coast are proud, hard working winter fishermen who have braved the icy waters for hundreds of years to earn a living.

These people now need help to recover from this crisis, which they did not cause. Help in the form of a substantial, yet fair portion of the Atlantic Provinces Fisheries Response program.' Mr. Speaker, that was not forthcoming, as we know. I do hope they will work on it. We will continue, as a Province, I understand, to have them react to it diligently. It is a problem of immense proportion now, and it certainly has to be addressed.

Part of the problem we are dealing with now, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the awareness of the other cod stocks in Newfoundland. The catch-phrase is northern cod. Now, northern cod, as we all know, is easy for the national media and or the media, in general, in the Province, to focus on. Today, I ask all hon. Members to join me to give an identity to the west coast of the Province that is so needed, and call it the Gulf cod from now on. Because, if you call it 4R, 4S and 3Pn, it just goes - you know, 2J+3KL has a punch to it, as well. But, if we start to call it the Gulf cod, we can create an awareness of it as something that is to be reckoned with. It is an economic force in the Province. It is very labour intensive, with the majority of inshore work in it, as opposed to offshore, which is less labour intensive as far as the effort goes, and it also is a sister stock of the Northern cod. Of course, the Province is divided into two areas of fisheries jurisdiction, which also means that Newfoundland has more

responsibility for the northern cod, the Gulf region is managed out of New Brunswick, which is another problem that is created in this.

I think we have to acknowledge the fact that the stock has been more seriously damaged than the Northern cod. There is a 25 per cent reduction in the total allowable catch in this year alone, where the northern cod was reduced by 25 per cent over a three-year period. And, today, I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to undertake some form of making sure that the media is aware that this is a problem of immediate proportions and not a problem that can wait for long-term diversification. It needs that, as well, but we need the immediate problem to be resolved through either an extension of unemployment insurance benefits, through the introduction of a program that will allow short-term make-work projects, but I say make-work in the good way, in that the people who are doing these things have input into what their communities need and to what their communities should have, so that it can be productive and valuable work with a good element of education for the people involved.

Mr. Speaker, I think we also have to come to grips with the size of the problem. I speak mainly for my own District, although it does affect others. I spoke to an official of the Department of Employment and Immigration last night, The CEIC in Port aux Basques, and as of yesterday there were 330 inshore fixed gear fishermen that no longer have enough stamps, during the qualification period which ended on 15 May, 330 that eventually, without any assistance, will be on

the case load of the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Those 330 gentlemen, plus the plant workers that are also affected, is an amazing amount, it just defies description as to the impact that will have on the Province. As well we have to look at the human tragedy, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of students who for the first time have their parents telling them, we do not have enough money for you to buy your new pair of sneakers. We do not have enough money to put a good meal on the table. Our car is gone and we cannot drive to Port aux Basques to the hospital. These are the things that I am hearing regularly and it hurts me as much as it hurts them. It hurts the social fabric of communities where these people have always been proud to stand and to be working whenever work was available, to work during the fishing season, and draw unemployment if necessary. They also, I might note, have to qualify twice. On the southwest coast they have to qualify for unemployment insurance twice yearly, in the winter and in the fall.

This is a case where the average fisherman throughout the Province would have a ten week qualification period, and on the southwest coast they have a twenty week, or currently, because of the fishery regulations, twenty-eight weeks of employable work weeks that are required for them to qualify for UI, so we have to attempt to bring this to light just to show the magnitude of the problem and to go from there.

Hopefully, all hon. Members will see this today and speak to it. There must be a balance, of

course, of the long-term enforcement of the plans that we have, that the Federal Government has for it, but the immediate need is short-term and it must be done now by the Government and not the people. The people should not pay, either financially nor should they pay in their dignity. Dignity should not be used as something to substitute for the lack of Government money.

Mr. Speaker, in the long-term I want to bring in the international aspect of it, if I have enough time. This report of the UN World Commission on Environment and Development, the former Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Harlem Brundtland, referred to as the Brundtland Commission, gave a brief overview of that and there are some things that are quite noteworthy in that report. They talk about the definition of an ocean, but not in the dictionary sense. The definition of an ocean in that report, 'The oceans provide the balance. They play a critical role in maintaining its life support systems, in moderating its climate, and in sustaining animals and plants, including minute oxygen producing vital plankton.' It also says, 'The oceans are marked by a fundamental unity from which there is no escape. Interconnected cycles of energy, climate, marine living resources, and human activities move through coastal waters, regional seas, and the closed oceans.' Mr. Speaker, based on that, even of itself it does not, like the inshore does not, even of itself, that does not say much. But when balanced off with the idea of the contiguity of the inshore/offshore and the way that one is interdependent upon the other, we see that the ocean has an interdependence on the

fish, the people who fish the sea, and the environment around it.

Now a couple of other quotes from that, Mr. Speaker, that are quite of note. In speaking about worldwide stocks, the report says that the worldwide stocks, which provide 95 per cent of the world's fish catches, are now threatened by overfishing. So what is happening to us here in North America today, in Atlantic Canada specifically, is we are not alone in this resource crisis. It is something that is very much a world problem.

Also, I might note that the catch of the long-range fleets in the northwest Atlantic has decreased significantly. In 1974, over 2 million tons were caught in the northwest Atlantic by the long-range fleets. In 1983, it was down to under 250,000 tons. Canada's share went from 50 per cent in 1974, which would have been a larger amount, to over 90 per cent of the current amount. Now that would give us some implication as to the fact that Canada does have a responsibility to bear on their fishing in the resource.

I would like to note also, Mr. Speaker, in cluing up here before the other speakers take over for the rest of the debate, that we do have a certain ally in this Report in that they state that the 200 mile limit should lead to better management because only one Government is in control. But they warn not to ignore the realities of shortsighted political and economic goals within national governments. Now, this certainly would refer to the Provincial Government's position of the need for a joint Federal/Provincial Fisheries

Management Board. Also, it would bring to light a reformed Senate.

The reason why I bring a reformed Senate into this, is that this matter being -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Ramsay: By leave, just for a minute, hon. Member's opposite?

The part endorsed by the Brundtland Report supporting the Senate reform idea - because if you look at the US they endorse this Federal/Provincial management thing as the Harris Panel did, but the Federal Government has decided that they already have enough input. To ensure that provincial views are heard and heeded, not just listened to by the Province telling Ottawa, but we have to be heeded as well, and that is through legislative power in the Federal system of Government.

I also might note that in the US, the US Senate has undertaken the power to block treaties signed by the executive of Government. So if our Senate was able to have that kind of thing, then we would have some unilateral ability to override the Law of the Seas aspects of treaties, that currently happens now in the States.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will sit to allow other Members opposite to go at it. I will clue up later.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank, you, Mr.

Speaker.

I would like to participate in this very important resolution that is being put forward by the Member for LaPoile concerning a very, very serious situation.

As he has outlined in his resolution on the south, southwest, and west coasts of the Province, there is no question there is a very, very serious problem in that area of the Province with the lack of fish, with the lack of landings and, consequently, with the lack of earnings.

I would just like to say to the hon. Member that, the 330 people he referred to who went on social assistance, as of yesterday: I would suggest to him they are not too tore up about a reformed Senate. They are not too worried about that today. They are worried about having to go to the Welfare Office to stay alive for the next number of weeks and months, that is what they are worried about. Reformed Senate now, I do not think whether the Senate is abolished or reformed, that is going to take care of the problems that you have out in your area of the Province, because the Federal Government has full jurisdiction over management of fish stocks off our shores. What we always argued, Mr. Speaker, is that the Province should have more say in the role of the responsibilities of the fishery, as we feel very strongly that if this Province did have more say in roles and responsibilities of the fishery, we would not have the very serious crisis in the fishery we are experiencing today. Because we see what someone else with total control has done to our most important resource, that is

why we should have some say over it. They have mismanaged it, there is no question, and no one can argue that. The goal and objective now must be to get that resource back to a healthy state to sustain a good fishery, and to provide a decent income for the people affected.

Now, while looking through the Member's resolution, we see it is solely a Federal Government request again. I would just like to say to this Member that he is a Member of a Provincial Government which has a responsibility to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians when there is a crisis of whatever sort. But an especially long-standing responsibility, recognized by every government since Confederation, has been the responsibility for the fishery, except this Government.

This Government, since day one, has consistently thrown all the blame on the Federal Government. And a lot of it has been justified. I have said that before and I will say it again. But there comes a time, when as a Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Government first responsible to and for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, should intercede and do something for the people so drastically affected by a very serious crisis in our fishery. Now this is what I say to this hon. Member. He is a Member of that Government, and he should have some influence over the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier, and other Cabinet Ministers, to get the Provincial Government involved so that those people do not have to go to the welfare office this morning.

Mr. Efford: My God! Don't be picking on my Department.

Mr. Matthews: I am not picking on your Department.

An Hon. Member: He is worried about your budget.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, worried about his budget. Moreso I am worried about the poor people who find it very, very difficult still to go to the welfare officer, people who worked all their lives and have made a decent living from the sea. The plantworkers particularly, and a lot of the fishermen along the south coast are only now having to adjust to seasonal employment, by the way. They were used to working twelve months of the year. It is not like other areas of the Province, and I do not say that in disrespect, but they were used to working twelve months of the year. They have had to adjust the other way, from twelve down to three or four, if they are lucky, months a year. That is unfortunate; and through no fault of their own, because they are still struggling and working hard to make a living from the sea. The biggest problem is there is no fish, which is no fault of their's.

Realizing, as well, how long it takes to deal with the Federal system, the bureaucracy -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: We know that - how long it takes, those people needed help yesterday. I would suggest to the hon. Member who brought in the resolution that the quickest way to find assistance for those people is through his Provincial Government. You are located here in the Province, you are a Member of that Government, you should have influence with the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier and

the Cabinet to get some solutions for those people who need it badly. Because if you are going to go on with negotiations with Ottawa, as you will find with anything, not only with the fishery, it takes an unusually long period of time before you actually get a solution or an answer.

So this is the Government, right here sitting in this Legislature today, which should look at this crisis immediately and do something about it. They cannot afford to wait. We see what is happening as of this morning; they have had to go to the welfare office, and that is not good enough. So I say to the Member, as sincere as he is about his resolution, I am really surprised he did not make some reference in this resolution to his own Government getting involved. Because he must recognize now, and the people who need the help recognize and I recognize, that if there is going to be an early solution or an early partial solution to this very serious problem, it is going to have to come from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We saw the Federal Minister come in a couple of Mondays ago and announce his fish aid package, which had a very glaring omission; it did not address this problem, and that is the reason why this Member brought this resolution forth today.

Mr. Gilbert: (Inaudible) didn't think.

Mr. Matthews: What is the old mumbler talking about? What was that? Who did not think about what?

Mr. Gilbert: You did not think that when it was brought in.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Matthews: At least I thought when it was brought in. The Member should sign his letters, mark his X where his name should go, and be content to listen and learn a bit about this. Because he knows as much about this as he knew about the plant being sold in Burgeo, which was nothing.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: Then he had the gall to talk to people up there and say, Now, who do you want to believe? You can believe me or you can believe Bill Matthews, of course thinking they were going to believe him. But you see who they believe today. They do not believe the Member.

That is what happened with the Burgeo situation. You have your choice of whom to believe, he said. Do you believe Mr. Matthews, who is casting rumours about the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador and about your plant, or will you believe me, your Member, who has been your friend for all these years? And, of course, quite naturally the people said Well, Mr. David S. Gilbert, I suppose I have to believe him. But when I got the calls back after the Minister of Fisheries confirmed the plant was for sale, Now, they said, we know who to believe, Mr. Matthews. And I have been all over Burgeo, and I have had to tell the people that Mr. Matthews was right and our Member did not know. And in future, they said, we do not think we are going to believe Mr. Gilbert anymore. Because how could he be a Minister of the Government of Newfoundland

and Labrador and not know our plant was being sold? And the Minister of Fisheries did not know. They found it really, really unusual that I would know and they did not, because they are the Government.' And one gentleman went as far as to say, Maybe you and Mr. Carter should change places. I said, Well, I would not take it that far. I would not go that far.

Mr. Carter: No trade.

Mr. Matthews: No. no trade.

So that tells the Member, representing that District, which, of course, is affected very seriously as well by this fishery crisis.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) waiver rights.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, waiver rights. Hold out for a longer contract.

But, seriously, this resolution and the problem affects the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation's area as well as it does the area of Member for Fortune - Hermitage, and all along the coast, and it is a very serious situation.

Of course there have been dismal catch failures in that area and no one can deny that. So, while I agree with the Member's resolution, And WHEREAS Inshore Fixed Gear Fishermen and Plantworkers find themselves in very difficult circumstances - that is indeed true - And WHEREAS these Fishermen and Plantworkers have called on the Federal Government to provide financial assistance to meet their immediate circumstances - and they have.

That is indeed correct, but before I go any further I want to say to the Member for LaPoile, just reflect back a few months ago, in the Fall, when we were pressuring the Government for money for the Fisheries Response Program, when we said you should be involved, that the program was inadequate. I just want to refresh the Member's memory on what the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations said at that time in answer to a question raised by my colleague, the Member for Fogo, when he asked what was going to happen to a hundred-and-something people in Fogo who did not have enough work weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, not only in this House but on the public media of this Province, told the people of Fogo they could go up and visit the welfare office.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: She said, We do have social assistance programs in place they can resort to. Now that was her answer for the people of Fogo. And it is obvious today, from what the Member for LaPoile said, that the 330 people, fishermen, he said, who will have to march up to the Social Services Office because their unemployment insurance benefits have run out, that the Provincial Government's response to the crisis in the fishery is for them to march up to the Welfare Office.

Mr. Efford: Don't call it Welfare Office.

Mr. Matthews: Social Assistance Office, I am sorry. I do not mean to lower the standards of the Department, or the stature of the Minister - Social Assistance.

Now, the thing about that is the only one who thinks any different about social assistance and welfare, you see, is the Minister. The people do not care, to them it means the same. Because as the Minister knows, out and about Newfoundland it is still the Welfare Officer and the Welfare Office. That is what they call it, the Welfare Office.

So it seems that the answer from this Government to the thousands of people around the Province is if the fishery is in such a bad shape and a state, your earnings are down, you do not make enough money to qualify for unemployment insurance, then the message coming from this Government is, go visit the Social Assistance Office. Because this Government has not put a cent toward addressing the issue and the problem. Not a cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer back to the Federal Fish Aid Package and the negotiations which were ongoing with the Federal/Provincial hoped for agreement that did not materialize for whatever reason. In correspondence between the Premier and the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Valcourt, it is very clearly outlined that the Province indicated to the Federal Minister that the Provincial Government was willing to put \$110 million into a joint Federal/Provincial Fish Aid Package.

Now, I say to the Member again, in all the discussion that was ongoing with the Feds about this Fish Aid Package, I do not believe the hon. Member's problem would have been looked at if the Federal/Provincial program had been announced, including the \$110 million from the Province. I do

not think that problem, the south, southwest, and all around, that problem would not have been addressed, even if we had seen a Federal/Provincial Package, with the Province's \$110 million involved in it, by the way.

An Hon. Member: Gulf got it.

Mr. Matthews: Gulf got what?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) you are talking about.

Mr. Matthews: Well, it does not matter what I call it I suppose. What difference does it make what I call it? I am talking about the problem. I did not call it northern cod, which you do not like either for other reasons, which I understand, because it has gotten a lot of attention at the expense or the cost of the other stocks. There are other stocks which seem to have been overlooked because of the emphasis on northern cod. So, what I am saying to the Member is, and I do not know if he is aware of this or not, but I want to make him aware because he brought in an important resolution, that if we had seen a joint announcement, this particular problem would not have been targeted in that announcement, you see. So that is a concern as well.

Now, what do we do about it? That is the question. What do we do about the very serious problem? Do we kick the Feds and kick the Feds and kick the Feds, and they get bluer and bruised and crippled?

An Hon. Member: Kick them out.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, and kick them out. Do all of that. Kick them until we kick them out. But it is not doing a thing for Mr. Ramsay's

inshore fishermen and plant workers, with all the kicking we are doing. So the best chance for a solution to help these people rests with this hon. Member's own Government.

An Hon. Member: What would you do?

Mr. Matthews: What would I do? I will tell you what I would do. If I were sincere about the \$110 million input into the Federal/Provincial Package, if I were sincere about that -

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: You have not put anything in.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, but you have not put in anything. I am talking about you now. You asked me what I would do. What I would do is I would take that \$110 million, if it was a legitimate offer, and I would try and address some of these problems as strategically as I could. Looking at that, that is not a lot of money either for this very serious problem. It is going to take a massive amount of money to address the problem, but at least you would have \$110 million to help some of these people.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) something else.

Mr. Matthews: Whatever. I mean, there are a number of things which can be done. I am sure the people in the Provincial Department of Fisheries know very well how they could utilize \$110 million to help some of the people who we all know personally are financially strapped. They did their utmost to fish, spent money on fuel and gear and other things, and have

not taken in enough money to pay for their expenses. And this morning, and tomorrow, and the next day, what will they have to do, which they do not want to do? There are some people who refuse to do it - they refuse to go to the Social Assistance Office. They have never done it before in their lives, and they find it degrading to do that.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is incumbent upon the Provincial Government now. I am not saying the Federal Government should not do any more. Yes, they should. They should do a lot more. They should do a lot more to address this issue and put a lot more money at this problem. But to get it started, while this talk and kicking and scratching and fighting with the Feds is going on, how about, Mr. Provincial Government, taking some of your \$110 million, or all of your \$110 million, and putting it into this very serious problem we are experiencing. Now, to me, that sounds rather reasonable.

Mr. R. Aylward: Very reasonable, yes.

Mr. Matthews: It is reasonable. And I am sure to the people out and about the Province it sounds more reasonable.

Mr. R. Aylward: The Minister of Fisheries would like to do it, I think.

Mr. Matthews: Because, you see, these people are not torn up about who helps them either. All they want is help. They do not care if it is the Provincial Government or the Federal Government or a combination of both, they want help and they want it very badly. And I am sure that is why the

Member brought in the resolution, but what throws me about his resolution is, he is only calling upon the Federal Government. And whereas the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has made repeated requests to the Federal Government to address this serious problem, and yes, they have. And they proposed some money of \$110 million to do it, so there is no question there is not much success, and the people cannot afford to wait any longer. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose an amendment really, to the Member's resolution, not to take away from the resolution but to tie-in with what I have said today, and seconded by the Member for Kilbride.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Why? What is the matter with that?

Mr. R. Aylward: Are you suggesting there are no fishermen in my District?

Mr. Matthews: Is there nothing else the Minister of Social Services can get picky about - who seconds the resolution or the amendment? You see, that tells me about how serious this Minister and this Government is about the Province. They are not serious about finding a solution, they are serious about continuing to kick the Feds, as much as they deserve to be kicked, but you are not going to find a solution by kicking the Feds.

An. hon. Member: Old anti-confederate himself.

Mr. Matthews: Never mind old anti-confederate, we can call each other names in this House, some that wouldn't be as complimentary

as anti-confederate, let me tell the Minister of Social Services, so he had better give that up. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following Amendment: That the following be added after the fifth paragraph of the preamble and reads as consequently,

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador had proposed a cost-shared program for economic diversification to the Government of Canada which would have committed an amount of \$110 million of Provincial funds to such a program."

AND that the words "Federal Government" be deleted in the sixth paragraph and the words "Federal and Provincial Governments" substituted therefore;

AND that the words "Federal Government" be deleted in the last paragraph and the words "Provincial and Federal Governments" substituted therefor.

Now that is the amendment that I am proposing, Mr. Speaker, and that is still calling upon the Federal Government to do what they should do, put their money into a very serious problem, perhaps more money than they have already announced for the other package. But as well the amendment recognizes one other factor, one very important consideration and that is, that the Provincial Government, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has a big responsibility to the fishermen and plant workers around this Province, particularly in areas where we have seen a devastating fishery, they have to get involved to find the solution for the people to get them through these financially hard times.

It is just not going to go away, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to go away. It is going to take awhile if we are going to see anything else negotiated or coming from the Federal Government for that to materialize, so the quickest fix to this, is for the Provincial Minister of Fisheries to go to his Cabinet colleagues and say, look we proposed an expenditure of \$110 million to address the fishery crisis, so please, colleagues, I have a suggestion for you, here's how we could address the problem as strategically as we can develop it, realizing that \$110 million is not enough, but it is a start to help some of those people who are hurting very badly. That is what the Minister of Fisheries should do and that is why I moved the Amendment the way that I have.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Matthews: We call upon the Provincial Government to get involved in addressing this very serious problem.

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the hon. Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, I rule the Amendment in order under Standing Orders 36.

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

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to be able to stand and support the motion put forward by my colleague for La Poile. It is a little sad when you see the Opposition take the approach that they normally have taken, and to put in an amendment to this motion which would help their buddies in Ottawa wiggle off the hook. To squirm and get off the hook and do the

things that they have been doing with this fishery problem, and it shows the mentality of an Opposition which would have the Provincial Government take the responsibility for an action that should be initiated by the Federal Government.

And I point out, that if there was a Saskatchewan wheat failure, there would be no problem at all with a \$1 billion program to go in to help the farmers, but because of the situation here in Newfoundland, we have to be in - they are saying that we, this Government, have to take over and let their Tory buddies off the hook in Ottawa. But I intend to carry out a little bit on that a bit later.

Then the Member for Grand Bank got up and the first thing he talked about was jurisdiction over the fisheries, and that is why they support Meech Lake - jurisdiction over the fisheries - and that is why they are going to support Meech Lake - because they came back and they are going to bring up and discuss the fishery each year.

Now the thing we asked for four years when we were in Opposition, the thing we pointed out was: if we had jurisdiction over the fishery, who is going to protect it? Who is going to protect the overfishing? The questions that we asked the previous Government and asked the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Fisheries; and asked the Premier; and wrote the Prime Minister; and talked about the serious concerns of the overfishing; and asking the Federal Government to get involved, because you see, this is a Federal responsibility, it is not a Provincial one. I will just

correct that little thing.

Now the Member for Grand Bank talked about the Burgeo plant. Now that was sort of interesting, because he talked about the Burgeo plant, and he said that he had all the news. He had all the news on it, and we were operating on rumor. Now, you see, the thing about it, this Government was responsible, we knew that there was a rumor there, we knew that there was possibly something to the rumor, but yet we could not come out and say, yes, we know all this. But the Member over there from Grand Bank with his little spies up in Mr. Crosbie's office and other places, they feed him this information and say - ask those questions, it will make you look smart.

What I say is so wrong about what the Member did is that it was done as a smoke screen for when the Federal Government, the next week, was going to announce that terrible program that they announced, and this was going to be the smoke screen. Let us see if we can spread more doom and gloom in the fisheries of Newfoundland. Let us see if we can spread more gloom and doom in the fisheries of Newfoundland right now, and take peoples' minds off this serious concern of the fisheries program that the Feds are going to introduce next week.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Let the man speak.

Mr. Gilbert: That is right, that is what I am telling you now, it will be a good idea, if you know it, why don't you announce it?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Why don't you announce it, because now the smoke screen that you had last week is gone. You had a smoke last week, there is nothing you can do anymore because the Feds have announced that terrible program.

The concern that my colleague from LaPoile put forward in this resolution today was raised five years ago, when we were in opposition. I intend to table in the House today, the Liberal Caucus Report on the inshore fishery. The information was gathered from August to October in 1985. When Members read it they will find what was said then is not so much different than what is being said now. There was a failure in the inshore fishery. The fishermen knew then there was a problem. We, as an Opposition, asked the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier, and the Leader of the Opposition was then the Minister of Fisheries, we asked them to take some action on this serious problem in the fishery. I will let you read it in the report. Nothing was done, Mr. Speaker, nothing was done. They had their buddies in Ottawa, the two Brians, big spike and little spike, as my colleague the Minister of Health says.

Nothing was done, the problem was recognized, there was a problem in the fishery, there was overfishing by the foreigners, and there was overfishing, maybe by our own people. There was the inshore failure that the people talked about. I commend this document to the Member for Grand Bank, to read it, seeing he is the fishery critic, I think -

Mr. Matthews: Pass it over.

Mr. Gilbert: I am going to table

it, I am going to table it, then everybody will get a chance to read it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: The support that we got from the Government then, when they had been talking to their big brothers in Ottawa was epitomized, I suppose, during the short-term reign that the Leader of the Opposition had in the twenty-eight days that he was Premier and when the famous amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act was announced back in the end of March 1989. I intend to table this too, Mr. Speaker. This is April 5, 1989, Executive Council: 'Today Premier Tom Rideout reacted publicly to the Federal Government's intention to propose amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Program as announced in yesterday's Speech from the Throne to open Parliament. The Premier is responding to earlier reaction by the Federal Opposition. The Premier states that he feels these comments are alarmist. The Premier said he is encouraged that the Federal Government is intent on approving the effectiveness and fairness of the program while recognizing the importance of unemployment insurance in the region. I would not expect to see any changes to the current system that would erode the earnings of unemployed workers while our employment rate greatly exceeds national average.'

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what happened to the unemployment program that was introduced and the changes that were introduced by the Federal Government back in April. I heard one of the Members a few nights ago get up and blame the Liberal dominated senate for it, but the problem is right here,

and his Government supported it. One of the last actions of a dying, crying Government, was that they supported this program. Premier Rideout went on to express optimism in it. I am going to table that. That is another document that I think should go out there.

We talk about the Fisheries Response Program for this year, and what happened, and you see what happened when he was Premier, when the Leader of the Opposition was the Premier, immediately the Federal Government announced a program, yes, we support you, big Brian we are all with you.

When the Fisheries Response Program was announced; Tom Rideout: 'First of all Art let me say, I like the focus of the program. The package is directed to addressing the problem in the fishery and more specifically it directs towards addressing the problem in communities where the plants are slated for closure. I think the focus is in the right direction. That is what I like about it.' Tom Rideout; 'I do not think that is necessary now, it is for the Province to start putting its money in. Is there any criticism? No, there is no criticism. It is a great program.' He says it is a fairly significant package to address the serious crisis that we have. It does not say much about the inshore fishery. This is what my colleague for LaPoile is talking about, the inshore fishermen along the south coast of Newfoundland.

An Hon. Member: Can I ask a question?

Mr. Gilbert: You will have your chance. The next thing that happened was another interview

with Mr. Rideout and he said: 'The focus is exactly what I would suggest. I think the focus has to be on the fishery and the focus has to be on the communities where the plants are slated for closure. In that respect I think the package carefully focused in the right direction.' That is fine but the only thing about it is that all the communities that received this great focus that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about, are not at all happy with it. They do not like it. They think it is useless and they have been quoted as saying this - then the announcer says; 'So a pat on the back goes to your federal counterparts.' 'Absolutely, I am sure there will be areas of the package over the next several days where we will be analyzing it where further observations will be made.' What a profound statement. We will table that, too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Grand Bank, Bill Matthews is pleased with Ottawa's aid package, he says it is the Province's opportunity for new development, both inside and outside the fisheries. What about the inshore fishermen? I would not like for him to say that on a wharf down on the south coast somewhere. Jack Cumben, a fishermen from Grand Bank, is disappointed with the announcement on the fishery. Cumben is not impressed with the \$6 million for Grand Bank. This is the sort of thing that is going on. This shows the slavish way the Members of the Opposition respond to anything that comes from Ottawa. If it is from Ottawa, it is right. This is what you see. We have the Member for Grand Bank getting up and saying he supports the program, and yet the fishermen right from his

community do not want it, it is no good for there community.

Now, the next thing: 'Tom Rideout thinks the aid package is properly focused.' Another quote, as we go through: 'Rex Matthews says that the announcement is not good enough for the town of Grand Bank.' Is Rex related to you, by any chance? Here you have one Matthews saying it is a great program and then Rex Matthews of Grand Bank is saying it is no good.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Then, we have the Coalition for Fisheries Survival not satisfied with the fish aid package and saying the Federal Government is incompetent when it comes to dealing with the fishery; that is Pat Cabot, a fisherman.

Again, it shows that the only people I know in Newfoundland who are interested in the Fishery Response Program and are supporting it, is the Opposition, the slavish, mulish people who look towards Ottawa and say, 'Yes, oh, Master, we will do what you say.'

Dr. Kitchen: What party is that, in Ottawa?

Mr. Gilbert: That is the Tory Party in Ottawa.

Dr. Kitchen: What party is that over there?

Mr. Gilbert: Now, we have another person who has some connections to that party, he is not in Government, he is now outside. Cabot Martin is not happy with the fish aid package, because there is nothing for the inshore sector, and yet we have the Opposition over there, making statements

supporting the program. And you know, when you get this sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, you have some serious doubts about what that program really is going to do for Newfoundland.

The serious concerns my colleague from LaPoile is raising is about the fishery along the south coast, the south coast inshore fishery. I have a few interesting statistics here that I think we should look at.

I just happened to zero in, Mr. Speaker, on the District I represent, the great and historic District of Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir.

What we have here is the fish landings from January to March in 1989, and again in 1990. In Burgeo from January to March, 1989, there were 497,000 pounds of fish landed. In 1990 there were 296,000 pounds of fish. Do you see the difference there, Mr. Speaker? And yet the Opposition are supporting a program that is announced by the Federal Government to supposedly respond to a serious crisis in the fishery, yet the fishermen along the south coast are starving to death. They support it - and the landings are down in Burgeo by over 200,000 pounds.

Now we go to Ramea. This, Mr. Speaker, is another most interesting statistic, and yet we have Members opposite supporting the Federal program. Their Tory buddies in Ottawa put out a program and little spike said to big spike, 'We agree with you, we will take anything you give us.' And what happened then in Ramea? The fish landings from January to March, 1989, were 629,000 pounds, this year, 211,000 pounds, Mr. Speaker, and yet, we have the

gentlemen across the floor supporting their Tory friends in Ottawa and saying it is a great programme. 'The inshore fishery is a shambles but it is a great program. By god, we will support you because we wear the same sweaters.' They are not thinking much about the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, when they do that.

Francois: one of the most prosperous fishing communities on the coast of Newfoundland. From January to March, 1989, they had 364,000 pounds of fish; from January to March, 1990, Mr. Speaker, 64,000 pounds of fish. The fish landing in that community is down 300,000 pounds, yet, hon. Members opposite are supporting that wonderful program put forward by their friends in Ottawa, while people are starving. I would like for you to go on the wharf in Francois and say you support it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have McCallum, another famous fishing community on the south coast of Newfoundland: January to March, 1989, 311,000 pounds of fish landed; January to March, 1990, 175,000 pounds of fish.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the program that they are supporting, a program that was brought in by the Federal Government and brought in to respond to a Fisheries Response Program in Newfoundland, a crisis in the fisheries in Newfoundland. And we see the people along the south coast, just in my District, and I am sure those statistics can be borne out for the whole coast, Mr. Speaker. Then you have people over there, Mr. Speaker, stand up and say they are supporting their

friends in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gilbert: Now, Mr. Speaker, just before I go on - I am going to table all of this, so everybody can have a look at it.

You can see the landings. I am going to table a few graphs which will show exactly - because some of the Members might not be able to read, so for the benefit of the people who are not going to read, I am going to have graphs of the actual groundfish landing in the 3PS area of the Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) car salesman, he cannot be anything else.

Mr. Gilbert: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been conversant and aware of the problem in the south coast fishery, as I say for the last five years. We started off with a program - we had our caucus go out and talk to the fishermen in 1985. The people who were involved in it, the people who were most affected by this knew there was a serious problem in 1985. It was highlighted and we gave it to the fellows who were in Government then, those people who are over there now supporting this Federal program and they are saying, it was a great program we just got, and they are saying now - do something about it. There is a serious problem. They are admitting there is a serious problem. They admit there is a serious problem. They accept the program that the Federal Government put forward that does absolutely nothing for the fishermen, the people who are most affected, the inshore fishermen.

An Hon. Member: How is that a

Provincial program now?

Mr. Gilbert: Well, Mr. Speaker, this thing has gone on now for years. But this year again we recognized very early in the year that there was a serious problem in the south coast fishery. We went and had meetings and I am going to table the correspondence, some more correspondence to the Federal Minister concerning this. It is from me and I say I am writing on behalf of my constituents who live in the south coast fishing communities of Burgeo, Ramea, Grey River, Francois, and McCallum. The people of these communities have fished as their forefathers have all their lives. And I might add it is the only way of life for these people.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: I know you would not understand. You have no concern for those people, see, because you are supporting a program that is going to force them to starve to death. For example, in Burgeo alone the inshore fishery for January was down 246,000 pounds. So the decline in landing creates a drastic situation. Unemployment benefits are not available for winter fishermen as the qualifying period ended on November 15, and will not reopen until April 15. The people have no opportunity for alternate employment, fishing is their only industry.

An Hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Gilbert: So I will ask you to consider the type of fishery failure, make compensation to those people, and support to their families in the short term.

Mr. Matthews: Who wrote that?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, let me tell you I wrote it because I have concern for the people of the south coast, the people in my District and the people all along the south coast. But I would not expect the Member to understand any concern or have any concern, because that is the Member for smoke and mirrors. He gets up and tries to add to their misery by saying something else is going to happen to him because my buddies are going to introduce a terrible program.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gilbert: Now last week I took the occasion to write the Minister again when this program came out. You know, I am doing it as the Member for the District representing the people who are most affected, my constituents. 'The inshore fishery has rapidly declined over the last few years to its present state of disaster. That is why the proud and hard working people waited for your recent announcement of support and direction to the east coast fishery crisis. Yet they waited in vain. Their problems have been ignored. Those communities over the years have not looked to Government for handouts. They are self-sufficient and the backbone of our country. They do not work for a couple of months, they work year round. They want nothing more to do than to be self-sufficient. They do not have the opportunity to drive to larger centers for retraining or alternate employment; distance and isolation remove those options. I would ask that you visit those communities with me. Do you know what I did? I asked the Minister to come down and visit those communities with me and see firsthand the suffering he has

inflicted on the people, the inshore fisheries in Newfoundland, and the people who have been involved in that for centuries. The Member for Grand Bank stood and made the statement, the smoke and mirrors one, about the -

Mr. Matthews: I am reading your (inaudible) to the Federal Government (inaudible).

Mr. Gilbert: He tries again, the smoke and mirrors Member for Grand Bank. He wants to create the illusion there is more misery going to be inflicted on the people so that his colleagues, his Tory buddies in Ottawa, can introduce a program that is going to gut and drive the people who live Francois, McCallum, Grey River, Burgeo and Ramea. They are driving them to Toronto, because your Government's program in Ottawa, these people you bow and worship, you slavishly worship -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Some Hon. Members: No leave!

Mr. Gilbert: Oh. Too bad!

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to compliment the Member for LaPoile. Because I know, after seeing the Member for LaPoile in the House for the last number of months, that he has in his heart sadness for the people of his District, and, indeed, for the people of the southwest and west coasts. There is no doubt in my

mind, none whatsoever, that that young man has his heart in the right place as it pertains to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. It is too bad he did not mention in his resolution that it is a two-way street - it is a two-way street, a Province and a Federal Government. As I listened to the dialogue that went on here today, the debate, I was amazed. When you speak of the areas, the south and southwest coast, the west coast and other areas in Newfoundland, those are areas of concern, and I agree with you that something has to be done to rectify a very, very sad situation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, on my way home, I was listening to the Fishermen's Broadcast and I heard a gentleman from Hermitage being interviewed, and his wife was also interviewed. And the sad thing about it was that because of the fishery - no fish - he said he was making a few dollars on lobsters, but that would not even buy groceries. He said the fishery was disheartening, and to add to all the rest of the misery, his unemployment insurance would run out this weekend.

An Hon. Member: Right on! And thousands like him.

Mr. Parsons: Yes, and thousands like him. And that is a sad situation. His wife was then interviewed and she said that her employment was due to run out as well, and because of the plant not being open, there was no way she could foresee her -

Mr. Hodder: Where was this?

Mr. Parsons: Hermitage. - getting enough stamps to qualify for UI this year. Now those people have nothing else to look

forward to but UIC.

An Hon. Member: Social Services.

Mr. Parsons: Now, those people are not Social Services orientated. They are not. They are people like most Newfoundlanders, who want to work and make a living at what they know best. And in many outlying areas of Newfoundland, rural areas, it is the fishery. They are hardworking people.

But, you know, the other thing that lady said was while the man of the House was making a few dollars fishing and she was drawing UI, they had two boys who were attending University in St. John's. You know, it was really sad. I could not help but think about it last night. She said they gave what money they could to give them the necessities so they could attend University, but, she said, they now had to take part-time jobs to make enough money to survive. The other thing the lady said was, I do not know if they can do it, work and attend university. Well, I am not saying they are average students, but if they are average students and they are working part-time, part-time work is not easy to get around St. John's now, you cannot pick your hours.

Mr. Simms: Not for 10,000 students.

Mr. Parsons: Especially not for 10,000 students. I am talking about when they are attending university. Again, if you are not an honours student, you certainly do have to spend some hours at your books during the night.

Mr. Simms: What is this Government doing to help that

situation?

An Hon. Member: There is nothing wrong with working your way through school.

Mr. Parsons: That is right. We agree.

Mr. Efford: (inaudible) telling people they should not go to work.

Mr. Simms: He is telling you they could not get work.

Mr. Parsons: I am not saying that. They could not get work. There is no work. How much work did the Minister of Social Services supply this year?

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Where?

Mr. Efford: In the city.

Mr. Simms: So you want these two kids from Hermitage to go drive taxis? Now that is as good as the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations telling them to go on welfare.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that all we hear from all hon. Members on the other side is that this is a Federal problem. Blame the Feds for all of this. Mr. Speaker, does that Government not have an obligation to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians? I heard the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, or the no-work Minister, say a few minutes ago that there are people out there who are going to starve to death. That is what a Government is in place for, to make sure this situation does not arise. And if

it arises because of conditions beyond their control, then they have to bring in a program to look after that situation. You cannot always say blame it on the Feds.

There is no doubt about his second whereas, 'Fixed Gear Fishermen and Plantworkers in the areas in question find themselves in very difficult circumstances.' There is not one person in this hon. House who does not agree with that, with the exception of a couple of people over there. I do not know what the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is doing to offset this situation. We had the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation - well, what a speech! What a speech! He read letters; he said what the Leader of the Opposition said. He mentioned the focus of the federal program, the aid program brought down for Newfoundland and Labrador. He talked about the focus. What was wrong with the focus? Certainly there was more money needed for the inshore, and the inshore question was not addressed, I do not believe, to anyone's satisfaction. There was more money needed, but it certainly was focused right; it was focused to communities in need, not to Marble Mountain. I get a charge out of it. He gets up and ridicules the Federal Government. Do you know why the Federal Government acted on their own? Because the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier had no plan, and they had to work on their own. They want to take people out of the fishery, and the Federal Government just could not do it. Look at what the suggestions imply, Mr. Speaker. The diversification they talk about, taking them out of the fishery and diversifying, part of the presentation made to the

Federal Government recommended that \$50 million be spent on Marble Mountain - \$50 million to be spent on Marble Mountain -

Mr. Matthews: Fishery and White Hills.

Mr. Parsons: - from a Fishery Aid Program. The White Hills, I believe, is \$25 million, from a Fishery Aid Program to diversify. Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me we can take the people from Trepassey, from Grand Bank, from LaPoile area, from out in that District, and send them over skiing, or send them over working on a ski resort. Mr. Speaker, how much work can there be on a ski resort?

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government received those recommendations, they would want to be a bunch of fools to say let us give that Government X number of dollars to throw away on something which has no association

Mr. Matthews: A billion dollars they wanted.

Mr. Parsons: A billion dollars to throw away for Dr. House's gratification, so Dr. House could come along and say, Look, I am the knight in shining armour. I am the one. Look, what money I spent. There would never be a thank you.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Oh, is he ever mad!

Mr. Matthews: What do you think the salt beef plant can do for Eastport?

Mr. Parsons: Ah, ha! Imagine! People do not understand what the

recommendations implied. A salt beef plant. Where is the salt beef plant?

Mr. Matthews: In Eastport.

Mr. Parsons: In Eastport. A salt beef plant in Eastport. We had one on Prescott Street, Mr. Speaker, and that went bankrupt.

An Hon. Member: A what?

Mr. Parsons: A salt beef plant.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That was your proposal, boy.

Mr. Parsons: That was your proposal. That is what the Federal Government received from this Government. And then, going back to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, he was mad. He got up today he was fiery mad because the hon. Member for Grand Bank -

Mr. Matthews: He did not know about his District.

Mr. Parsons: He did not know about the plant in his District going to close. He did not know a thing about it. The hon. the Member for Grand Bank asked the hon. the Minister of Fisheries one day, Do you know the plant is closing in Burgeo? No, he knew nothing of it. He asked him if he know there were negotiations ongoing for the plant to close in Burgeo. The Minister of Fisheries said he knew nothing of it, and the Premier looked over at the Minister of Fisheries and shook his head. The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, I mean, he did not know the fishery was in a crisis situation. That is how little he knew about it. I

would like to ask him a few questions about what he knows about the fishery. Did you ever haul a haul-up? Do you know what it is? Do you know the foot rope from the head rope of a trap? What do you know about it? Do you know anything about it?

You will get up and read a whole bunch of letters - it should not be allowed - a whole bunch of garbage, and you do not know one single thing about what you are talking about. If you had any presence of mind or intestinal fortitude, enough to represent your people well, you would have known that Burgeo was going to close, not let the hon. the Member for Grand Bank tell you. And why did he tell it? Because he did not want the people to be hoodwinked. He wanted the people down in Burgeo to have a chance -

Mr. Matthews: To know the truth.

Mr. Parsons: - to know the truth. And the truth is precious, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Like when he told him about the hydro centre in Bay d'Espoir.

Mr. Parsons: Yes. Go back to the hydro centre. He never tried fishing. When I heard that hon. gentleman today get up and talk about - all he did was place emphasis on the hon. the Member for Grand Bank; all he said was, what a mistake he made when he told the truth.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, that is right. Because they are not used to dealing in it, see.

Mr. Parsons: The Minister of Fisheries recognizes what I am saying is a fact.

An Hon. Member: What hypocrisy!

Mr. Parsons: Told the truth to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that is what this hon. Member did, that is what he is charged with but will never be convicted of by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, in particular the people of Burgeo.

The hon. the Minister of Development is coming in now. His area is hard hit, and I thought the Minister of Development would have developed some sort of a plan, he would say to the Cabinet, Look, we have to pump that \$110 million in, it is our responsibility. The Federal Government has come up with money, now we are going to put our \$110 million in. Because his area, his constituency is affected just as well as other parts of the southwest coast and the West Coast.

Mr. Matthews: The old squawker over there is asking, Where would they get the money?

Mr. Parsons: Where would they get the money? Sure you said you had a \$110 million to spend. That is the Minister of Finance. Ah, let's face it, the Minister doesn't know where he is going to get the \$15 million, he doesn't know where he is going to get the \$25 million from the payroll tax this year and next year, so how can he come up now and say he knows what the Premier was talking about when he offered \$110 million to the fishermen and plant workers in Newfoundland and Labrador?

An Hon. Member: All he knows about is Kentucky Fried garbage.

Mr. Matthews: Yes. St. Hubert. St. Hubert.

Mr. Parsons: Yes, we will leave it to the St. Hubert bit. I have to be nice to him.

Mr. Speaker, when the amendment was brought in by my hon. colleague, all the amendment said was to place some emphasis on the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I am sure that each and every Member in this hon. House will certainly vote for that amendment. There is no doubt in my mind. Because, Mr. Speaker, before 1949, we were a colony. Our fishery survived as a colony. We had no Federal Government to look up to, we had no one; we did it on our own and there were trying times, very, very, very trying times in the '30's, and, Mr. Speaker, the colony survived. Now, every time the hon. Members get up, it's blame it on Ottawa -- Ottawa has done this, Ottawa has done that.

An Hon. Member: Blame it on the Tories.

Mr. Parsons: No, we will never blame it on the Tories. Because I will say the Federal Governments of the past decade were responsible, to a great extent, for the demise of the fishery. There is no doubt at all about that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: Hold it now. Just a moment now. Let me tell you where it started. It started in 1972, when they signed that infamous treaty with the French which gave them the right to rape 3PS, and, also, when their fishing was over on 3PS, they had the right to fish in 2J+3KL, and they have that right today. That is what the Liberal Government in Ottawa did.

In 1977, I think it was, Trudeau brought in the 200 mile limit because of expedience. He wanted some big deal with which to come to the people and here it was, the 200 mile limit, instead of saying to the powers that be at that time - he had all the European communities on his side - Look, our situation is different from Iceland, it is different from the Seaboard of the United States, it is different from any other parts of the world. Our Continental Shelf runs out in a nose and a tail. We could have gained the day. We could have won the day. But because of expedience, because he didn't want to ruffle any feathers, he said, Okay, a 200 mile limit. We have today overfishing by the foreigners on the nose and tail of the Grand Bank, and that was caused by your Liberal buddies then in Ottawa. Now let me say what happened to the stocks in the last few years. We were told that in 1986 the TAC should be at 400,000 tons.

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Parsons: Who said it? Your friend, Dr. Kirby. Dr. Kirby in the Kirby report, that is who said it; your Liberal Senator. The same Liberal Senator who is now playing a part in holding up the legislation you all condemn on UI. That's the same Senator, and Allan MacEachen. That is who is holding up the UI, when they talk about the UIC payments.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Parsons: That's who is holding it up, it is the Senate.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: By leave?

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I have many regrets, I suppose, but I have one regret today and it is this: Given the nature of the problem, and given the fact that the hon. Member who just spoke is willing to tell it as it is and to attribute blame where it justly belongs, I regret today that all Members in this House can't speak with one voice, and that we have Members opposite who appear to be more interested in protecting their political soul mates than they are in doing what is right for the Province. The problem we are addressing here today, and have been addressing in this House now for some weeks and months, is a problem that was caused in its entirety by the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: It does not matter what political stripe. I would make the same statement, Mr. Speaker, were there a Liberal Government today in Ottawa. I attended a meeting in the Federal Capital last week, last Friday, and in my few remarks I made that point, that the problems we are experiencing today in this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, and, of course, maybe to a lesser extent in the Atlantic area, are the sole responsibility of the Federal Government because of bad management on their part, bad management of the fishery. There was not one Minister around that table, there was not one

Federal official, nor, indeed, the Federal Minister himself could not argue on that point, because everybody, I think, agreed that the problem is, in fact, the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, if were to follow the advice given by Members opposite, and I think the hon. Member for Grand Bank in his few remarks made reference to the situation and suggested that the Province just cannot afford the luxury of sitting back and waiting for the Federal Government to accept its responsibility and come forward with some kind of an adequate response program - he is saying we just cannot afford the luxury of sitting back and waiting - the Province should wade in there and pick up the tab for what it is going to cost to correct what is obviously a federal problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, if one were to follow that through to its final conclusion, I suppose Ottawa would only have to drag its heels on any federal program, wait until the Province gets desperate and then, of course, the Province, to follow the hon. gentleman's logic, would then have to rush in and pick up the tab for what it is going cost to correct that problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have written the Federal Minister many times on this issue. In fact, I have had two or three meetings with him. The Premier has written the Prime Minister, and on each occasion we have pointed out the seriousness of the problem, the suffering that is being inflicted on innocent people, people who are not responsible for the problem, and we have asked that the Federal Government accept its responsibility and do its duty to these people. I must confess that

to date we have no indication at all that they are going to come to the rescue. In fact, I understand there was a question asked yesterday in the House of Commons by the Liberal fisheries critic of the Minister for Industry and Trade, Mr. Crosbie. The hon. Member from New Brunswick, the fisheries critic, put the question to him, given the seriousness of the problem and the suffering being inflicted on people, when can we expect some solution from Ottawa? The hon. Mr. Crosbie, I think, replied that the matter was being monitored and that maybe at the end of the season some kind of help would be forthcoming. Of course what the hon. gentleman obviously does not know is that the fishing season on the south and southwest coasts of the Province comes to an end around March 31, so the fishing season is long past, the end of it. Maybe he is referring to the northeast coast, in which case I do not think the people of that area can hold out that long, because I have some statistics here on landings and I am told that normally the that normally the winter fishery in that area would be relatively stable with landings in excess of about 14 million pounds from the January to April period. That would be a normal set of circumstances, 14 million pounds. In 1989 the catch in that area was 1.1 million pounds. And I am told that in 1990, this year, the catch in that same area where, as I said a moment ago, a few years back the normal landings would be 14 million pounds, the landings in 1990 will be less than 1 million pounds. In fact considerably less.

Mr. Speaker, the situation, I suppose, can be summed up in very simple terms. The very survival of that part of our Province and

the survival of anywhere from 800 to 1000 fishermen living in twenty-five communities stretched along that coast, their survival depends on what happens over the next few weeks -- on what action the Federal Government is prepared to take again to live up to their responsibility to those people.

It is all very well for the hon. gentleman opposite to maybe run interference for their friends. It is all very well for them to talk about the Province coming up with an aid program. Mr. Speaker, the Province, as the hon. the Member for Grand Bank must agree, came up with an assistance program which will cost \$14 million, to supplement the layoff period of fishermen in his District and in the town of Gaultois, and the City of St. John's. You know that is \$14 million, and we do not begrudge doing it, Mr. Speaker. I think the Premier has made that point and made it well. And whether we have spent any money yet or not, Mr. Speaker, is not really important. The fact of the matter is the amount has been allocated and will be spent as is required.

Now I do not know what the hon. Member has against that program, but yesterday in the House he went on to attack my hon. colleague, and certainly left the impression -- rightly or wrongly, whether he intended to or not -- left the impression that he was against the program. He was questioning the legality of it, and questioning the need for it. I believe he made reference to the fact, and he was trying to get the hon. Minister to admit, I think, that maybe there were payments made before March 31st. And I believe I know why he wanted to know that, because as we all know Fishery

Products International had their annual balance sheet released some time ago on that date and they showed a profit of \$130,000, which I suppose you cannot even call a profit given the size of their operation.

But, Mr. Speaker, he cannot seem to understand, and the Opposition does not seem to understand, and I will repeat what I have said before, what the Premier said, not one cent of that \$14 million will end up in the coffers of Fishery Products International or National Sea, not one cent. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that program we made available to them, those funds will end up costing FPI about \$3 million. FPI, and I am not here defending Fishery Products International by no means, that is not my role, in fact that is one that I would find difficult to adjust to, I do not mind saying. But in fairness to them, under the laws of this Province, when they made their decision to close the Grand Bank and Trepassey plants they were required by law to give a sixteen week layoff notice to their workers.

Because of the Province's intervention they are now going to give twice that number of weeks. In fact, it will be sixteen or twenty weeks this year, 80 per cent of which will be paid for by FPI, and next year, all things being equal, hopefully there will be another sixteen or twenty weeks extended layoff period that will be paid for -- 80 per cent of which will be paid for by the Province and 20 per cent by the company. But the net cost to the company of that program will be in excess of \$3 million. Now the point I am trying to make, and I am not making apologies for that, because whether it cost FPI \$3 million or

\$30 million, quite frankly, is not relevant right now. But the point I want to make is that there is not one copper of that \$14 million special program going into the treasury of the two big companies who own the plants that are now due to close. The money will go into the pockets of the workers.

Now I do not know why the Member - and I do not really believe that he means to convey that impression - but it would appear, having listened to him yesterday, that he has got some hang-up about that program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: Anyway, let us give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the doubt. I think he is a good Newfoundlander. In fact, I suppose I can take some credit for his political training, because at one point in my career he was on my campaign team. So I have to take some - maybe it is blame I should say, not credit. But I do take some credit or blame or whatever for the hon. gentleman.

But, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the motion, of course, is to condemn Ottawa for not including that part of our Province, the south coast, the southwest coast of our Province in their recent so-called Fish Aid Program. Immediately upon learning of the details of the program, as scant as they were, we sent Mr. Valcourt a letter expressing concern that he left out that part of our Province and again asked him to reconsider. But to date, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any indication that the Minister is prepared to even listen to what we had to say.

Mr. Speaker, the money that is

being made available under the Fishery Aid Program, the five hundred and some odd million dollars, \$543 million, I believe it is, is a bit of a charade in that \$130 million of that, in fact, a substantial portion of that five hundred odd million, is to cover normal programs that the Federal Government would have responsibility for anyhow. And I am thinking about - I believe there is about \$150 million in there for surveillance and research. That is a normal Federal responsibility they have included to make it look good. They have tried to build it up by including their unemployment insurance benefits. A very substantial amount, the early retirement.

So when you look at the overall fish aid package you are not talking that much money. Then I think to add insult to injury what they have done, Mr. Speaker, is suggest that there is a need to cut back on the number of fishermen in the Province. A need to put a freeze on the progression of part-time fishermen to that of full-time fishermen, without regard for what is going to happen to them once these actions are taken - implemented. Now the hon. gentleman is shaking his head and I believe I know why, although he is wrong in what he is thinking - that is obvious. In every utterance that we have made about rationalizing the fishery, about professionalizing the fishery, and about making it a more viable and a more stable industry, we have always said that we have to diversify the economy in order to provide jobs for those who will obviously be displaced out of the fishery. That has been the gospel as far as we are concerned.

The Federal Minister's response package contained \$90 million for economic diversification, \$90 million spread over a five year period divided amongst four, or maybe five provinces, because I understand that Quebec is not very happy that they have been left out, and that will add up to about \$4.5 million per province per year if it is split evenly. Now, I would like for hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me what can you do in terms of diversifying the economy, providing alternate sources of employment for substantial numbers of people, on \$4 or \$5 million a year. It is a pittance. The Province did in fact offer to cost-share a program of economic diversification - the cost of it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, we are talking apples and oranges. We are talking about a different situation altogether. It is difficult to think, Mr. Speaker, when other Members are having meetings across the way. Could I have order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries is recognized.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, however you cut it up \$90 million over that period for those many provinces is just not worth talking about. If Ottawa is serious in trying to do something to protect and conserve the fishery, and to make it a viable industry for those engaged in it, as in fact they should, then I think they are going to have to readdress that problem.

The offer that the Province made, under the conditions it was made,

still stands. If Ottawa will come through with that program that was recommended by us then, of course, the Province has undertaken to cost-share, and if Ottawa is not prepared to do that then it is quite obvious that they are not too interested in doing the job that needs to be done - but we are. Mr. Speaker, for any Newfoundlander, and this is what disappoints me, today when every Member in this House should be of the same mind in supporting - given all the facts and given the truth of the matter, given the fact that what we are saying is true and is right, forget the politics of it, I think this matter is -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) provincial government.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to speak after I finish he can get on his feet, but I am not going to engage in a two-way conversation with him while he is sitting in his chair. It is disrupting.

Mr. Speaker, the Province is quite willing to pay its way and to accept its share, even though we should not have to, because the problem that we are now addressing is not of the making of this Province, or the fishermen of this Province. It is caused by the Federal Government and they have accepted that. I think Ottawa has pretty well accepted it. I said a moment ago that if there was ever a time when Newfoundlanders in this House should stand up as one, and forget politics for a moment, it is now, because the matter is too serious to be playing politics with, stand up as one and demand the kind of action that we feel we should be getting from Ottawa, rather than try to camouflage what

it going on and to run interference, then I believe we would stand a much better chance, and we would be serving the people that we are elected to serve, I think, in a much more honourable and a much more effective way. But as long as this division exists where you get Opposition Members who want to play politics with it, want to try and score political points and who are here, obviously, to protect their friends in Ottawa then, Mr. Speaker, that defeats the whole purpose of what we are trying to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my time is about up so I will take my seat now. But, before I do, I would like to go on record as supporting the resolution so ably presented by my colleague for LaPoile. To accept the amendment, Mr. Speaker, would be almost a form of hypocrisy and dishonesty. In that, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are doing it for political reasons, just to score a political point. Just to score a political point, they are willing to bankrupt the Province. They are willing to bankrupt the Province in order to score a political point. And, I think we have to be more responsible than that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to the Minister of Fisheries that before the final vote is taken on this resolution today: I

cannot speak for the two gentlemen to my right, in terms of the Official Opposition, and I expect the Government, since it was their Member who brought in the resolution, we will speak as one voice. That will be accomplished before the final vote is taken on this resolution today.

But it is also, Mr. Speaker, incumbent on this Government to be a participant in the problem that the hon. gentleman is addressing in his resolution. He has a very serious problem. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, coming from this Government to the Government of Canada during the months of negotiations on Building a Viable Future Option, addressed one iota the problem that the Member is addressing in his resolution today. Nothing, not a thing, Mr. Speaker, in the Building a Viable Future Option, that was under negotiation for months, referred to the failure in the Gulf cod, as the hon. gentleman says, the failure in the southwest coast fishery, nothing, that I can tell him. So, Mr. Speaker, he should know that.

He also should know, Mr. Speaker, that in years passed, and it should be the same now, when there was a failure in any part of this Province in the Fishery there was normally some kind of a halfhearted response from Ottawa. But even halfhearted as it was, whether it was Tory Governments or Liberal Governments in Ottawa at the time, I do not remember a year when the Provincial Government did not participate. I do not remember one year when the Province did not participate. I remember the last four or five years when there were failures along the northeast coast and Labrador, when there were failures

on the Member's own coast the last year, I believe, when I was Minister of Fisheries. There was a Federal response. There was a Provincial response, joint, Mr. Speaker. Interest-free loans went to the fishermen - yes, Mr. Speaker, interest-free loans went to the fishermen.

An Hon. Member: It must have been an election year.

Mr. Rideout: No, it was not an election year I say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Yes, I suppose, the fall of 1988 and January of 1989 was an election year.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister was calling for those things at that time, demanding that we do them, and we did them. Now he gets over there and tries to hide behind the hypocrisy of his own actions today.

The point I am making to the Member is this: in the past the experience has been, as halfhearted as the response was on the Federal side, there was always a complementary provincial component. There is no complementary provincial component in what the Member is recommending, or what the Minister is talking about. That is why, quite frankly, we proposed the amendment we did. There was nothing in all of the documents that have gone to Ottawa from this Government to address the crisis in the southwest coast fishery, nothing.

In the employment diversification package, that the Premier tabled the other day, I do not believe there is one project identified in

the Port aux Basques/southwest coast region. There is not one identified. So there is a total absence, Mr. Speaker, of any provincial participation, and our point of view is that there should be provincial participation. I mean it was the Premier himself, in this statement issued on May 7, who said the Province indicated in its presentation that it was prepared to share 20 per cent of the cost of this Response Program proposal and set aside \$110 million for this purpose over a five year period in the hope that it would be part of a \$550 million Federal/Provincial package. That is the Premier's own words, Mr. Speaker.

Now if this Government is not prepared to support an amendment which calls on it to participate, we know they had \$110 million at least accounted for, that is what the Premier said on May 7. If pointing out that, Mr. Speaker, to this House, is trying to defend political buddies in Ottawa, as the Minister says, then the Minister can put up with it, Mr. Speaker. But this is the first major Response Program to the fishery crisis in this Province in years that the Province has not participated in, and is not proposing to participate in, because the Government has already said that they are going to vote against this amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all right. They can vote against the amendment, but I can tell them that we are not going to vote against the main motion when the vote comes to the floor. We do not mind standing and condemning when condemnation is necessary, Mr. Speaker, but we will try to improve it, will try to make it better, we will try to hold out

some ray of hope for the people living along the southwest coast of this Province by begging the Government that the hon. Member supports, by begging them for God sake at least to put some degree of effort, some degree of funding, some degree of financial responsibility where your own mouth is. We are going to do that I can tell the Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: They did not want an agreement with the Feds.

An Hon. Member: Your time is up.

Mr. Rideout: No, it is not. The Member will have to wait for four more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Don't be so foolish.

Mr. Rideout: Some of the other stuff that the Member got on with in making his presentation today, Mr. Speaker; he did not call upon his own Government colleagues to participate at all which is a glaring omission in his presentation. Surely a Government backbencher should have been able to call upon his own Government to put in some funding to help address the situation over in that part of the Province.

Mr. Simms: Would not let him.

Mr. Rideout: But the other thing that the hon. Member ended up his few remarks on today in support of his motion, Mr. Speaker, was to somehow tie the problem of the fishery, in general, but the southwest coast in particular, into this Senate reform business of the Premier. I assume he was referring to 3 PS, Mr. Speaker, where there is this Canada/France Interim Agreement and he tried to

make the argument that if there was a reform Senate and if there was equality in the Senate of Canada that this international treaty that he was talking about would never have been approved.

Mr. Speaker, how many times have his own leaders said in this House in debate, particularly on the Meech Lake rescinding resolution, that he is not proposing any new powers for the Senate. They do not have any power over treaty making today, and I am after asking the Premier and others have and they said, no, I am not proposing that this group have any new powers. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is going to be sadly mistaken, even if the fanciful dream comes true that he is going to solve the international problem in that particular area through this foolishness called Senate reform. It is just not in the cards, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Mr. Rideout: So, Mr. Speaker, we support and we have a great deal of sympathy for the problem that the hon. gentleman and his constituents face. But what we cannot understand is how anybody can be against the Province participating in the solution. That is the point that has been made by my colleagues who have spoken on this resolution today: How can anybody be against the Province participating in the solution?

Mr. Speaker, as much as the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Social Services might mumble, I will sit down when Your Honor sits me down, not because he tries to mumble me down. So, Mr. Speaker, he can put up with it. He might not like it,

but he can put up with it. We do not like quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose it is any secret, we do not like listening to the hon. gentleman either, but we have to put up with him, as much as we hate it. We have to put up with him.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: No, and that I do not. I like your pictures better.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is unheard of, first of all, that there wasn't any provincial participation in 1989, last year in the Federal Response Program. There is not any this year in a problem that is particular and contiguous to the southwest coast of Newfoundland. There isn't any. They are not proposing that there be any. And how anybody can stand in this House and vote against an amendment that would ask, not only condemn and beg the Federal Government to get involved, but at the same time would ask the Province to participate. How anybody can do that, Mr. Speaker, is proving the one sentence that the Minister of Fisheries said, which was correct, and he said this, and I wrote it down, 'our intent is to condemn Ottawa.' That is the intent. Well, we want to try to broaden this resolution so it will do that, and let us do that collectively, but, also, let us call on this Government to carry out its responsibilities to the constituents of the hon. gentleman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been sitting here, listening intently to all other speakers in the debate and trying to piece together, I suppose, what we are involved in here.

We could stand and say that this is politics and this is the way we do business, but the view the Opposition has as to how we should go about it is a view they may have had when in Government, but I would submit that their participation in Fisheries Response and so on, was probably quite marginal. As far as our District goes on the southwest coast, I know of programs that were brought in and the Province did not have the financial capability to become involved in all of the affected areas. The applications far outnumbered the amount of money available, and as it was then, it is now. The response that the Province could give would be an amount that is not sufficient to address the problem. It is an amount that, as I understand it, when the former Government was in, after the implementation of an inadequate Federal response, that the Provincial Government then introduced their response. Am I correct in that assumption?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Ramsay: That is the way it was done. So, for us to follow their lead, we have to wait the reaction of the Federal Government, and then, the Province can look at the situation and assess it and see if the Feds have again circumvented their responsibility, and the Provincial Government, I am sure, will react responsibly in that situation.

But to ask us to do what they did not do is, Mr. Speaker, I think, a dereliction of their responsibility in elevating themselves to a position where they just did not do that which they asked us.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to note that something which hits home quite hard to the people on the southwest coast and, I would say, elsewhere in the Province, is the support that was given to the Federal Fisheries Aid package by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I feel sincerely that he has done damage to his credibility, being a former Minister of Fisheries, by his support of the Federal Government's Fish Aid package. The people of the southwest coast cannot understand how said former Minister would be so supportive of it.

In this week's Gulf News, 'Southwest coast ignored' is the headline, 'Condemnation of Federal Aid package universal'. It certainly doesn't sync with the opinion of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition at the time when it was brought out. Now I know you have problems with it, as we do. I have problems with it, as well, because I know how darned hard it is going to be to make it work; because there is no specific allocation of funding for a community. It says, this much money for that community, but it has a qualifier in there, 'up to', Ferryland, 'up to' X number of millions of dollars. The various communities have this qualifier there. If they do not know how to attract the industries and they do not attract the necessary things that will put these funds in motion, then that money will disappear. It will disappear.

That will not be \$584 million. They will not get a slush fund from the Federal Government to play with. The Federal Government will not allow that money to go into anything which does not create an industry. So that makes the announcement somewhat iffy. Because I know the small amount of \$7 million that was in place for our area, because of the loss of the railway, is possibly under the same impression, it may be jeopardized if they do not come up with the business in order to do it.

An Hon. Member: Did it help?

Mr. Ramsay: Now, did it help? Well, it has created a few jobs, but nowhere near the amount that have left. Also, if you want to talk about when there is a crisis situation, we could look at the railway deal. That happened as a crisis situation as it related to the employment picture in my District. Who put the money in? Who did not? Who failed to put money into LaPoile District under the Railway Agreement? The Provincial Government did not contribute anything whatsoever to that Agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ramsay: No roads for rails. There are no roads in LaPoile District on it. There are a few little side roads, and a bridge here, or something like that, but there was no legitimate financial contribution on the part of the Provincial Government to offset that Federal initiative. So, the correlation of that, to what we are looking at here, there is no Federal initiative.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: What am I missing? Explain.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: There is nothing missing? The thing that is missing right now is food for the tables of the people in some of the households in my District. That is what is missing right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ramsay: We have a problem here. And I am sure, I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever, notwithstanding your amendment to my resolution, that in the situation, once the Federal program - I mean, they have no choice. They have to react. They have to respond. But once that comes, this Government will -

An Hon. Member: What do they do in the meantime?

Mr. Ramsay: What do you mean, what will they do in the meantime? Do you possibly think - you know the Cabinet system. You know the way it works - that they could come through, they could put through this Minute in Council and start handing out cheques right, left and center? It can't be done. It is impossible! It would take a period of time that would not allow that to happen until the Federal program came through in the first place. The infrastructure is not in place to deliver the Provincial funding as it is for the Federal Government with the Unemployment system.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) right now. Today.

Mr. Ramsay: What? Am I bothering you that much that you have to interrupt me? Why don't you just

calm down a bit and let me say what I have to say.

Now there are several other things we could look at here. Do the people in my District think the Provincial Government has a responsibility?

Mr. Matthews: Yes.

Mr. Ramsay: We have a responsibility, yes, as a last resort. That is the way current things are happening. There is no program to address it right now. We, as a collective group here, Members on both sides of the House, provide - now you can say we provide here as the Government, but the thing is when legislation goes through, the legislation goes on the agreement of both sides. You might vote against it, but you are party to everything that is put through this House. You have to agree to allow legislation to pass, so, therefore, it is all of us as the institution of this Provincial Government, the MHAs of this House. We have a collective responsibility, no matter what side of the House we sit on. So to blame or to assess as to whether it is this Liberal Government or the PC Government that was in before, that does not hold water. There are holes in it, and the holes are that we as Members of this hon. House are collectively responsible for the people of this Province.

Mr. Matthews: Then put some money in it.

Mr. Ramsay: Okay, let us throw money at it. That does not do a thing. Mr. Speaker, the problem is one of immense proportions, it is one I really don't know how the Federal Government even is going to be able to address in the

period of time that is necessary. Now, the Federal Government could come in tomorrow and say, Okay, we are going to put in this program. We all know the majority of these Federal Government programs take four to six weeks to be developed, to see who qualifies, to see how the program is going to proceed. And to think that the Province could automatically implement a program, with money thrown in there, in order to assist these people right now, without the right kinds of checks and balances, it just cannot be done. With the Federal Government working on it now, as I understand they should be because of the representations which have been made by us to them, it should certainly give the people of the area some level of support, and some level of security, I suppose, in understanding that they are going to be looked after.

Now, there are some terrifically sad stories, Mr. Speaker. I have had calls where I felt like crying for these people. What can I do but say I will do what I can; I will take your concerns to the right people; I will see to it that we address your problem? But the majority of these people say to me, It is a Federal problem. And I say, Yes, it is. It is a Federal problem. And don't underestimate the intelligence and the capability of understanding of the average person who is in this situation. Because as much as we here collectively might like to have the money as a Provincial Government to put into this kind of program, the people of the Province might say, Look, we know it's a Federal Government responsibility regardless, Liberal or PC Government, collectively that body should be able to put the money in and address the

problem.

Now, you went on to suggest that the Meech Lake thing that was mentioned in the debate - if I can only find my notes here - would have no real effect. I would say, as for the administration of a program to offset this problem, there would be little or no effect on the social situation in the communities of which I speak, the down-to-earth problems which the people are now experiencing, there would be little or no effect by throwing money at it. So to suggest, also, that the Meech Lake situation, which is one where we hope that in the future if things are done, the long-term approach will make sure -

An Hon. Member: The Premier is against it.

Mr. Ramsay: Against what?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: No, no. And our Government has asked for joint Federal/Provincial management of the fishery. A joint Federal/Provincial Board -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) that?

Mr. Ramsay: In the Harris Task Force Report. It is the kind of thing we have been representing to Ottawa all along, that there be a panel which jointly, through the Federal and Provincial Governments, has input in the fisheries management. But they refused that; they say we already have enough.

Mr. Speaker, to clue up, I feel that today we could have certainly sent a message to the people on the west, south and southwest coasts. We could have sent a

message that was a solid message, which never had the kind of rhetoric that has been involved in debate here today. We have gotten down in the gutter again.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: You do make a point. We have, in a way, gotten down in the gutter. We brought politics into it. We are political animals, we brought politics into it. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly feel that the part of the resolution, the amendment to it that was expressed by the hon. the Member for Grand Bank, is not one I can support. I support the principle of it, but as it is written, changing the gist of what I have written as the resolution here, I do not support that. It does change it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is in the best interest of this House to do something which even the former Provincial Government would not do; they would not implement a response program prior to the implementation of a Federal response, so why should we ask this Government to respond as the other Government never did? Now maybe they feel we are a bit above the way they used to act.

An Hon. Member: We are.

Mr. Ramsay: I think we are in a way, but not necessarily along the same methodology they used. There is a certain thing here that was mentioned by the hon. the Member for Grand Bank. He called for increased control in the management of the fisheries. He called for that, and then he said he will not stand for the Triple "E" Senate. To mix that together, and he talks about one without the other, it does not make a lot of

sense. He will stand and speak about the management of the fishery being a Federal jurisdiction, and then, in the same sentence, he will say that the Provincial Government should put money in there to offset the problem the Federal Government has caused.

Now, if we went around throwing money at all the problems which have been caused over the years by Federal Governments, both PC and Liberal, I dare say this Province would be that far in the hole that \$5 billion would seem like pennies. So for us to have reacted in that way there would be far more of a provincial debt than there currently is.

Also, I might note, for an hon. Member who speaks of Meech Lake as not being important to the people in my District, he and the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West thought it was an important enough issue to respond to a letter in the Southern Gazette on Meech Lake.

An Hon. Member: Did you respond to the letter today?

Mr. Ramsay: On the 1987 Constitutional Accord, it is obvious the Member for Grand Bank made his party's position known on the Meech Lake Accord in a letter to the editor in the Southern Gazette.

An Hon. Member: What does it have to do with this?

Mr. Ramsay: It has a lot to do with this, because you said the people in the District I represent, Meech Lake means nothing to them, according to today's debate.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Ah, ha! You said they would not. Anyway, you think of the Meech Lake debate to make sure that you respond to letters to the editor.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) next week (inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Based on the same thing, and I invite you.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: You come on out and they will be waiting for you, I can tell you right now.

Ms Verge: Will you be in Corner Brook tomorrow?

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) for the press conference?

Mr. Ramsay: For the press conference? How can I be there if I have to be here? Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think I will clue up. There are a couple of minutes left here, and I would ask hon. Members not to support the amendment, but to support the motion. With that, Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment please say 'Aye'?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against the amendment please say 'Nay'?

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement that the vote be now called?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout), Mr. Doyle, Mrs. Verge, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Hynes.

Mr. Speaker: All those against the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford), the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Barrett, Mr. L. Snow, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), Mr. Grimes, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren), the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Short, Mr. Langdon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: That is something to cheer about.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

CLERK (Miss Duff):

Mr. Speaker, the vote is nine for the amendment and twenty-four against.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

All those in favour of the main resolution, please say 'aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those against, 'nay'.

I declare the main motion carried.

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m.