



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 25

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

1 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

This is National Crime Prevention Week and in observance of the week the Federal Solicitor General's Department has given awards throughout Canada. Among those honoured are VOCM and two individuals in Gander.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I just wonder if the hon. Member would wait a few minutes to allow the strangers to get in, and probably give everyone a chance to listen to the important announcement she is making, because the press are just beginning to settle in, too. Just wait a minute.

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley East.

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate having the chance to say my message with the members of the news media and the public settled in the galleries. I was saying that this is National Crime Prevention Week and the Federal Solicitor General's Department is observing the week by presenting awards to groups and citizens throughout Canada who have made an outstanding contribution to crime prevention. Among those honoured are, in our Province, VOCM and two citizens of Gander. VOCM was given an award in Ottawa yesterday and that was to recognize the radio networks contribution to

overall crime prevention, and in particular to salute VOCMs involvement in the Block Parent Program and their sponsorship of the Officer Cares Robot. The citizens of Gander who have been honoured are two women, Juliette Nicholls and Patsy Briffett who originated the Street Proofing Program there.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all Members of the House to unite in sending a message of congratulations to each of those recognized by the Solicitor General's Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

All hon. Members will know that during the summer, when the House was recessed, one of the distinguished Members of this House, a Minister, passed away, and in that respect I, on behalf of hon. Members, contacted the family and indeed attended the funeral to represent hon. Members. I also spoke to the media in that regard. In this regard I would like to read a letter into the records of the House for hon. Members:

"To the Speaker: Dear Speaker, May I thank you most sincerely for your telegram of sympathy and your kind words about Hugh in the media. The presence of so many of his colleagues on both sides of the House was appreciated by all the family at the funeral service. Yours truly, Mrs. Hugh Twomey and family."

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say - and this is the first opportunity we have had to do this

publicly in the Legislature - let me say on behalf of all my colleagues on both sides of the House how deeply saddened we were to witness the passing of Dr. Twomey just a few months ago. Those of us who served with Dr. Twomey in the House of Assembly know that in that gentleman there was the essence of decorum and the essence of doing public business in a proper manner. He contributed greatly to this Province as a medical doctor, as a Member of the House of Assembly, and as a Member of the Cabinet and the Government of the day. I want to compliment your Honor on attending the funeral on behalf of all of us, and those Members from both sides of the House who attended and appropriately grieved with the family, the passing of a great Newfoundlander and Labradorian, and a person who contributed tremendously to public life in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, although the late Dr. Twomey was a political associate of the Leader of the Opposition who just spoke, he was a personal friend of everybody who sat in this House, and everybody that ever had anything to do with him, always pointed to Dr. Twomey as the example of what a gentleman or gentlewoman should be, in terms of their dealings with their fellow citizens, without regard to politics or creed or color or anything else. Dr. Twomey in his whole attitude, in his whole behavior toward people displayed that, all of the years that I knew him. And when he sat in this House I think colleagues who have heard me say in the past how much we admired his behavior on the

opposite side of the House to which we sat at the time, and how much respected he was. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing our deepest sympathy to the family of Dr. Twomey, and expressing our admiration for one of the worlds real gentlemen. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity today to inform Members of this Honourable House of the status of the Hibernia negotiations. Members will recall that Government expressed concerns over the summer with the pace of the negotiations. It was our view, upon reflection, that the negotiations were not proceeding at a sufficient pace to allow for their expeditious conclusion. In light of this, the Province arranged a meeting to discuss the status of the project with Federal Ministers and the heads of the four Hibernia companies. That meeting was held in Montreal on September 12th, and was successful in providing a refocused sense of direction for the talks, as well as agreement to a schedule for their orderly conclusion. Government has commented previously on those meetings in more detail, but one of the essential understandings reached was that negotiations needed to proceed on a time table to allow for their conclusion by mid 1990. Since the September 12th meeting, intensive negotiations have been proceeding with the Federal Government and the Oil companies

in a number of areas. We are satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the pace and status of these negotiations, and the schedule agreed on in September remains intact at this time, with significant progress being made on all outstanding issues. A critical part of the negotiations from Newfoundland's perspective relates to the Industrial and Employment Benefits that will be negotiated for this Province. Government is committed to ensure that the Industrial and Employment Benefits objectives outlined in the Statement of Principles are fully met under the new design now proposed for the topsides portion of the Hibernia production platform. Be assured Mr. Speaker, that this House and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will be kept updated on all progress, or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that progress is being made in these negotiations, because obviously the Government does not seem to have any other sort of job creation strategy on the go at all. At times I wonder if I believe my ears - they are pleased that things are going according to the Statement of Principles. Not that long ago, not that many months ago, the Liberal Party - then in Opposition - were deadly opposed to a lot of elements of our Hibernia deal with the Federal Government and the Oil companies. I am surprised the Premier did not

delay the negotiations until Mr. Chretien became Prime Minister, then we could go back to the good old Liberal, Nova Scotia Agreement. The Premier thinks the Provinces have too much power already, and that agreement gives all the power that counts to the Federal Government. We will be watching carefully and asking questions with regard to what we get, because we are losing the main support frame. This industrial objective was not chosen strictly for the jobs alone, it was chosen so that we could also develop a technological and industrial base, that would be useful in the future in pursuing our own off-shore projects, and probably exporting our expertise and technology overseas.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier may soar like a legal eagle over the troubled waters of Meech Lake, but our unemployed, Mr. Speaker, need to see lots of cranes over Hibernia.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to report to this hon. House, and to inform the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, of the results of our Forest Insect Control Program in 1989. I am pleased to state, as I am sure all Members of the House will be equally pleased to learn, that the program was successful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

As it was last year and the year before.

MR. FLIGHT:

As it was last year, Mr. Speaker. We will get to last year now in a second.

The 1989 program was directed only against the hemlock looper, and for the first time used only the biological insecticide Bt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Bt is environmentally acceptable, and from that point of view much preferred over such chemical products as fenitrothion.

The spray program is a joint undertaking of the Province and the two paper companies. A total of 3,738 hectares were sprayed with two applications, and 1,624 hectares with one application, for a total of 5,362 hectares. This was entirely in the Castors River area of the Northern Peninsula. Good weather conditions are crucial to an effective Bt program, and despite some delays the operation was carried out successfully. After spraying, defoliation levels were considerably lower in sprayed areas than they were in unsprayed areas. This result was achieved despite the presence of a second insect, the blackheaded budworm. The blackheaded budworm hatches earlier than the looper, and begins feeding earlier. Much of the defoliation that was observed is thought to be caused by this insect.

With regard to the blackheaded budworm, Mr. Speaker, we are carefully monitoring the population levels. This insect has always been present in Newfoundland but has not been a problem in the past. It is a reminder, however, that we must be always vigilant and prepare to deal with such threats to our forests.

Mr. Speaker, our forests are an invaluable, renewable resource. I intend to take whatever measures are necessary to protect it, using the most environmentally safe and acceptable means at my disposal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would first like to say to the Minister how disappointed I am. I know in the last Session of the House I was the Agricultural and Rural Development critic, but I think everybody around this Province, more especially the Members in the House, should know, if they are doing their job efficiently and well, that I am also the critic for Forestry now in this Session, and I did not get a copy of the statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

MR. WOODFORD:

I really should not comment on something I did not see. But in any case, I would like to say that I think, in the first part of the

statement it said that the spray program was successful. Whether it was a fluke, or not, if the program worked, I have to agree with everybody else in this Province, nobody would want to see it fail in any case, regardless of what the officials said or not. You have to be constructive and agree with the Minister if it was well received and the spray program was done in a proper manner and it was successful, so be it.

But I think at the time it was against, if I am not mistaken, the advice of the officials at that time, because they advised using fenitrothion. But apart from that, it is good to see that it was a success, whether it was a fluke or not, it is good for the Province and good for the area as a whole.

I do not know what else is after coming up. I think there is something else with regard to the blackheaded worm now, or something like that. Well, I serve notice to the Minister that it will not only be the blackheaded worm he will have to monitor from now on, he had better keep an eye on me. I can assure you that I am not one to be destructive, or criticizing for the sake of criticizing. I will do it constructively and in a proper manner in this House. I would appreciate very much if the Minister would, from now on, instruct his staff to just drop his statement on my desk in the evening, just before he speaks. That would be sufficient. I do not expect him to walk to my office with it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A point of order?

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, you can call it a point of order if you wish. It is really not, I suppose, it is a point of clarification and an apology to the hon. Member. I can assure the Member that a copy of this statement left my office at least fifteen minutes before I arrived in this building, to be hand delivered to the hon. Member.

My information is that a member of my staff took the copy of my statement, by hand, to the Member at least fifteen minutes prior to the House sitting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To the point of whatever it is. let me simply say I accept the Minister's apology. The fact of the matter is, that up until the point that we left our office to come to the Legislature, we had two Ministerial Statements delivered to us, and both of them were from the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. There was no statement delivered to the Opposition office from the Minister's Department.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order but the Chair accepts the explanations.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, today is the eve of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, and the 13th annual

open house and review of activities for the Department of Mines and Energy. On this occasion, it gives me great pleasure to say a few words about the Province's mineral industry.

My Department is presently forecasting that the value of mineral production for this year, 1989, will be \$995 million dollars, almost one billion dollars. This is the highest value since 1981, when the total was \$1.03 billion. This year's forecast is based on \$809 million for the iron ore from Labrador West and \$186 million for all other products. This is the highest value for iron ore since 1984 and the highest value for other commodities in this decade.

In mineral exploration, Mr. Speaker, last year, 1988, all-time records were set in diamond drilling (234,000 metres), that is 234 kilometres, new claims (over 26,000), claims in good standing (almost 66,000), and exploration expenditures (\$41 million). This year, exploration activity is down slightly. We forecast expenditures for 1989/90, or for 1989 at about \$35 million. However, 1989 will still probably be the second best year ever, and there are several interesting prospects and potential future mines in the exploration stage.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues in the House and any member of the public interested in learning more about the activities of my Department and about the Province's mineral industry, to attend my Department's presentations and poster displays which start at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning at the Raddison Plaza in St. John's. The CIM meeting starts tomorrow night and

continues until Saturday, November 4, at the same location.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. A. SNOW:

Allow me first of all, Mr. Speaker, to thank the hon. Member for St. John's West (Dr. Gibbons) for his courtesy in allowing me to have a look at the statement by him concerning mines - unlike previous Ministers that have done the complete opposite. Mines, of course, are very important in my district, and I am glad to see that the hon. Member for St. John's West and the Minister of Mines recognizes it's economic importance, not only to my district, but to this whole Province. He stated that the value of the mining industry in Labrador West and the importance of it to the Province, is great, and I am glad to see that he recognizes that. I would hope that the rest of the Ministers in the Cabinet, his colleagues, will also recognize the economic generator that is in Menihek in the iron ore mines, and adopting the principle that the Premier articulated yesterday with regard to the adjacency to a resource, that people living adjacent to a resource should have an opportunity of participating greater in that resource. I am sure that his colleagues, when they are distributing things like culture capital grants and other things, roads allowances, I would

certainly hope that they would consider that economic generator in Labrador West.

With regard to the upswing, it is largely due to the productivity of the workers in Western Labrador that has generated this extra production of iron ore in Western Labrador. It has very little to do, if anything to do, with what the Department of Mines are doing, because they are very lax in representation in Western Labrador. In exploration, in his statement, he talks about it being down slightly. There is no doubt that is true. He, too, can read the stats that are being put out by the industry and it is interesting to note that there are prospects of a new mine opening up just adjacent to our community, in Fermont, Quebec, and that is largely due to the increased exploration activity in that province. There is increased exploration activity in the Province of Quebec, adjacent to Schefferville, which is just north of western Labrador, and that is largely due to participation of that particular provincial government in incentives to promote further exploration, which, of course, you need not only in that province but in this Province; you need to have that further exploration prior to the opening of mines. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Premier informed the House that the Member for Port de Grave, the then Minister of Social Services, had been relieved of his duties and that a Judge of the Supreme Court would be asked to investigate the serious allegations that had been made against the then Minister by Eastern Shipbuilders Limited.

Since Monday, I have had an opportunity, as well, to review the allegations contained in the letter the Premier referred to in his Statement to the House on Monday.

Can the Premier tell the House what kind of investigation, for want of a better word, the Premier is intending to ask this Judge of the Supreme Court to carry out? What kind of investigation does the Premier have in mind? What kind of investigation has the Premier requested of the particular person who is going to carry out the investigation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, what we have said we would do is appoint a Judge of the Supreme Court to consider the allegations and any relevant matter arising out of it - not just simply the direct allegations in the letter, any matter arising out of these allegations, because they have the potential to be serious in relation to the hon. Minister - and ask the judge to look at all of these, everything

that relates to it, and advise. We will release the findings publicly, whether or not, in the judge's view, there was any improper action on the part of the Minister.

I have asked the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, Mr. Justice Goodridge, to name a judge to conduct this investigation, and I will ask the Cabinet at its regular meeting tomorrow to formally appoint whatever judge the Chief Justice names to conduct that investigation and set out the Terms of Reference. As soon as those Terms of Reference are settled, I will table them in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Premier for his answer.

I ask the Premier, under what authority - is it under the authority of The Public Inquiries Act - will this particular person be appointed to review and investigate the matters that Cabinet plans to refer to this person?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
That will all be decided at the meeting tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and will all be spelled out in the Order in Council making the appointment, and I will table the Order in Council in the House.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I assume the Premier, hopefully, will table the Order in Council tomorrow if the matter is finalized.

PREMIER WELLS:
We have to get His Honour's signature first.

MR. RIDEOUT:
When you get His Honour's signature, yes, I understand.

MR. SIMMS:
It can be done.

MR. RIDEOUT:
But it can be arranged.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is an involvement of many, many people and agencies in the allegations we are talking about here, the Fisheries Loan Board, the Coast Guard, Eastern Shipbuilders, the former Minister and many, many others, is the Premier going to ensure in the Terms of Reference that this inquiry is an open, public inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
I do not see any necessity for a big, open public inquiry. I am asking a judge to look at all the facts and advise me whether or not there are any facts that arise as a result of his investigation that would warrant any conclusion of impropriety. I do not see that it is necessary to establish something like the Hughes inquiry, or something like that. I would

not think of that as normal.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the only authority I am aware under which the Premier can appoint this person to do the work is the authority of The Public Inquiries Act, and I would be surprised if any judge would accept such an appointment without it being a public inquiry.

In view of the seriousness of this matter and the seriousness of the allegations, I want to ask the Premier again is it the Premier's intention to ensure that a thorough open public inquiry is carried out into the allegations made by Mr. Petten and Eastern Shipbuilders Limited against the Minister?

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, whatever inquiry is necessary will be done. The terms of reference will be decided tomorrow. I want this thing to be aired, and the full findings of the judge will be made public. Whether it is necessary to establish a court setting and have counsel and lawyers appointed, I would not have thought that that would be necessary. But if in the judge's view that is necessary, there will be nothing that will in anyway inhibit the judge from doing that. We have asked the judge to examine a set of facts

and examine all those facts related to it, and give us an assessment of that.

Now, if the judge feels it is necessary to conduct an open public inquiry and have legal counsel available and set up that whole paraphernalia, then it will be done. If it is not necessary, it will not be done.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is also to the Premier. On the opening day of this hon. House, the Premier read from a prepared statement as it pertained to a certain Minister. With your concurrence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote an excerpt from that statement.

'Accordingly he has asked that I relieve him of responsibility as a Minister and as Minister for Social Services until the allegations have been thoroughly examined and a determination made as to whether or not there was any impropriety by the Minister.'

I have information, Mr. Speaker, that dictates to me that this is not what happened, but rather the Minister was called in and asked to resign, his resignation was demanded, or, if you want to be more explicit, he was fired. I ask the Premier, is this true?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier come clean to the House and tell us what transpired at that meeting between him and the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will come clean to the House. I will not tell the Member the details of the discussion I had with the Minister or anybody else. I can say to the hon. Member and to the House, as I did in the statement, which part of the statement the hon. Member overlooked reading so as to create this deceptive position, that when the Minister returned from official duties on behalf of the Government in Prince Edward Island, the Minister met with me at my home. We had the initial discussion there, and agreed to meet the next morning to review it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer the question.

PREMIER WELLS:

We discussed the matter in detail and what I have advised the House is what occurred. The Minister wrote me, in fact, and asked me to carry out the investigation. Now, I can table that letter if that is of any benefit, and I have no hesitation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

We have the letter.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do know where you would get the

letter, but I suppose you could.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, we would get the letter.

MR. WARREN:

We would surprise you.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And you would have had to do what you did, anyway.

MR. PARSONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

I want to ask the Premier, did you have information other than the letter from Mr. Petten on which you based your decision? Did you go to any other departments and seek information? Was there any political interference in your firing of the Minister? What was the reason?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

There are two questions. Did we have any other information? Yes, I made other inquiries. All that information will be made known to the judge when he is appointed, not to the hon. Member.

MR. WARREN:

That is why it should be public.

PREMIER WELLS:

The second question was?

MR. PARSONS:

Was there any political interference?

PREMIER WELLS:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, it is the Premier who has a political responsibility to answer to this House, not a judge.

Now, let me ask the Premier once again, in view of the fact that the Premier is not answering to this House and says he will not answer to this House as to what other information he based his decision on to give the Minister the flick, will there be a public inquiry so that the public will be able to judge the information that will be presented in a public forum, if the Premier is not prepared to take his responsibility and present the information to this House when the appropriate questions are asked?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. gentlemen opposite who addressed this question do not have any belief in the principle of presumption of innocence until proven guilty. Maybe they presume people to be innocent and they are not prepared to let normal processes take their course.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition stood in this House and said that the Government had acted quickly, in a prudent way, and whatever the result is, the result is. Now, that is exactly what we are doing. But I am not about to sit or stand in this House and have hon. Members opposite conduct their own personal inquiry of the

matter, when we are going to appoint a judge to do just that.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

Is the Premier aware that allegations have been made that the former Minister of Social Services politically interfered in the issuing of social assistance, in the form of accommodations, for a single able-bodied person? And is he aware that as a result of a visit by a client to the Minister's office, accompanied by a member of the media, that the Minister's Executive Assistant and that media person returned to the Social Services Office and, as a result of that return visit, the decision was reversed, from board and lodgings to a furnished apartment?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
I have no knowledge of what the hon. Member is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, the situation I just outlined, does the Premier see that situation as political interference, or has the Department's policy changed with regard to providing accommodations for single able-bodied people?

Would the Premier have the matter investigated? Should not the inquiry be broadened to look at all aspects of political interference by the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member has any basis for the suggestion he just put forward, all he has to do is let me have it and I will see that it is checked. He can make it, and I will make the result public, make it known in the House. But I am not about to embark upon a witch-hunt because the hon. Member has made some allegations which may or may not have any foundation in fact.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of contradictions, the Minister who is in a rush to try and resettle Newfoundland under a new name, amalgamation.

Let me say to the Minister responsible for amalgamation, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that the Premier has publicly stated that any town or community that does not wish to be amalgamated does not have to be, and since certain towns that were on the original list have been removed, why is the Minister continuing to hold feasibility hearings in certain areas where the council and the citizens have decided that they do not want

amalgamation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

A good question, Mr. Speaker, a very good question, and one we addressed and discussed and decided, in the best interests of the 115 communities involved, that it would be wiser to proceed with the feasibility hearings to give the people and the councils, community groups and others, an opportunity to speak to the hearings, speak to the commissioners, present briefs, orally or written, and have their views known, knowing that in some cases, as the Member has suggested, some of the councils were in opposition to the feasibility process. But we felt it wise to let them have an opportunity to say that, and let others have an opportunity to speak, knowing that it was possible that they could change their minds, having heard other people in the community and other presentations of briefs. So, the Government felt it wise to proceed with feasibility studies in all cases involved in the forty-five groupings of communities.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member from Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I know of districts in the Province - my colleague from Green Bay and his district - and the citizens of the communities have unanimously rejected amalgamation, as have councils in other places. If the people have made the decision that they do not want amalgamation, why does the Minister and the people

he has appointed as Commissioners, the people who work for him, who know the answer he wants, insist on having the hearings where people unanimously rejected this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Provincial and Municipal Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the same question worded a little differently, but the answer once again is that we had to hear from the people in the hearings process. The Act clearly sets out a feasibility process to be followed through public hearings, and those hearings and that procedure had to be followed. This gives the opportunity for those who are for or against the amalgamation to have their say, and to do so in a properly set out procedure, as required by the Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

After listening to that, Mr. Speaker, and after hearing what the Premier has already stated on amalgamation, can I ask the Minister very briefly who is in charge of amalgamation? Is it the Minister or the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Provincial and Municipal Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

The Government is, of course, ultimately in charge of amalgamation, but the feasibility process and the hearings process is my responsibility as the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Premier. Yesterday, the Federal Defence Department released the environmental impact study on low level flying in Labrador. Would the Premier advise the House if his Government endorses the findings of this report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The EIS study has been released. The study is made up of several volumes. Government is currently examining the details of the study and will be releasing a position paper on various aspects of the study over the next few weeks, as we do our analyses of the process, because it has been a long and involved process so far.

What we are trying to determine at this stage is if, in fact, there were any major deficiencies in this process. And we have, I believe it is something like twelve weeks, to determine if there are any major deficiencies. So we are first looking at it from the point of view of, are there any major deficiencies in this report? Then, as we reach our conclusions on this, we will be notifying the House and notifying the people of the Province as to Government's position. Then, if

there are no major deficiencies, we will get into a hearing process. The Government's position is what it has been for some time, that we want to see economic development in the Province but not at the expense of the total way of life of the native people.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary is to the Premier. If the hon. Member wants to answer, that is fine. Also in the report there were two particular items: One. 'The effect on wildlife are difficult to determine because too few studies have taken place.' The second one is, 'As for the impact on people, report conclusions are vague.' Now, with those two revelations, is the Minister satisfied that the NATO training center should go in Goose Bay, knowing that the studies are not complete on wildlife, and the report conclusions on the impact on the people is very vague at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I am not willing to do at this point on behalf of Government is to make any rash statements based on a line or two that happens to be contained in the summary document. We want to have a look at the whole study to find out what information they are talking about, and then we will

make a rational, reasoned, sensible response.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the Minister of Fisheries, I will direct my question to the Premier. In light of the Minister of Fisheries' recent statements concerning the tightening up of loan guarantees to fish companies -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is here.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am sorry! I will wait until the Minister takes his seat. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries is, in light of his recent statements concerning the tightening up of loan guarantees to fish companies throughout the Province, will the Minister confirm for the House that loan guarantees have been issued to Oceana Seafoods of Twillingate, and inform the House of the amount of the guarantees and when they were issued?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, a loan guarantee was made to the company in question. It was in mid-summer, and the amount was for \$500,000.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the

Minister is that over and above an amount that was in place before to the company, or is that the only outstanding loan guarantee to Oceana? The Minister can answer that in answering the supplementary. From information I have, there are a number of pending plant closures in the Province over the next number of weeks because of Government reluctance, or dragging its feet on issuing further guarantees. It seems the new policy of Government is to withdraw greater support for the fishing industry. As we all know in this Province, if ever there was a time for the Provincial Government to offer more financial assistance to the fishery, it is now.

Will the Minister, when he gets to his feet, explain to the House why the guarantee was issued to Oceana? Was it merely because the plant is located in his district?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

The last comment is not worthy of an answer. I think he knows better. I should point out to the hon. Member, in the House, that in recent months there have been a number of loan guarantees given to various companies, including one to the plant in Twillingate. Based on the advice of the Department of Finance, the Department of Development and my own officials, it was felt that the company was entitled to that guarantee and it was good business sense to make it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister still

did not answer whether or not the \$500,000 loan guarantee is on top of or in addition to other loan guarantees which are in existence with the company, and have been put in place over the last five or six months.

I would like to direct a supplementary to the Premier: Does he not find it somewhat peculiar, in light of the Minister's revelation, that a \$500,000 loan guarantee has been issued to Oceana, in the Minister's district, over the last few months? And is it not somewhat peculiar that just last Thursday the President of Oceana Seafoods, Mr. Etchegary, was appointed Chairman of The Fisheries Advisory Council, a body that will advise the Minister on major policy and program initiatives in this Province? Does the Premier not think that that is a little bit fishy and probably borders on conflict of interest?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not. There have been quite a number of loan guarantees, and they will come before the House for approval in the next few weeks; a number of loan guarantees to various industrial and business enterprises that genuinely need help and where that could be justified. For some fish plants, not alone in Twillingate, but in other areas of the Province, wherever it was appropriate, that was done. As to the appointment to the Advisory Committee of the gentleman mentioned, I assume he is the most qualified, and reliable, and able to do it, and I do not see why the hon. Member

should try to castigate the man for that reason.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. You cannot be one way on this side and another way on the other side. You have to accept that when you take on the responsibility of governing the Province. There has been only one loan guarantee issued in the Province to a company, the President of which has now become Chairman of the Fisheries Advisory Council, so again I ask the Premier, does he not sense here that it all ties into the Minister of Fisheries, having the loan approved for Oceana in Twillingate and then, just a short time after, having the President of that company appointed Chairman of his Fisheries Advisory Council? Seriously, it does look a little suspicious, and will the Premier not agree that there is a potential conflict of interest there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Frankly, it escapes me. Maybe I am missing something. If I am, maybe the hon. Member would let me know. But I do not see how continuing a loan guarantee -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Continuing? It is new.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know whether it is new, or it is adding.

MR. W. CARTER:

It was \$1.9 million under the

previous administration.

PREMIER WELLS:

The former administration thought that endeavour was of such merit that they provided loan guarantees totalling \$1.9 million, and they were probably right. Was it an additional \$500,000?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes.

PREMIER WELLS:

The additional \$500,000 provided on a temporary basis now probably is a confirmation by the new Government that what the former Government did in granting the loan guarantee of \$1.9 million was probably sound, so I have no quarrel with that. Now the question is, does that somehow disqualify the individual from being on the Fisheries Advisory Council? Is that somehow a conflict of interest?

Well, as I say, maybe I am overlooking something. If I am, I would appreciate the hon. Member telling me what he thinks I am overlooking, because I do not see any inherent conflict. It would be very helpful to have the advice of somebody who is experienced in the Fisheries available on the Fisheries Advisory Council, so I frankly see nothing wrong with it. I do not really see any potential for conflict, but if there is, we would act immediately to correct it. I do not see the basis for it merely because the hon. Member says so, or he wants to somehow try and create the impression that there is.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The former member for Carbonear was the answer to your question, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put another question to the Premier, because I think it is very important. There is a tremendous amount of confusion out around Newfoundland and Labrador today about the whole amalgamation issue, a tremendous amount of confusion as to whether or not towns will come in voluntarily or involuntarily. I noticed today, when my colleague put a question to the Minister, that the Premier was again shaking his head. Let me ask the Premier directly if it is Government's position, as articulated by the Premier in various parts of the Province, that no town in Newfoundland and Labrador will be forced to amalgamate against their wishes? Is that Government's position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the whole question that was raised today. The Minister stated the Government's policy very clearly. We want to make sure. Even where towns say we do not want to amalgamate, the examination process is going to take place so that we can provide them with information that will enable them to make a sound and sensible judgement and give other people in the town an opportunity to express their opinion. We spelled out our position very clearly on that. There is not an iota of difference between the hon. Minister and any other Member of the Government with respect to that. The Government has also stated very clearly its position that once the

assessment is done, if towns do not want to amalgamate and they are opposed to it, the Government will not force amalgamation on towns that do not want to amalgamate. The Government will not force amalgamation on towns that do not want to amalgamate. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say it a third time: "The Government will not force amalgamation on towns that do not want to amalgamate."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know how many more times the Minister or I have to say it before it penetrates. I remember what my law partner used to say about people who took that position: 'A person convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still.' It is clear that hon. Members opposite who are convinced against their will of what the Government's position really is, still want to hold on to their own opinion. Well, Mr. Speaker, the position is very clear. We have spelled it out. The Government will not force amalgamation.

Whether this House will decide that it should be done or not in the interest of the people, the House will decide and there can be an open public debate on it, and I could conceive of a circumstance where it might be possible. I think it highly unlikely that it would ever come before the House, but I could conceive of a circumstance where one particular town, or two, may be doing something totally wrong, totally against the overall interest of the Province. Then, the House will decide as the House should decide.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Let me say to the hon. the Premier, thanks to his statements and statements made by the Minister, it is not people over here who need to be informed, it is the Minister and the general population of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Having made the unequivocal statement he just made, let me ask the Premier this: Labrador City, Wabush, Steady Brook and other communities objected to amalgamation and have since been taken off the list, why is it that no feasibility studies are going ahead in those communities but are going ahead in other communities that objected? Why is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

It is very obvious for anybody who is prepared to stop and think about it. They were not taken off the list because they objected. It is very simple. They were taken off the list for other good reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The reason for Steady Brook is it is in your district.

PREMIER WELLS:

It is not in my district.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is for political reasons. That is the reason.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

On behalf of hon. Members, I would like to welcome to the public galleries today eleven students and their co-ordinator from the Western Community College, Stephenville, where these students are pursuing a small business entrepreneurship program. I would like to welcome them on behalf of all hon. Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Motion 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Orders of the Day were called, but before we call Orders of the Day there are other statutory items on the Order Paper that must be at least called. I have a colleague who wanted to present a petition, for example, but Petitions have not yet been called.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry. The Chair was of the understanding that this being Private Member's Day, we called Orders of the Day. I looked at the clock and there were just two minutes to go, and decided that I would call Orders of the Day.

MR. SIMMS:
Right. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER:
Because on Wednesday hon. Members will know we go into Orders of the Day at 3:00 o'clock, and thinking there would not be time to do anything within two minutes, I called Orders of the Day.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
A further point of order. That being the case, in other words, Your Honour has called it 3:00 o'clock, basically?

MR. SPEAKER:
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:
That being the case I think the Standing Orders also say 'That debate on the resolution on Private Member's Day must begin', it says 4:00 o'clock, 'obviously 3:00 o'clock' because of the new rules. Therefore, the first readings would not be permitted either, in my estimation. Therefore the hon. the President of the Council and Government House Leader now would probably just as soon forget he even stood and asked for first readings, is that what he is saying?

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House

Leader (Mr. Simms) enjoys playing his little games, and I enjoy the Opposition House Leader. I understand, Mr. Speaker, the slight confusion that was here in the terms of the calling of The Orders of the Day.

Your Honour looked at the clock and assumed that it was 3:00 of the clock, and therefore quite rightly called Orders of the Day. When I looked at the clock from a slightly different angle, Mr. Speaker - because we are at a different angle - it looked to me as if there were a couple of minutes left and that we could get through a first reading under Orders of the Day. However, it is now 3:00 o'clock and I would like Your Honour's indulgence for a moment. There has been some discussion with the Opposition during the last number of hours. At this particular time it is normally Private Member's Day and we were dealing with a private Member's resolution from the Government side of the House. However, I believe there has been agreement that the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan) introduce a resolution for debate today that is of utmost importance, dealing with the unemployment insurance situation in the Country. I believe there has been agreement on both sides but this can be confirmed by the Opposition House Leader.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions, and the way we view it is that, basically, it is another Resolution, albeit proper notice has not been given. so we are prepared to take leave of the

fact that the proper notice has not been given, and we are prepared to debate this Resolution.

The only thing I would like to have clarified, from the point of view of procedure for the future, is that this will count as a Resolution from the Government side on Private Members Day, and that next Wednesday's resolution will be one submitted by the Opposition. If we can have that clarified, and agreed to, then we have absolutely no difficulty in proceeding.

I will ask the Government House Leader to clarify one other thing, right at the beginning, before the Minister gets up to introduce the Resolution. She has spoken to me privately and I understand she has difficulty with closing the debate because she has to leave, and she wondered if we would have any difficulty in allowing, I think, her colleague the Member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), to close the debate on the Resolution. If that is a request, we would agree with it. We have no difficulty with that - if that is indeed the case.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I thank the Opposition House Leader and the Opposition for acceding to that request that was made privately by the Minister.

With regards to the other item brought up by the Opposition House Leader, we have, during our brief association in our present roles, had a very convivial relationship in terms of Private Members Day. It is our attitude that it should be, by and large, an Opposition day, and we have been allowing

more Opposition resolutions than Government resolutions. I think that is only right and proper. I would assure the Opposition House Leader that, absolutely, next week the Opposition will be able to choose the resolution for debate during Private Members Day.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair understands then, that the House agrees to the procedures outlined, and we will forego the normal regulations required for this Resolution. I will call upon the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to introduce the Resolution and to proceed with the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to move the following Resolution:

Resolution

WHEREAS 146,000 persons in the Province received Unemployment Benefits last year in the amount of 752 million dollars.

AND WHEREAS the Federal Government is presently proposing changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act that would significantly reduce the amount of benefits received by residents of this Province and significantly reduce the number of residents eligible for these benefits.

AND WHEREAS everyone is in agreement that a decrease in

Unemployment Insurance dependence is most desirable, however any proposed changes to the system must address the issue of short-term dynamics during the transitional period leading to a decrease in dependency, and Bill C-21 does not address this.

AND WHEREAS over the past number of years, both levels of Government have induced residents of the Province to depend on an annual income security system that includes seasonal make-work projects supplemented by Unemployment Insurance benefits, both the Federal and Provincial Governments have a responsibility to ensure that people affected have an alternate income security system to ensure an adequate level of income during the transition period.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House endorse the Provincial Government's position that implementation of the proposed changes be delayed until a financial program is developed to ensure that people adversely affected will have adequate income during the transition period.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Everything is agreed so the Member may carry on.

MS COWAN:

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in 1986 the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment in its report commented, 'to remove UI without replacing it by an alternative income security scheme would be to condemn hundreds of Newfoundland and Labradorian families to abject poverty and the stigma of welfare.' Sadly, I rise today to report that the Federal Government

is about to enact Bill C 21, part of their Labour Force Development Strategy. Without immediate attention this Bill will condemn, not hundreds, but thousands of Newfoundland and Labrador families to uncertain futures where poverty and welfare will be commonplace. No one can refute, Mr. Speaker, the need to decrease dependence on UI. The Federal Government spent \$752 million in 1988 in this Province on UI payments. It is easy to understand that it feels this is too much, but who is being asked to bear the brunt of this heartless effort called fiscal responsibility? The answer, Mr. Speaker, are the thousands of the Province's people who have been forced into a lifestyle and economy that centers around welfare and UI, a lifestyle that has been spawned and developed by make-work projects set up by the Federal and Provincial Governments. Now, with little time to even study the proposal - never mind the time needed to provide safety nets for those who will suffer because of it - Bill C 21 today in Ottawa receives third reading. While the nation was distracted by discussions about the GST and other issues of national and international consequence, this ill considered legislation has been slipped through Parliament.

In April of this year the Federal Government released a policy paper entitled 'Success in the Works' outlining a labour force development strategy for Canada that included changes to the Unemployment Insurance Program. On August 10 the Federal Minister released an impact assessment of changes to the UI program indicating that the impacts would be marginal in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, owing to the high rate

of unemployment. On September 18 the Federal Legislative Committee met in St. John's. Most witnesses expressed the fear that the proposed changes would have a devastating impact on many people and communities in this Province. In July my officials began to express to me concerns that the new labour force development strategy was not the rosy coloured picture painted by the labour strategy proposal called 'Success in the Works,' an unfortunate title, a tragically ironic title for a document that will bring further hardship, further hardship to already sorely pressed individuals. As a result, a Cabinet committee consisting of the Ministers of Employment, Education, Fisheries, Finance and Social Services was formed. Subsequently, Dr. Doug May, Dr. Sherry May of Memorial University, and Dr. Michael Denny of the University of Toronto, all three considered to be among the leading Social Economists in Canada, were hired to assess the impact. In two months, a study of major proportions was prepared, and will be released today. Following speaking to you, I will be addressing the media, and releasing a copy to them. All MHA's will find the report at your office, upon your return. The Prime Minister of Canada, The hon. Brian Mulroney, has been forwarded a proposal and the reaction of our Government, as has the Minister of Employment at the national level, The hon. Barbara McDougall, as have all Newfoundland MP's. The findings of this document are staggering, to say the least, but first Mr. Speaker, what is the Labour Force Development Strategy designed to achieve? It has four goals: an increase in the private sector's role in training, a realignment within the UI Program

so that funds are directed to training, an improved parental benefit program and a more stringent approach for those who quit voluntarily. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that nearly everyone would be pleased to see an alternative lifestyle for our Newfoundland and Labrador people that is not dependent on UI, and the strategy, in the long term, will go a long way to reach that desirable goal. However, while moving toward the objective, many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will suffer unduly. There is no protection for these people in the strategy, in fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no acknowledgement that such individuals even exist. It seems that in Ottawa, there is the misguided notion that people here will find the extra three weeks work they need to qualify. I ask you Mr. Speaker, where will they go to find that work, will they be forced to head for Central Canada, or to live a hand to mouth existence here? Bill C 21 was created by Central Canadians for Central Canada. The Provincial impact study indicates that a far greater number of people will be impacted adversely by the Amendments to the UI Act than the Federal Government has identified. Why is there such a difference in the two studies? The Federal Government, in their analysis, assume that individuals affected by the new changes will respond to the situation by working additional weeks. Given the employment situation in Newfoundland and Labrador - the notion that a large number of individuals will find additional weeks of work, is ill conceived, no, it is appallingly heartless. Our Province's economy is simply not able to respond to the situation. The Avalon region may have 11,000 who could potentially

lose benefits, if they are unable to find an additional three weeks work. Thousands are working in in-shore fish plants. The Provincial analysis indicates that the number of people losing UI benefits, as a result of the reduction in the benefits entitlement period, may be as high as 30,000, with the actual losses in income greater than thirty million. All three UI regions in the Province will be affected. In addition some 6,000 will lose benefits as a result of increased penalties for voluntary quits. Some people may be impacted by more than one measure, and Mr. Speaker, I ask you to understand that these calculations are based on 1988 figures, and do not take into account the job loss that will be created by the reduction in fish quotas. The Labour Force Development Strategy, of which Bill C-21 is a part, does have long term benefits for this Province, but many are at risk in the short term, and there are others who will always be at risk. It is essential that these individuals have some form of protection during the transition period. Some form of income security must exist for those affected. Adjustment programs must be available for those who do not benefit from training programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must remind the Federal Government of a Canadian commitment to not only recognize, but to address regional disparity. Not one Newfoundlander or Labradorian, nor one other Canadian, must be allowed to suffer because of the Labour Force Development Strategy. Success in the works must be shown to be aiming for success for every Canadian. There must be success for the people of Foxtrap, for the people of Conche, of Harbour

Grace, Black Tickle, Twillingate, Burgeo, Witless Bay. As I name the communities all of us here can see, in our mind's eye, the faces of the individuals who live there. Each and everyone of us, including the Federal M.Ps., have not only an elected responsibility, but a moral responsibility to the people suffering from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this Assembly must, with one voice, call upon Ottawa today to delay the proposed changes. A program must be developed that will ease the people of our Province painlessly toward the success envisioned by the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to see the Minister of Labour (Ms Cowan) bring this resolution into the House of Assembly today, to look at the possible affects that the changes to the unemployment insurance program are going to have upon the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am very pleased to see the Government say anything, as a matter of fact, with respect to the unemployment insurance situation in our Province. If there is one problem that eats away at the heart of any individual, that eats away at the heart of any community, any

society, any family, it has to be unemployment, and our dependency upon the unemployment insurance system, here in the Province of Newfoundland.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to stand here today, as one Member of the House of Assembly, and defend in any way, shape or form, any changes to the unemployment insurance system here in the Province of Newfoundland, unless and until some very fundamental considerations are afforded the people of this Province, by the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

It has been the position that it is, and it continues to be the position of the Members on this side of the House, that until the unemployment rate in the Province of Newfoundland is comparable to what it is nationally, that we will not tolerate any changes to the U.I. that impact negatively upon our Newfoundland people. That is clear, that is definite, and that is unmistakable. And that is the message, I believe, that the Federal Government has to be given today, by all Members of the House of Assembly. I would encourage the Minister to be strong on this particular issue, and I would encourage the Government to be aggressive on this particular issue in dealing with the Federal Government, because it is vital to the people of Newfoundland.

We are living in a Province, Mr. Speaker, that continues, in spite of an awful lot of effort over the last number of years, outside the periphery of prosperity. And the

Government cannot, in our view, and it should not, tolerate any further hardship being imposed upon the people of Newfoundland by any reductions, any reductions, in our social programs. The unemployment insurance system in Newfoundland is a social program. Eight hundred million dollars, I believe the Minister of Employment indicated, somewhere between \$700 million and \$800 million comes into the Province each year from unemployment insurance. So it has to be regarded as a very, very, important program for our Newfoundland people, and we certainly, as I indicated a moment ago, do not want to see that changed until the unemployment rate is brought down to the national average.

We did, Mr. Speaker, recently present a paper on this to the Federal Committee, when they met in the Province some time ago, upon the possible effects that it might have upon the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. But we find now that the Minister is coming in today with a new analysis of the economic impact, and it seems to be even more devastating than what we originally thought it would be.

Bill C-21, I believe, is before the House of Commons right now. We are hearing an awful lot of conflicting reports, as a matter of fact, as to what the final outcome of that will be. We are hoping that the Federal Government will make a few changes in Committee or on the Floor of the House of Commons, that will lessen somewhat the economic impact that we are hearing this will have upon the Province. I would encourage the Federal Government today, to step very cautiously when dealing with unemployment insurance in

Newfoundland, because it is a very, very important program. The Federal Government has to be made realize, they have to come to the realization that you are not dealing with Ontario or Quebec or Alberta or British Columbia, where economic opportunities are much more available to the people. You are dealing with a Province that has the highest unemployment rate in all of Canada. Any changes that are made to the U.I. - as I said, we do not support any changes until our unemployment rate is at the national average - but if they persist in going ahead with changes to The Unemployment Insurance Act, these changes should reflect the economic problems that we have here in Newfoundland.

Last week we were hearing reports that 9,000 people would lose their benefits completely because of these changes. We were also told last week, that out of the 97,200 Newfoundlanders collecting U.I. benefits every year, 26,000 will see a reduction in claims. We are told as well that these changes translate into a \$70 million loss to our Newfoundland economy.

The report that the Minister is bringing in today paints even a bleaker picture of that, and shows that the initial reports that we had with respect to the economic impact, may very well not be accurate. I am hoping that some of the figures contained in this report today are not accurate. Let us hope. But that is probably not the case.

We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to on the one hand have great concern for unemployment insurance in Newfoundland, and at the same time cancel out our own employment programs. That is what we have

been doing. That is what the Government has been doing over the last seven month period, with respect to the Private Sector Employment Program. That was the program that provided about 3,000 jobs to our people each year, here in Newfoundland. It provided some meaningful jobs and we had a lot of enthusiastic people in Newfoundland, employers, hoping that that Program would continue.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, it provided an awful lot of long-term jobs, because figures that I recently obtained from the Minister's Department, indicate that 61 per cent of the people who were employed on those programs, continued to be employed even after the program had run its course. So it is very, very important, that we not only indicate to the Federal Government that we do not want any changes to the unemployment insurance system in Newfoundland, but that we also demonstrate to the Federal Government that we are concerned enough to keep our own employment programs in place here in the Province. When you consider the Private Sector Employment Program and the 3,000 jobs that it created, you have to think about fifteen Long Harbours, and possibly ten Come By Chances, and twenty fish plants in the Province, 3,000 jobs that were created under the Private Sector Employment Program. So as I said, Mr. Speaker, we have to demonstrate to the Federal Government that not only are we concerned about unemployment insurance, but we are concerned about creating employment as well. Because it demonstrates, I believe, a certain hypocrisy on the part of the Government, to say that they are concerned about unemployment insurance, but still

come up with the business of cancelling programs, here and there, that provide meaningful opportunities for our people.

In going over some of the changes to the unemployment insurance scheme over the last number of weeks, Mr. Speaker, one issue which was of a very, very, serious concern to Members on this side of the House, was the boundary issue. The very serious boundary issue that has to be dealt with under this program. We have made the Federal Government aware of it, and hopefully some changes will be made. Because what you had happening, with respect to the boundaries in a number of areas in the Province, was that the whole of the Avalon Peninsula, for instance, for the purpose of setting the unemployment rate, was lumped into one region. Everything between St. John's and Goobies was considered to be the Avalon Peninsula, for the purpose of setting the unemployment rate. And that would prove, I believe, in the long run, Your Honour, to be a very bad move by the Federal Government, if it remained unchanged, simply because you had areas of relatively high employment, like the urban areas here in St. John's and Mount Pearl, lumped in with areas of high unemployment on the Avalon Peninsula. And that continues, as far as we know at this point in time, to be the case. These areas of high employment, the urban areas, St. John's and Mount Pearl, are still lumped in with the areas of high unemployment. And we have, as an Opposition, because of our objections to these changes, hopefully convinced the Federal Government to change those boundaries so that they accurately and adequately reflect the true employment and unemployment

picture around the Province. You cannot have an area that has an active service industry, like urban areas lumped in with those areas that have no service industry at all, because the service industry, as everyone is aware, is a relatively good employer and will artificially create a low employment rate for the high unemployment areas. It sounds a little bit complicated, but that is how it goes when you have areas that are urban areas, lumped in with the rural areas of the Province. We do not know what the Federal Government is going to come up with on that, but hopefully, if they do not have their heads buried too far in the sand on the whole issue, they will listen and they will take heed, and realize that we live in Newfoundland, that we do not live in Ontario, we do not live in Quebec, we do not live in Alberta or B.C., where the economic opportunities are so much better than they are here in Newfoundland, that we do live in a Province with the highest unemployment rate in Canada, and hopefully they will do that. It is the number one problem that we have, and I think the Government has to realize that it is the number one problem that we have today.

Getting down to the Government report, we certainly hope that it is not accurate, because it contains information that is much more serious than what we had originally thought it would be. It contains information that is much more serious than what we had originally been led to believe. In the Avalon region, with an unemployment rate of between 12 and 13 per cent, 11,000 people will lose their benefits if they cannot find three additional weeks

of employment, and 3000 of those people are women. 3,000 of the 11,000 people who will lose their benefits completely, are women who have been involved in the inshore fish plant sector, or who have been employed in inshore fish plants around the Province. Three additional weeks may not sound like a great deal, and I guess it is not if you are living in Ontario, Alberta or British Columbia, because it is not all that difficult, I guess, to come by three weeks. But I can tell you it is very, very difficult indeed, if you have ten weeks of employment, to come up with three extra weeks here in Newfoundland. I know it to be a fact. I have been working on trying to get a weeks work for about six or seven people for a period of three weeks, and it is very, very difficult to come up with one extra week of employment, not to mention three weeks. That could be very, very devastating for the people in Newfoundland. In the Fortuen Bay - Gander area they have an unemployment rate of 14.5 per cent, and 8000 people would have to work one additional week to qualify for unemployment insurance, with an unemployment rate of 14.5 per cent. In the Corner Brook and Labrador area, these changes probably will not have any great impact on people at all. It sounds a little bit ironic to say, 'Thank heavens they have an unemployment rate that is high, because they will not have any negative impact from this,' but that is the situation. CIC are saying 40,000 people will lose about \$20 million, and the personal income reduction is \$112 million, that in turn will create a shortfall in provincial revenues of about \$15 million, I say to the Minister of Finance. It is going to have an effect as well, we are

told, on the Government, in that their community development projects which they have each year, run for a ten week period, and they are going to have to be extended now. They will probably have to be extended to eleven, twelve, thirteen or fourteen weeks, depending upon what area of the Province you happen to be living in, because, sad to say, these programs are geared in terms of duration, to having an individual qualify for unemployment insurance, after he finishes on that program. That is going to have a negative effect upon the provincial economy as well, and it is forecast that the Government will have to come up with \$3.5 million extra, within the Department of Social Services, if they continue their Community Development Program. I certainly hope the Government is not contemplating closing out that program, as they did with the Private Sector Employment Program. We cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that all this is lumped in with a failed fishery. In areas of our Province we have had a fishery that has failed this year. A construction industry that just about died, and as I said before, a Government that cancelled out the Private Sector Employment Program. It is like kicking an individual when they are down, Mr. Speaker, for the Federal Government to come up with these changes to the Unemployment Insurance Program right now, when the Government is asking for Federal support. That is fine, we support that, but as I said before, what you have to do is demonstrate to the Federal Government that you are taking steps as well, as a Government, to reduce and minimize our dependency upon the unemployment insurance program here in the Province. And

you do not do that by cancelling out very, very meaningful employment programs.

This report, I notice, has a date of September, 1989 printed on the cover. I guess the question I would pose to the Government right now is; why has it taken the Government so long to put together a paper on this, and to bring it here before the House of Assembly. Here it is November, and we have this report dated sometime in September - since September, 1989. So presumably, it has taken a couple of months for the Government to bring this report to the House of assembly, and to have some action taken upon it. I think that there is more urgency to the unemployment problem in Newfoundland than that. So the Government could be a little bit more expeditious in the way it is dealing with the problem. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, must not only be asked by the Provincial Government to delay - I think the Government is pussy footing around on the thing and I do not think they are being strong enough, as a matter of fact - they must not only be told or asked to delay implementation of these changes to the unemployment insurance system, they should be bloody well told that you are not going to tolerate as a Government, any changes being made to the unemployment insurance system in Newfoundland, until and unless the unemployment rate is brought down to the national average. So again I say to the Government that they have to be a little bit more aggressive, if you will, in their approach to the whole problem, and to indicate to the Federal Government that they are not willing to tolerate any further changes.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated a few minutes ago, we on this side of the House had a position paper presented to the Federal Government recently when they were here in St. John's doing their hearings on this particular problem. And I must say - and I will use the opportunity again to take a crack at that Committee - we were very, very disappointed that the Committee, while they were in town, chose not to meet with the Provincial politicians. We are the people who represent the people of Newfoundland and Labrador - 100 per cent of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. There were numerous interest groups who did meet with the Federal Committee - and I am not being critical of these people - they represent their own interests, their own particular group of people. But there is nobody who represents the interests of 100 per cent of the people of Newfoundland as much as do the Provincial politicians.

Now I see the Speaker is pointing to his watch and indicating that my time is up, so I will just conclude by saying that we support the resolution that the Minister of Employment and Labor Relations has put forth today, but we would say to the Minister that it does not go far enough. It should not only say to the Federal Government that we want them to delay implementation of the proposed changes, we should be saying as well that we do not want any changes made to the U.I. until the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and Labrador is reduced to the national average. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of things about this most important resolution brought in by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The results of this kind of ad hoc procedure that the Federal Government has chosen to follow will be felt for a long time in our Province, and I feel it cannot be taken lightly. We have here something that goes right to the core of my district. Unlike individuals in the previous speaker's district, for whom he is looking for one week's work, I have people in my district who have only one week of work. Now, where will they get the other nine - possibly ten now - weeks required to qualify for UI? We do not have the benefit of the urban area, here on the Avalon.

They have chosen also, I might add, to lump the District of LaPoile in with Central Newfoundland, which has two to three large urban centres. So the district of LaPoile, which has a number of smaller fishing communities, and even the large centres in the District of LaPoile, is severely affected by the poor inshore fishery, the failure of the inshore fishery, and they have chosen to lump it together and give us an unemployment rate of 14.6 per cent. Now 14.6 per cent is far and away from the unemployment rate of my district, even for the largest community in the district, Port aux Basques; it is much above 20 per cent in the majority of the district. I wonder, sometimes, if it is the political party in power, the Government the previous

speaker helped elect, that is doing this, or can we blame the federal bureaucracy? The ultimate responsibility for this lies with the political power, the Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa.

I think we would be happy to send a copy of the hon. Member's speech to his colleagues in Ottawa, whom he helped elect, just to make sure that he gets the message across.

Another thing I would like to draw attention to, Mr. Speaker, is a quote from the Royal Commission on Unemployment. It states, "To remove the unemployment insurance system without replacing it by an alternative income security scheme would be to condemn hundreds of Newfoundland families to abject poverty and the stigma of welfare". Now, this statement is in light of the situation at that time. Currently we have a failure in the fishery, a reduction in the quotas for offshore, and possibly inshore will be affected, and they offer no alternative. It has been put on the fast track through the House of Commons; used closure on it just to tidy it away, to get it out of the way. They do not want to deal with it. They do not want to deal with Newfoundland again, as they have chosen so much over the last while to put us behind the curtain, as the saying goes.

In my district, as I mentioned, there is a total lack of stability. How are the people there going to survive the winter? I am very worried. I do not know what to do for these people. In a lot of cases it might be easy, as the hon. Member stated, to go look for one week of work, but if I have to try to look for ten or eleven weeks of work for some of these people to assist

them, it puts us all in a compromised position. I do not feel the Government of Canada should do this kind of thing, because it really puts us in a very, very difficult situation.

Another thing I want to bring to the attention of this hon. House is that, in a lot of cases, with the scenario as far as fishermen are concerned, they have fish stamps and land stamps, and it is all pretty much a convoluted mess when you have labour involved and mixed together with the fishermen's UI system. They do not come up with an alternative or some way of categorizing this, so we end up with a case where a fisherman with three land stamps, will require twelve or thirteen fishing stamps, or the number of stamps in total. It is just a total mess that they have allowed to happen. They have not addressed that. So what are we to assume, that the fishermen's UI system is next on the cutting block? One is left to assume that. They have now, I suppose you could say, privatized the UI system; they have taken the unemployment insurance system and made it self-sufficient in their efforts to make the unemployment insurance system more efficient. They have combined it together so that the general revenue of Government does not have any place in the UI system, and, therefore, now they have to create a premise whereby the Government monies do not have to go into the unemployment insurance system.

The way they are going, will they now take the UI system and sell it, as they plan to do with the Post Office? It is conceivable. If the unemployment insurance system could make a profit, and I mean profit in excess of revenue

going into the plan and the way they would prefer to allow money to come out of the plan through this plan and others, the way they plan to realign it, then maybe it will be a viable money-maker for Government, to utilize this excess revenue. I just offer that as food for thought.

There are a couple of other things I want to note. One is that one of our colleagues in Ottawa, the hon. Fred Mifflin, on June 1 in the House Debates on legislation, talking about the release from the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Ms McDougall), quoted her as saying in her statement, 'The legislation strengthens the ability of the UI program to continue to act as an economic safety net by focusing on those in need.' Indeed, that is quite a statement to make in light of Newfoundland's situation at the current moment.

He then tabled a letter of rejection for funding under the Job Development Program, and that letter stated that the Job Development Program is not designed to be a safety net. In areas like my own District, where fishermen who do not qualify are in need of a fisheries response program, they say well, we cannot do anything to put you on UI other than to help you with a job development program; this is the way we will do it and you have to have X number of weeks to qualify. Well, the majority of the fishermen in the District do not qualify, because they do not have enough weeks work anyway. So, this is the type of heavy-handed tactic we are seeing, a program being developed that no one will fit into.

So, okay, the Federal Government

will commit, say, \$500,000 to one of these programs, and it is something that precedes this realignment of UI, then, all of a sudden, they will say, well, there cannot be any unemployment in Newfoundland. No one applied for the program, no one has met the criteria, so there is no problem. This is the type of result we get when people in Ottawa are making decisions without consulting with us, the people who know the districts best. They are not consulting with Members of the Districts, Federal or Provincial. And this is a very dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that we can, through our efforts in speaking to this resolution today, be assured that this hon. House will put forth a message to the Federal Government, that message being that they have to take a closer look at this, do a complete reassessment of their efforts, and make sure that Newfoundland is not left trying to scramble out of this current situation, to a point where we will affect and hurt our efforts to improve the economy of the Province. We want to improve, of course. We want to make sure that our efforts to better and improve economic development, new ventures, whatever, here in the Province are good, but we cannot turn our backs on the current unemployment system as it now stands. We require that in the interim, as bad as it seems. As the previous speaker mentioned, we rely on this system somewhat, to the tune of \$752 million last year. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members here keep in mind, in any way we possibly can, getting this message across. Because people in Newfoundland will remember us not for what we do but for what we do not do. And if we do not address this properly, and

if we do not see to it that they change the way they are addressing this matter, then we are the ones who will have to deal with the results. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

I would like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to the resolution presented by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Unemployment.

MR. WOODFORD:

Or unemployment. Maybe so.

I would like to say that the resolution, as far as I am concerned, is not only a good, constructive resolution, it is also a timely one. I do not think any Member in this House - I suppose when it comes to the vote, we will all see - would vote against such a resolution. Sad to say, and I suppose we are all a part of it, when you look at UI as a motherhood issue in this Province, it says something for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and also for Canada, as a whole.

When we look at the figure of 146,000 persons in the Province who received unemployment insurance benefits last year, and when we look at the more staggering figure of \$752 million that was paid out, that is one of the biggest businesses in this Province, I would say, possibly, next to Government, where you are

looking at a Budget of \$3 billion per year. And when you look at the income from UI, \$752 million into the provincial economy, it says something for the Province, as a whole, no doubt. In looking at those figures, nobody should tamper with something that puts so much money into the economy of this Province. Although it is under the UI program, a program that none of us likes to see, to think of someone tampering with it, as far as I am concerned, is just something else.

Now, we have seven representatives for the Province on the Federal scene, two representing the Province in Government, in this case a P.C. Government, one as a Cabinet Minister. We have only one voice at the Cabinet Table, and I am sure I cannot see Mr. Crosbie sitting at the Cabinet Table and agreeing to bring in a program that would be detrimental to this Province. I have not seen the total content of the Bill, but I intend to. Some of the things that came out last spring in the election campaign, just previous to the provincial election, were taken to heart, and I can recall two or three of the most important things that were mentioned: there is a qualification period, the waiting period when you quit, and the different areas of the Province, east versus west, depending on the unemployment rate at the time.

We talk about regional disparity in Canada. We have it right in the Province. The very fact that we recognize that the Avalon Peninsula part of the Province would have to go to 14 or 16 weeks as a qualification period while the rest of the Province stays at ten, and then, if the unemployment rate came down to 11 per cent, I

think, or 11.5 per cent, or something like that, the same would be applicable across the Province, is evidence of the disparity within the Province, as a whole.

I note that in the fourth WHEREAS it says, "over the past number of years, both levels of Government have induced residents of the Province to depend on an annual income security system that includes seasonal make-work projects supplemented by Unemployment Insurance benefits..." I would not say that the Minister intended malice or anything like that, but when you start getting down to what happened in the past with resolutions such as this - I agree that it happened. I do not think for a minute that any Provincial Government or any Member of a Provincial Government, whether red, blue, or orange, would purposely try to put this Province in the light of \$752 million in unemployment benefits. There is always an element of blame, no doubt. But we as politicians, and I think there will be evidence of it here this evening, should stick together. This, as I have said, is a motherhood issue. We should not be blaming anybody. The past is the past. We have to look to the future.

The real change, as talked about by the other side for sometime last spring, is still talked about around the Province, more specifically by members opposite. I think one of the biggest changes you could make, especially speaking as Members of the House of Assembly, is to speak constructively and forget putting blame on the past, whether it be a Government, whether it be an individual or whatever. We have

to work together as Members of this Assembly on behalf of the people of the Province as a whole, and do it constructively. Yes, criticize the policies of both sides, as we are doing here this evening, but do it constructively, on behalf of the people of the Province.

The Fisheries Response Program, Mr. Speaker, this year is an example, as far as I am concerned, of the ignorance - I say ignorance in the sense, I suppose, of knowing what is going on here in the Province with regard to the fishery. I can speak on behalf of the residents of the White Bay South part of my District. A section of my district is dependent upon the fishery. To give you an example, in the community of Jackson's Arm this year we have 152 residents who need extra weeks to make up their ten weeks so that they can draw unemployment insurance. Out of the 152 who need it, only 77 people are eligible under the criteria now. Because as you know, anybody who was under the Fisheries Response Program last year needs six weeks to qualify this year, and anybody who was not under the Fisheries Response Program last year, needs three weeks to qualify this year. Last year was maybe not so bad. It was bad enough, but not too bad, and that is probably why we did not hear much of a cry.

I have people who worked 26 weeks, 27 weeks, 17 weeks, 18 weeks last year who got two weeks this year, or four weeks. I do not think there are many over ten weeks, maybe 11 or twelve, maximum. Out of the 26 people who did work and were fortunate enough to get on the Fisheries Response Program last year, in Jackson's Arm, only

one person is eligible under the criteria for this year's Program.

Harbour Deep, in the Leader of the Opposition's District, thirty-two need UI, out of which only eight are eligible. Now, this is only one small section of the Province, one small section, really, of the District. So, that tells you something. That tells you the importance with regard to unemployment insurance on one part, and that has to do with only the Fisheries Response Program.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes, that is right, in the old system.

Now, I have made representation, as we all did collectively and individually over the last number of months, because nobody around this Province had to wait until October to know that the fishery was bad. We could tell last June what the fishery was going to be like. It was only a matter of time, only a matter of saying whether they were going to get three, six or seven weeks. Everybody pretty well knew they were not going to get ten weeks. So we made representation that the criteria be changed, I suppose, for Canada generally, but for the Atlantic Provinces, and more specifically for here, this year, because of the downturn in the fishery, both inshore and offshore.

In the request we also asked that if we do have a Fisheries Response Program and those people are allowed to work under some new criteria that is going to be instituted by the Federal Government, hopefully that program will be used for everything, not

just something related to the fishery, so that the community of Jackson's Arm, for instance, or Sop's Arm, or Pollards Point or Hampden could have a program put in place to do something with the fire hall, or to do something with the Development Associations' offices, or something else around the community not tied strictly to the fishery. Because, as you know, in the prime time for working in the fishery in this Province, people did not get their stamps. If we bring in a program to enable them to get their stamps at a time when - well, I guess the season dictates that here. I do not have to tell anybody what it is like to work in late fall or early winter in this Province. It is mad! Hopefully, some of those requests will be granted.

The very nature of our industries in this Province says something in relation to UI, as well. The construction industry: Over the years, as everybody knows, once late fall comes, construction pretty well dies in the Province of Newfoundland. And not only in the Province of Newfoundland, in other provinces as well, but more specifically here.

The agricultural industry: There are certain commodity groups in agriculture that can work year-round, for instance, the dairy business, the poultry business, the broiler industry, and so on. But root crops, for instance, are seasonal. Once the fall of the year comes, if you do not have the proper storage facilities that automatically stops, as well.

One of other industries we have in the Province that is solely dependent on UI, and for reasons, I suppose, that come with change,

is the forest industry. One time, when everybody was cutting the four foot wood, so to speak, they pretty well worked year-round, except for taking a break in the spring of the year so that they could save their roads, the road system they had into wherever their stands were. But now that they are into the eight foot cutting, it is very hard. In fact, I had an example last year in my district, where a bunch of loggers, in the Grand Lake area, could not cut because of snow conditions. So I, in conjunction with the union at that time, made requests to Kruger that the cutting be done in the time of the year that would be easier, like in summer and early fall, to get away from this winter cutting, especially working in deep snow cutting eight foot wood. It just could not be done. It was hazardous and dangerous to the individual.

That was granted by Kruger, and I think Abitibi-Price is doing the same thing, if I am not mistaken. So that automatically says that the forestry people, especially the people in the woods section - not the mill, because that works year-round, the people who supply the raw material to the mills around the Province, which is a very integral part of the operation, as far as I am concerned - no raw material no processing - they get the benefit of UI.

You can go on to the tourism industry. Some of it is seasonal. We heard the Minister of Finance say yesterday, and I am sure it was just an oversight, that tourism is mainly seasonal. But I do not think for a minute that he thinks it is just a seasonal thing. Tourism in this

Province, yes, probably the main part of it is in the summer months, but we have a prime example in our area that really brings dollars into the whole Humber Valley, and that is Marble Mountain. It is a prime example of what it does not only for the tourism industry as such as it pertains to Marble Mountain, but for the transportation industry as well. The airport at Deer Lake, for instance, is a prime example of what happened because of Marble Mountain and the development there. We have airlines coming out of our ears there now, all because of the fact that they are catered to in the summertime and wintertime, and pretty well year-round, and it has mainly to do with the tourism industry pertaining to Marble Mountain in the wintertime.

Then, again, there are sections of it, for instance the food industry, restaurants specifically, who hire a lot of part-time help in the summertime, who are automatically laid off in the fall, and some of them will not meet the qualification period under this new bill. So there are certain areas of the Province, and certain sections of the Province that have to be looked at and given some flexibility. There is no doubt in my mind about that.

Look at the fishery. The fishermen are treated one way, and so they should be because of the industry they are involved in. But all should be looked at, and not as one general thing, to just come in and say, well, this is it, ten weeks here, sixteen there and so on. With regard to people quitting, I do not know exactly what the waiting period is now outside the Province, but I have run into some people who have to

wait ten to twelve weeks. Now for anybody to quit their job for no other reason than just to get out of it, or something like that, as far as I am concerned the waiting period cannot be too high. I am sick and tired of hearing business people around my area saying we cannot get this one to go to work, we cannot get that one to go to work, so-and-so just quit; he quits, automatically he goes down and gets UI, and someone has to be found to replace him. The waiting period part of it, especially when it is up to ten and twelve weeks, is something, as far as I am concerned, that should be looked at, and it would be of benefit to everybody, not only to employers in the Province, but to Government, as a whole, and to individuals.

We had the employment program. I think a grave injustice was done to that employment program last spring. We see evidence of that across the Province today. I can speak of, I think it was 72 hired on on the program, in the district, the last two years, and when I checked as of last April, 47 of those people were still working year-round, part-time. Maybe it was just in that area, I do not know, but to me, personally speaking, I think it was a program that, if monitored and policed, could be an excellent program. I am talking about the Private Sector Employment Program.

We all know that when people get out of school, or they get out of University, no matter where they get out of, when they go looking for a job the first thing the employer asks is, do you have any experience? That is the first question. And it is sad, because a lot of those students and a lot of those people are quite capable

of doing a job, but because they have not got that little piece of paper that says, Sir, I worked with Kruger, I worked with Abitibi-Price, or I worked with some other company for six months, they are gone, they do not get the opportunity unless they know somebody. Unless they are lucky enough, I suppose, to latch onto something for a few months in the summertime, they are left out in the cold.

Under this program, I know of a lot of students more specifically, but also people, who, having been unsuccessful in obtaining permanent jobs, were hired under the program, trained well, proved that they could do the job and were eventually kept on. Now I think that the Minister should, in her wisdom, in talking to people around the province, take a second look at that program for another year. This is the time of the year when Budgets start to be drawn up. Forget the politics of it, forget what happened in the past, as I stated earlier, and just look at it constructively and say, we did not go with it last year, maybe we were wrong. Own up to it. Be a woman about it. It is nice to be able to say that. Instead of saying be a man about it, it is nice to say be a woman about it. Bring it to your colleagues. I understand you have to have the consensus of all your Cabinet colleagues, but just look at it and I am sure you will come up with, if not the same program under the same criteria, something to get those people back into the work force, and to get students who are coming out into the work force, as well. You will be doing two things really, helping people who are looking for a job, and also helping the small businessman, or woman, around the

Province by giving them a little push, probably a business just starting off; they need that little extra kick, they need a kick-start.

I think my time is up. To clue up my remarks on the resolution I say to hon. Members, forget this element of blame. Let us work collectively. Let us get something in place that is going to get the people in this Province working. Let us not make an excuse for anybody who is on UI in the Province. If we collectively show leadership as politicians, I think we will see the unemployment rate come down in this Province, there is no doubt about it; if they see they have proper leadership, and we zero in on each district of the Province, the fifty-two. Yes, it is our job to bring the Government to task. I mentioned one thing today, the Private Sector Program. Since I have been here, we took on the Federal Government when it came to something detrimental to this Province. As far as I am concerned, this program is detrimental to this Province, and detrimental to every man, woman and child in it, and moreso this year, where we have the fishery wiped out, as far I am concerned, and we have other things in the Province for which this was a bad year, as well.

I would like to support the resolution. Other Members are going to speak on it. There are other things I would like to say, but I think I have had my chance. I commend the Minister for bringing it in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a privilege again to rise in this hon. House and address all Members on different issues of the day. I think it is very important for us to relay our views on this particular resolution. I particularly want to add my views, because it has such a dramatic impact upon my riding of Eagle River, in Labrador. As many of you know, this is a fishing district, and, as many of you know, in the wintertime, certainly after October 15th of every year, we have 60 to 70 per cent of our people drawing unemployment insurance benefits.

It is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, but it is a reality, and it is one that we have to be always conscious of. What I want to do today is outline what I believe are some of the fundamental problems with that particular legislation. I want to point out what I believe is the lack of a philosophical thrust to the Bill; I want to address some of the specific demands that are in that particular Bill; and I want to illustrate these particular cases through reviewing the situation in Labrador.

When I mention the philosophical thrust of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is the Federal Government of this country putting upon the agenda of this country the Conservative agenda, the Conservative agenda of survival of the fittest, the agenda of taking away the commitment that any Government should have to the social safety net of this country. They are

withdrawing the financial commitment, Mr. Speaker. The first time since this legislation was put into effect in this country, this particular Government has made moves to withdraw any financial commitment to the Unemployment Insurance Program. They are putting it adrift. They are sending out a message to the people in this country that no longer do they have the commitment to the social safety net that they have to be always accountable for.

Mr. Speaker, this particular philosophical thrust is damaging. It is coming through in this particular Bill loud and clear, and I am sure it is also coming through in other legislation, where the Government intends to privatize and intends to shed themselves of their commitment to social justice in this country. We are setting into effect, Mr. Speaker, the fast track to Reaganomics, the fact track to Thatcherism in this country, and it is a very serious issue indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

You should talk to your own leader.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

While I echo the comments of the previous speaker, and while I believe that we always have to be constructive in our criticism, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us as representatives of the people and judges of the day, to keep them honest, to keep them in check, and to keep them on the straight and narrow as it relates to our social safety net, which is what I believe makes Canada one of the greatest countries in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to talk about just a couple of the specific demands that are in this legislation and why I believe they have to be changed. While I agree that education and training is critical to the future development of our fishery and the future development of our people as a whole, I believe the Federal Government has been remiss in indicating to this country that education and training has to go into effect, regardless if there is a mechanism to deliver that training or not. I believe that it has to be introduced, but introduced in a gradual way. Because, Mr. Speaker, as a member for a district in Labrador, and knowing the educational system in Labrador, I know that right now there is no educational mechanism in place to deliver the kinds of training they want in terms of secondary training and in terms of quality of training. There is no way that that can be delivered as part of this particular package at this particular time, and I believe that is a fundamental flaw. While I agree with that particular thrust of the legislation, I believe that it has to be reviewed and implemented in full concert and co-operation with our provincial Department of Education, our community college system, and our university system throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

The other parts that have a dramatic impact, and certainly illustrate the thrust of the whole legislation, is in terms of the benefit period and the qualifying period. The legislation being put forward indicates that the benefit period will be reduced from

forty-two to thirty-nine weeks, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, as it is right now throughout the Coast of Labrador, we have some 500 to 600 people who have still, at this point in time, not been able to get ten insurable weeks in the last fifty-two. So there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that this particular three week deletion in the benefits that these people will end up getting next year, even for those who do qualify this year, there is no way that that is not going to have a dramatic impact upon these communities, these isolated communities in particular, along the Labrador Coast.

In terms of the qualifying period, again there are moves in this particular legislation to have individuals come up with ten, twelve, fifteen, or twenty weeks, depending on the unemployment rate at the time, in order to qualify. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is ill-conceived. Because if they had looked at our particular situation in Labrador, where I come from, there is absolutely no way they can expect, in this short period of time, to be able to garner five or six extra weeks in order to qualify for unemployment insurance.

Again I want to reiterate the Labrador situation. In my first speech to this House, Mr. Speaker, I tried to raise the awareness of all people in this House as to the situation in Labrador, and tried to indicate to them why it is so unfair and so unjust. If I might again reiterate that, at the present time in Labrador fishermen cannot draw unemployment insurance benefits until November 15 of each year, and their benefits have to end by May 15 of the following year. There is no place on the

Labrador coast, Mr. Speaker, where the fishery goes until November 15. As a matter of fact, there is no place from L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain that the fishery extends beyond October 15. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, there is no place on the coast of Labrador that begins fishing before July 15 of each year, and, in some cases, Mr. Speaker, it is later than that.

I believe this certainly should be cognizant to the Members of the Federal Government. They have to be cognizant of this situation, Mr. Speaker. They have to be cognizant of the fact that the times of the year that fishermen have no income, that families have no income, are the two worst times of the year, just before Christmas, and just before they have to go back in the fishery, in the spring. Pretty well 65 per cent or 70 per cent of the people from Lodge Bay to Cartwright, in particular, have to move outside every summer to small fishing communities, and they usually start moving outside around the 15th or the last of May. Again, Mr. Speaker, only one who has lived it, and saw it, and experienced it could ever fathom the despair of not knowing whether there is going to be a cod tail out there when you get out there this summer, but you have to go to the merchant and try to secure your fishing gear and your groceries for the upcoming months. It is devastating, Mr. Speaker, and it is wrong. I believe that the Federal Government should instill in this particular legislation the kind of compassion, tolerance and understanding that would reflect that particular reality.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to spend a couple of minutes talking

about the Emergency Response Program, because this particular program is critical to us in Labrador at this point in time. At the present time, as I indicated earlier, some 500 to 600 people have yet to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits. In the Labrador Straits, in particular, Mr. Speaker, the criteria for eligibility is just cruel and, I believe, totally void of any compassion. What they are saying to us now is that if you were on the program last year, which is the only time this program was used in the Labrador Straits since the fishery was there - it was only last year that this particular program was used there, and they are saying to all of the fishermen this year, because you were on that program last year, you cannot qualify unless you have six insurable weeks this year.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. Because if they were to go back twenty years before that and deal with the same individuals they are telling today they cannot qualify for that particular program, they would find that every one of these worked for ten and twenty weeks of every year before we had a failure in the fishery, as we did in the last two consecutive summers.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that while we voice our opinions on the particular legislation that is here, we should also use this opportunity to express our dissatisfaction with the Federal Government's demand for longer periods for eligibility under the Emergency Response Program. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think we should also indicate to them that it is high time that this program was put into place.

I made my first inquiry on June 12 of this year to the Federal Minister responsible for Newfoundland, Mr. Crosbie, to get his co-operation and support in bringing this particular program into the coast of Labrador, because at that time we knew there was not going to be a fishery in the coming summer, and in the coming weeks. Certainly we can review what has happened there this year, and it is certainly confirmed.

It certainly was essential that this particular program be put in place long ago. I think the Federal Government and the Department of Employment and Immigration should review their standards when they institute these programs, because if they are looking at the fishery here on the Avalon Peninsula, then they have to understand that the geography of Labrador, in particular, demands different things, and the fish run in different cycles, and there is no way that we can have our fishery determined by the standards that exist in here.

As I say, in this particular situation, this year, this program is at least two months overdue, Mr. Speaker, and people are starting to really wonder where the Program is. If it is not put in place soon, again the geography of Labrador would mean that a lot of the fisheries related projects that are going to be demanded of this particular program will not be able to go ahead, because everything will be frozen up and the particular work will not be able to be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks and give other individuals a chance to express

their views, but I would like to conclude my remarks by asking the Federal Government to acknowledge the wrong of their ways, to acknowledge that what they have done in this particular Bill is detrimental to our people in Newfoundland and Labrador. I would ask the Prime Minister himself to acknowledge the plight of Newfoundlanders, and to live up to a promise he made not too long ago, when he said, "I am not afraid to inflict prosperity on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador." Mr. Prime Minister, if you are not afraid to that, please do the right thing. Do not take millions and millions of dollars out of our economy next year, put it back in, hold your head high, and be the compassionate individual we all expect of that position.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I believe this resolution is timely. I believe that it is a great resolution. I am very appreciative of the members opposite for expressing their support for this resolution. I certainly support it. I hope our voices will mean something substantial, and that we will get some great changes. I hope that the road to a guaranteed annual income will start here again in this House of Assembly, and I hope that the dignity and compassion that everybody deserves in this Newfoundland and Labrador will become a reality, yet.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. LANGDON:

Mr. Speaker, when the Newfoundland and Labrador populous were debating whether or not to join the Canadian Federation, the proponents of us joining Canada argued, and rightly so, that we would automatically be entitled to the social programs that other Canadian Provinces had already been privileged to have, and that included unemployment insurance.

intimated that we should have been a part of the Canadian Federation earlier. The reality of the situation is that we were not.

The Premier stated at the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities Convention, in Gander, a few weeks ago, that Newfoundland had if not the lowest, one of the lowest disposable incomes in all of Canada, and because we were the last to get out of the gate to join the Canadian Federation, there is no doubt that it had a bearing on that economic situation. Newfoundland and Labrador by its very nature has a formidable problem, immense, rugged and difficult terrain, with a sparse population stretched across hundreds of hamlets, coves, and bays.

Ours is a very difficult Province to govern, and the very nature of our way of life is, in my opinion, unique to that of all of Canada, a distinct society to say the least. Given the scenario that I have outlined, life is difficult enough for the inhabitants of this Province. We are now faced with changes that will indeed make the quality of life here more difficult for the Province and its people. That, Mr. Speaker, cannot and will not be tolerated by the Legislature and the people of this

Province. How can some faceless bureaucrat in his or her ivory tower in Ottawa, or some politician, make it more difficult for our people to get unemployment insurance. And that is not only, Mr. Speaker, true for the present Government in Ottawa, that was also true of the Liberal Government under Mr. Trudeau. One of our own, the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Rompkey for Labrador, interfered as well with the unemployment insurance benefits for this particular Province, and all of Canada. Times are difficult in this Province and have been and will continue to be. We have been dependent on the fishing industry for 500 years and because of the fluctuating factors that come into play, there has not and will never be, a gradual progression of disposable income from that resource. The Newfoundland and Labrador fishery would confuse Adam Smith, the Father of Capitalism, and John Maynard Keynes, a great Canadian economist.

There have been some divergent thought and innovative changes in political thinking, that would take time to formulate, to put the Province on the economic road to success. And until that time comes we must never allow changes that will distract from the quality of life in this Province. Let us not forget also that the Provincial Government cannot, and must never forget its responsibility to the people of this Province, in the time of crisis in the fishing industry. They must never withdraw its financial support from the fishing industry, the plant workers and fishermen. Can you imagine the two barrel negative impact on our people, if this became a reality?

Mr. Speaker, as seen in the proposed amendment to Bill C-21, it could affect Fortune Bay, Gander region, and there is a 30 per cent chance of that happening. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what Gander and Fortune Bay is doing in the same region?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a good question.

MR. LANGDON:

Gander with its service centre, its industrial base, versus Fortune Bay, which does not have any diversification of economic opportunity, and then to suggest that the unemployment rate for that area is 14.9 per cent. That asks the reality of the people in my District, as already suggested by the Member for LaPoile District (Mr. Ramsay), and that gives some wrong impressions to the bureaucrats who make these decisions.

The historic community of Seal Cove with its reputation of having some of the best loggers in the country, these loggers are now unemployed. They received about seven weeks work less this year than they did the year before, and some of them have just got in 'under the wire' to use the proverbial expression, to qualify for UI. So if the Federal Government is deciding to lengthen the number of weeks that these people must have in order to get UI, where will they work? And the same situation applies to the fishermen in the District of Fortune - Hermitage, as has already been indicated earlier by different speakers. There are people in that District this year who have one stamp, two stamps, and their weeks wages, in a number of instances, have been \$5 for the

total week, \$10 for the total week, \$15 for the total week. Can you imagine, with that type of gross earnings, what type of rate of unemployment insurance these people would be entitled to over this particular year? To make it more difficult for these people then to get UI is, in my opinion, a first degree criminal act.

Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of me to suggest that there are not abusers of the system. Has anyone ever thought about why there is abuse in the unemployment insurance system? In many instances it is because the people concern need every penny they can muster to survive. The system has to be analyzed, streamlined and paralleled for those who quit work, and there is no doubt in my mind that that is the part that has to be addressed. But I would think the universal agreement of all the people in this Legislature today is to leave the particular system as it is, and not to tamper with it. I am not negative, just to be on the record, Mr. Speaker, against the proposed changes. We must be very careful because the social programs have tremendous economic benefits for this Province. Let us not jeopardize what we have. Any decrease in benefits to our people is not acceptable. That does not mean that the status quo is what we want. There are alternatives other than what is suggested in this revised paper. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all of us, regardless of Party stripe, is unified in getting the most benefit for our people, to improve the quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would be so bold here today to suggest, and it has already been suggested by the Member for Eagle River, that a

guaranteed annual program should be studied as an alternative to the U.I. program. I firmly believe the positive aspects of this program are worth a serious analysis. The economic ramifications for this Province would be enhanced. I am convinced of that. There are those out there who are doubting Thomas', but I am firmly convinced that our people are industrious, they are honest and hard working individuals, but there has to be a mechanism whereby we can channel these strengths to reach its maximum potential.

Last weekend, Mr. Speaker, we saw at our convention in Gander the youth playing an integral part in the Party, and suggesting to the Party ways in which policy might be changed, so that the young people in this Province might benefit.

As a point of interest, Mr. Speaker, the PC youth of St. John's has placed a bid to host the convention in 1990. When we can incorporate all the ages in the political spectrum, then there can be changes made in the total fabric of our society.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, any negative accruing to our people by Bill C-21 cannot be tolerated. And the Federal Government of today and the Federal Governments to come cannot be permitted to shirk its responsibility to the Newfoundland people. We as a Party have stated categorically that a decrease in unemployment insurance dependency is not desirable, as stated by the Provincial Government. But until the economic mechanism is in place to reduce that dependency we must never let the people of this Province suffer. We have to keep

what we have and build on from there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to support the resolution presented in the Legislature today, which has been presented by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, that the Federal Government be told in no uncertain terms that they shall not tamper with the social benefits of the people of this Province. And to suggest as well, that the Provincial Government, as has already been indicated, make sure to suggest in no uncertain terms, that they are not going to stand for that, and propose alternatives that can indeed help the people of this Province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure, indeed, to stand in this Honourable House and support this resolution, and it is a pleasure to follow my friend and colleague from Fortune - Hermitage. Many times in the past we had followed each other in debate, but in different circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the historical analysis of the UIC Program and the reason for the implementation of the UIC Program a long time ago was just that, it was an insurance system to make sure that people had income when they were laid-off from one job and waiting for another. We all know in Newfoundland that the UIC Program has become a main supplement to our income.

Three major changes in Bill C-21 is estimated to reduce the unemployment insurance benefits by some \$115 million, to Newfoundland and Labrador. I think it is also very important, not only in terms of the loss of income to people in Newfoundland and Labrador, but the loss of this income means a reduction of \$15 million in provincial revenue. For those of us who have to manage the Newfoundland economy, it means that this Government will have to come up with an extra \$15 million. It will either mean a cut in programs or a raise in taxes.

We also know that the UIC Program is broken down into three distinct economic regions: the Avalon Peninsula, Fortune Bay - Gander, Corner Brook and Labrador. Of course, I stand in this House today representing the constituents of the District of Bellevue, and it is interesting that the District of Bellevue overlaps both of these economic zones.

The people of Chance Cove and Bellevue are lumped in with the urban area of St. John's. And the people in Norman's Cove and the people in Southport work in the inshore plants, and most of the time they have difficulty getting the ten weeks work let alone 13. Approximately 950 people in my District will be cut-off the unemployment rolls. These people, Mr. Speaker, are males and females between the ages of 18 and 25. Single parents, those with a low level of education, and females ages 35 to 65. During the summer and the early fall I spent a fair amount of time in my District, and wherever I travelled there were people who were saying they only had six weeks employment for the

year. And most of the calls that I receive at my office are from people who are looking for an extra three or four weeks to get their unemployment.

The other big aspect of Bill C-21 is that \$80 million will be put into training and re-training. I guess the question in Newfoundland is training for what jobs. I do not think in Newfoundland and Labrador we should be embarrassed with the fact that we recover roughly \$800 million through U.I.C. Mr. Speaker, rich Ontario and the golden triangle in Ontario, have put undue pressures on a poor Province like Newfoundland and Labrador. We know that the Federal Government's policy on interest rates and the reasons we have high interest rates in this Province, and in this country right now, is because of the economic activity within the golden triangle. Sometimes in central Canada people forget, that without Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as consumers of the manufactured goods in Ontario, these jobs would not exist. Mr. Speaker, we not only need to look at the total U.I.C. program, and it is a fact, we need to look at the total economic model. We need to get some of that economic activity, that is in Ontario, into Newfoundland. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what should happen in these areas of high economic growth, is that the Bank of Canada should apply high interest rates to discourage development in that area, and to cut down on inflation. I think we should also have a bank rate in the poorer Provinces of Canada that is considerably lower, to make sure that there is economic growth.

I always wonder why we have such economic growth in southern

Ontario when industries there are screaming for workers, screaming for space to build, and we have great congestion within that particular area. We need a Federal Government and we need a strong Federal Government to make sure that we have more money pumped into regional economic development programs. We failed - we failed miserably. I do not know the reason why we failed, but ACOA and everything else does not seem to work. I think we need to get at the major corporations in this country to make sure that they relocate some of their manufacturing facilities to Newfoundland, and we need transportation subsidies and other kinds of help. We may even need to say to a corporation, forget about corporate income tax if you come to Newfoundland. We need to look at these particular things, and get economic activity going. As a person who spent most of my life in training in this Province, I do not disagree with the Federal Government putting more money into training. For a long time in Newfoundland we had a post-secondary system that was stagnant. A system that was imported from Ontario, and a model that was imported from Ontario and placed in Newfoundland, to solve the training and economic woes within Newfoundland. I was very happy in the role that I played with the Avalon Community College, in introducing a new course at that particular college last year. And, we operated the particular course in Placentia and called it Industrial Generalist. Those of us who grew up in rural Newfoundland all know that Newfoundlanders are Jacks and Jills of all trades, and that is what this particular course was meant to do, to give people an introduction to three or four

different trades in order to be able to fit into the seasonal cycle of employment within this Province. Out of the twelve people that we trained in that particular program, eleven of them became employed in rural Newfoundland. These are the kinds of initiatives that we need, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland. We understand from the effect of the layoff, or the reductions in unemployment, that one of the sectors of our population that is going to be heavily affected, are the people who are under-educated. But, I can guarantee you that once the Federal Government Program is announced, and once we get the input from Ontario and Quebec, we will see very little money from the UIC program for the under-educated in this Province. I have been involved in negotiations over the years, and sat at national meetings where we talked about putting money into programs for under-educated people, and every time Ontario and Quebec have said, well, layoff is a Provincial responsibility, we have the money and we are able to mount programs ourselves. So Newfoundland and the other poorer Provinces of Canada are left holding the bag again. That really gets back to Meech Lake and why this Government supports rescinding a resolution on Meech Lake. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, two years ago announced the National Literacy Policy, and put a lot of money into literacy programs. If you were to analyze what happened, not one cent of that money is going into the delivery of programs. It is building up research and supports, because Ontario and Quebec said there will be no money spent in these Provinces for the delivery of programs, and as a result we

have very little affect from these national Federal dollars, and with Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker, we will have more of it.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand and support the resolution of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. I realize that there is only a few minutes left and my hon. colleague for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) is to close out the debate, but I tell you I could speak for two hours on this particular resolution, and I am proud to stand in the House and support it.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Bill C-21 will pass in the House of Commons. It is into its third reading today and I think we can assume that it will pass. It is going to put this Province in a very awkward situation to remove UI in the guise of Bill C-21, as proposed. A number of previous speakers have said it will definitely drive hundreds of our citizens to the welfare roles, and I can assure you that is what is going to happen.

There was an earlier question on whether or not our report was factual and maybe the most up to date one, and I think that we can take this particular report because it is an unbiased report as far as I am concerned, as being the true picture of what is going to happen after Bill C-21 is enacted. I wonder, I guess, and I express the sentiments of the previous speakers in saying; I

wonder where we will find the extra weeks of employment in the Province, remembering of course, that not only will individuals suffer because of the lack of extra weeks of employment, but the extra expenditure it will be to the Government of Newfoundland to increase social service work programs and other programs, in order to cope with the changes. I will, on behalf of the Minister, thank the Members on the other side of the House today for the support. I do believe that from what I heard from each individual Member in the House as a whole, that we speak here on this particular resolution with one voice, and what a better chance for me to be able to get up and speak on behalf I guess, of the whole House, when it comes to a resolution of such magnitude and one that is so far reaching. There were presentations made by this Government on September 8th to the committee of the House, I just wanted to make that comment known, we did it as a, not necessarily as a Government, but a number of us backbenchers and others got together and made the presentation. It is very important also to remember that in this particular document, the question of whether or not the Avalon Peninsula would be divided into two regions rather than one, has not been addressed, and I think it is very important that the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and all of us address that particular question as soon as we possibly can, because changes are definitely needed in that particular region of the Province. Of course, being from Carbonear district, it is my hope that changes will be made, because we are suffering out in that area as much as the Ferryland district is suffering, and all the other

districts that are outside of the immediate St. John's area. In summary then, Mr. Speaker, I just want to read the primary goal of the UI system and it states this: " that the provision of an adequate level of income in relation to community standards for individuals and their families who experience reductions in their incomes for reasons which are beyond their control", taking into consideration that this particular statement is in the UIC Act, and I guess the goal, set up in the beginning for unemployment insurance, it sort of seems that Bill C - 21 is in direct contradiction to that particular goal that was set some years ago, and I just wonder if that has been taken into consideration. It is certainly going to affect that particular goal because the new bill is going to affect the principle.

New entrance requirements, reduce benefit duration and training, are probably the three most important issues in Bill C-21. Each one of these have been dealt with today by both Opposition and Government Members. I do not have to stress the importance of these particular sections. There are two other important sections, but I think most of us probably agree that the UI system has to be cleaned up in Canada, if we are to progress as a productive Country.

I do offer my congratulations and I am very pleased, and I will repeat this on behalf of the Minister who proposed the resolution. I thank you very much from this side of the House, as well as thank the hon. Members of the Opposition for showing their support today for this particular resolution, and as a new Member, it certainly makes me feel good to

see us doing something in the House entirety rather than for one side or the other to be taking a certain direction. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I would like to move that the resolution be put. Thank you very much.

On motion, the resolution carried.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

We are just calling for a division.

MR. SPEAKER:

A division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the Members.

Ready?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to waive the ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All right.

All those in favour of the motion, please stand:

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter); 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 President of Treasury Board (Mr. Baker); the hon. the Minister of Health and Social Services (Mr. Decker); Mr. Walsh; Mr. Noel; Mr. Gover; Mr. Penney; 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. P. Warren); the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons); Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Murphy; Mr. Dumaresque; Mr. Short; the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout); Mr. Hewlett; Mr. Hearn; Mr. Doyle; Ms Verge; Mr. Simms; Mr. Matthews; Mr. N. Windsor; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Woodford; Mr. Hodder; Mr. S. Winsor; Mr. Langdon; Ms Duff; Mr. Parsons; Mr. G. Warren.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion carried unanimously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I just want to remind the Government House Leader that there is no motion required on Private

Member's Day, just for future reference.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader is correct. On Wednesdays, the Speaker just declares the House closed. I do not know if the Government House Leader, in the meantime, wanted to say anything about tomorrow; it is normal to make any announcement. If he does not, we will carry on. I wonder if the Government House Leader wanted to make any announcement about the proceedings tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

All right.

This House is now adjourned until tomorrow at 2:00 o'clock.