



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 39

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before proceeding to Orders of the Day we have a number of people we would like to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. Members. First we would like to welcome to the galleries a group of students from Indian River Elementary School, Springdale. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Fowlow, Mr. Reid, Mrs. Sheppard and their chaperones, Mr. Wells and Mrs. McCarthy.

Also, we have thirty-five grade seven students from the Catalina Elementary School, Catalina, accompanied by their teachers Marvin Ryder, Harold Brown and Miss Lori Gill.

Also forty-seven grade seven students from Coley's Point School, Coley's Point, accompanied by their teachers Mr. Lloyd Pike and Mr. Bert Bartlett.

Also we would like to welcome to the galleries Councillor Newman Harris representing the town of Summerford.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier, in a statement to the House on May 11, provided an excerpt from Cabinet Directive 217-'89 which said, and I will quote the Premier's statement, the following: 'Directed that approval is given

to the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force with respect to fish quota reductions as follows' and it went on to outline the conditions related to the approval. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries if he would table for this House the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force the Premier referred to in his statement, which were specifically given approval by the Cabinet through Cabinet Directive 217-'89?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement. I am not sure what the procedure is in tabling Cabinet papers.

An Hon. Member: It is not a Cabinet paper.

Mr. Carter: It is not a Cabinet paper?

An Hon. Member: It is a Directive.

Mr. Carter: It is a directive. Well, I will take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking, nor do we expect even if we did ask, for a Minister to table a Cabinet Document. What we are asking is for the Minister to table the Provincial Task Force recommendations which the Premier specifically referred to in the Cabinet Order C217-'89. Now, will the Minister undertake for this House to table the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force to the Federal Task Force? That is

specifically what we are asking for, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: It is not a Cabinet Document.

Mr. Rideout: It is not a Cabinet Document.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has been on this a couple of times before in the House and asking a similar question concerning that information. My understanding is that in documents released by the Premier the general recommendations were in fact released and they had to do with the fact that there had to be provided at some point alternate employment and proper programs and so on to handle the situation. I really believe that has been answered in a general way by the Premier, in the past.

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, my supplementary is for the Minister of Fisheries who would be aware of this particular document. The Premier, in tabling the excerpt from Cabinet, made it clear that he was talking about the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force with respect to fish quota reductions. What we are asking the Minister of Fisheries is will he undertake to table for this House those recommendations? We do not want a Cabinet Paper, we do not want Cabinet Directives, we do not want Cabinet secrecy, but we want to have before this House the recommendations of the Task

Force, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Carter: It is the same question, and I will have to give the same answer. I will take it under advisement.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Fisheries confirm that the Provincial Task Force on Fish Quota Reductions continued to negotiate with the Federal Government throughout November, December, January, February and into March on the Building a Viable Fishery option which included: fewer fish plants, fewer fishermen, and fewer fish plant workers? Did the Provincial Task Force continue those negotiations for all those months, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, it is like listening to a recording. It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Task Force, headed by my Deputy Minister, Mr. David Vardy, did in fact have a number of meetings with the Federal Task Force, headed by Mr. Ken Stein. In the course of those meetings, a number of matters pertaining to the fishery were discussed, a number of options were talked about. As to how far they extended into the new Year, I do recall that it was probably around the latter part of February, after the appointment of the new Minister, Mr. Valcourt, that relations between the two committees appeared to be tapering off. Telephone calls were going unanswered. Members of my staff

were curious as to what was going on. On several occasions they tried to make contact with the Chairman of the Federal Task Force and, I think, we pretty well concluded then that maybe the new Minister wanted to put his own label on things, wanted to have time to think it out for himself.

I believe it was sometime in March when the new Minister came to the Province and met with the Premier and myself. Then it became, I think, pretty obvious to both of us that that was the reason, the Minister wanted to do his own thing. In fact, I understand that shortly after his appointment the Federal Cabinet Task Force, headed by the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, pretty well ceased to function, as did the officials Task Force, headed by Ken Stein.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe what ceased to function was the effort of this Government to try to work out an agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister this? Will the Minister stop skating around the issue, stop dodging the issue and will the Minister confirm that officials of the Provincial Task Force on fish quota reductions were negotiating and had arrived at a draft Memorandum of Understanding up to and including the 6 of March past, despite what the Premier and the Minister have said, which included and accepted the principle of fewer fishermen, fewer fish plant workers and fewer fish plants? Isn't that a fact, Mr. Speaker, and won't the Minister come clean and admit that to the people of this Province?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I could answer the preamble to his question but I won't, it would be unparliamentary. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that on January 2 Mr. Crosbie came to Newfoundland and requested a meeting with the Premier and myself and our respective Task Force, at least the heads of the Task Force, and at that meeting we expressed some concern that things weren't moving fast enough and, in fact, because they weren't moving fast enough, the Province had to, on its own initiative, provide something like \$14 million to extend the layoff notice to workers in the fish plants that were announced to be closed, Gaultois, Grand Bank, Trepassey and, of course, St. John's. At that January 2nd meeting, it was agreed by the Premier, by Mr. Crosbie and by the officials that a Memorandum of Understanding would be put together, hopefully completed by the end of January, ready for the signatures of both Governments sometime in February. My officials did, in fact, go to work and start drafting that MOU. But, again, things dragged out and by the time the deadline had arrived, there was no completed document. From there on in, of course, we had the appointment of a new Minister, relations between both committees cooled off and that's where it stands. There was never an MOU signed. There was one drafted, but never signed by both parties.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a supplementary.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, it is like pulling hen's teeth, we are

getting a little bit closer to the truth with every question. Can the Minister confirm that up to March 6, 1990 officials representing the Provincial Task Force were negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding with the Federal Government which included fewer fish plants, fewer fishermen, and fewer fish plant workers? Isn't that what was happening as late as March 6, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no. Absolutely not. We talked about the need to rationalize the fishery. We talked about the need, maybe at some point in time and under certain circumstances, to reduce the number of people who are depending on the fishery.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Oh, no, that is no secret. I mean, Mr. Speaker, any Newfoundlander who would not agree with that must have his head stuck in the sand so far that, you know, he -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, in all our discussions, in all our talks with the Federal Government, we have talked about diversifying the economy in order to provide alternate sources of employment to accommodate the fishermen who would be displaced from the fishery. The union supports that position, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government supports it. We support the need to rationalize the fishery. Mr. Speaker, there are too many people depending on the fishery under existing

circumstances. When you realize that the average Newfoundland fisherman today is earning \$10,000 a year from the fishery, then if that is the kind of a situation the hon. gentlemen want to perpetuate, well, that is fine. But it is not fine with us.

Mr. Rideout: That is not true (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: We want to see the fishery become a viable industry, one that will be able to provide a decent way of life for those engaged in it. To do that, we have to make certain changes, and to make those changes we have to find ways, by diversifying the economy, where people will not become so dependent on our main industry.

We talked about secondary processing, Mr. Speaker, processing of underutilized species, for example, providing ways and means of creating jobs in industries related to the fishing industry, the manufacture of fishing gear, boats, you name it, but certainly at no time did we suggest, nor will we ever suggest, that you take people and just throw them out of the fishery, on a wharf or on a beach, without giving them a sort of alternate employment. Mr. Speaker, that was the sole purpose of our meetings with Ottawa, to find ways of diversifying the economy, trying to get sufficient monies from Ottawa to do that. Unfortunately, the soul mates and great friends of my friends opposite let us down completely. They let the Newfoundland people down completely.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Ninety million

dollars, a Tory band-aid. Ninety million dollars, Mr. Speaker, over a five-year period, divided amongst four provinces, that is their answer to economic diversification.

Mr. Simms: What is your answer?

Mr. Rideout: His answer was, 'absolutely no.'

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries, and \$584 million is a lot better than no dollars. Let me ask the Minister of Fisheries a question relating to the operation of the Twillingate fish plant. Could the Minister inform the House how much in loan guarantees has been written off by the Provincial Government as a result of the Oceana Seafoods receivership?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, let me give you a short history of the fish plant in Twillingate.

An Hon. Member: We didn't ask for (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Alright, let me give you a long history of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: I don't know what they have against poor old Twillingate. They can't seem to get over the fact that this Government, without any Government guarantees, working with the Economic Recovery Team, have managed to do something to help the oldest town, I suppose, on the

northeast coast, Twillingate.

Mr. Simms: How much was written off?

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, back when the previous Administration was in power, they gave a loan guarantee to a company known as Oceana Seafoods, headed by Mr. Gus Etchegary.

An Hon. Member: Yes, what about it?

Mr. Carter: \$1.9 million.

Mr. Rideout: \$1.5 million.

Mr. Carter: \$1.9 million.

An Hon. Member: You gave the \$4 million.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, \$1.9 million. Now, if you want me to repeat it I will, \$1.9 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: How much? How much?

Mr. Carter: Alright, let me give them the benefit of the doubt. Let us say it was \$1.5 million - it was not, it was \$1.9 million - that amount, Mr. Speaker, will be written off. The company went into receivership. Last year they lost \$1.7 million, despite massive efforts on their part. I am not attributing blame to the directors. Because of circumstances, many of which were beyond their control, the company went into receivership. The Bank of Nova Scotia loan of \$1.9 million, or whatever you want, \$1.9 million it is anyway, will have to be paid off by Government. That is money gone. There was a mortgage held by the

Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation that enabled them to buy the company at, I believe, \$1.5 million - wasn't it - \$1.3 or \$1.5 million.

That is secured by a first mortgage on the plant.

Mr. R. Aylward: That was with our guarantee.

Mr. Carter: Pardon?

Mr. R. Aylward: (Inaudible) our guarantee.

Mr. Carter: No, it did not. Your guarantee was for \$1.9 million.

Mr. R. Aylward: \$1.5 you just said.

Mr. Carter: \$1.9. If you are trying to confuse matters, this matter is too serious a matter to be - if they cannot comprehend what I am saying, then they can meet me behind the curtains after and I can try to explain to them. But it is too serious a matter to be having fun with.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree it is too serious a question to have fun with, Mr. Speaker. That is why I am asking the questions, because I want to know how much it has cost the taxpayers of the Province. My understanding was that there was a \$1.5 million loan guarantee in place, and that was increased by \$400,000 or \$500,000 by this Government. Maybe I am wrong. That is why I asked the question, I was not sure.

Let me ask the Minister this. On May 18th, in responding to a

question by my colleague, the Member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister confirmed that there is a management fee being provided the new operator of the Twillingate fish plant. Can the Minister inform the House of the amount of that particular management fee, how much is being paid by the Province to the new management?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be no objection to tabling it, it is public information, but the fact of the matter is, that information will have to come from the receiver. That company is in receivership. The receiver is now in the process, in behalf of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, of winding up and doing what needs to be done to get the plant back in operation.

I can only tell you, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of what I do know about that management fee, that it is equal to or maybe slightly in excess of what it would cost the receivers to mothball that plant for a year. I do not have the exact amount, but I can get it, and I am sure that will be revealed, bearing in mind that the cost of mothballing the plant, I believe, would be close to \$100,000 a year - close to.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, that is a very small price to pay considering that there are going to be 500 people employed in the plant, that there will be a market provided for 800 fishermen, being operated by a company that is taking all the risk, putting up their \$2 million or \$3 million

working capital, no loan guarantees; they will absorb the losses and hopefully pick up the profits. I do not know what the exact amount was, quite frankly, but I can get it and I will be happy to table it. I guess my colleague, the Minister of Development, who answers in the House for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, will have to answer that question.

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

Mr. Matthews: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why I am asking the questions, I would like to inform the Minister, is because the people of the Province were led to believe that there were no financial contributions or concessions made by the Provincial Government toward the reactivating of this plant, which we fully support, by the way. But I think this information is necessary so that people will know exactly what kind of a deal is in place for the reactivation of the Twillingate fish plant, because there are many others in the Province crying out to be reactivated, to find new management.

Would the Minister be able to inform the House if there is a lease fee being charged the new operator? If so, how much would that lease fee be?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I can say this much, that if there is a lease fee, it is a very nominal amount. But, again, that information will have to come from the receiver, and I suspect, within maybe a few days or a week, I am sure my colleague, the

Minister of Development, will be very pleased to table the document. Because, as I said in the House last week, it is a deal I am quite proud of and I give a lot of credit to the Recovery Team, and to my colleague, the Minister of Development. I shall be forever grateful to the team for their efforts. I am quite proud of being able to put together that package that will have the effect of saving -

An Hon. Member: You put it together?

Mr. Carter: No, I helped put it together. I played some part in it, of which I am quite proud of.

- that will have the effect of saving one of Newfoundland's oldest towns, Twillingate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we are quite proud of that, as well, and we hope there are many more historic towns which will be saved by similar deals. That is why we want the information from the Minister. Can the Minister inform the House if there are any other financial considerations being extended to the new operator, for instance, commission on sales, etc.? Would there be anything else?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, if these people are supportive of what we did in Twillingate, I would not want to meet people who were not supportive.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware about the commission. I know there is a standard commission fee, I believe, a brokerage fee it is called, is it not? which most fish companies pay. Their agents, operating in the New England States, who act as brokers for -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) actually happy when Twillingate closed -

Mr. Carter: Well, I will tell you that is obvious. But, Mr. Speaker, there are brokers in the New England States who market fish which goes in from Newfoundland, and some companies have their own marketing organization. The company headed by Dr. Blackwood, I believe it has its own marketing organization. So, as to what happens in terms of a fee or a brokerage fee, I have no idea, and, quite frankly, I could not care less. All I care about, Mr. Speaker, is that today we have a community in Newfoundland with 500 people who last year were working and who this year hopefully will be working, and if that does not please the Opposition or it displeases them, well, that is fine. But I can tell you one thing, you are not making any friends in Twillingate by asking these silly questions.

Mr. Rideout: Those questions are not silly for Fermeuse and a whole bunch of other places too, and that is why we want the answers.

Mr. Parsons: Are you doing the same things for those places?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: You do the same for

them and we (inaudible).

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

Mr. Hewlett: Fairness and balance.

Mr. Rideout: Fairness and balance for (inaudible) and a dozen other places.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister of Fisheries cannot give the details of this particular operation in his own District, it makes one suspicious of what the details are.

Mr. Rideout: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: And the people of the Province have a right to know the details. We found out there is a management fee from the Minister; the Minister of Development has confirmed that there are commissions; and it looks like there is a lease fee.

An Hon. Member: A brokerage fee.

Mr. Matthews: A brokerage fee of some kind. Will the Minister of Fisheries undertake to table in this House for scrutiny by the Opposition and the people of the Province the deal, the agreement which has been signed between the Development Corporation and the new operator? Will you undertake to table that deal with complete details for the House of Assembly?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, look, if it will help them, I am almost prepared to buy prime time on

television. If they want me to, I will go on television and I will explain in a most -

Mr. Matthews: I did that once. Most people (inaudible) 30 per cent (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: They are against Twillingate. I never thought I would see the day.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: And we are doing so much to help other -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, let me say this. If it will help Members opposite to satisfy their little curiosities, I am prepared, almost, to buy time on television and have graphs and charts and affidavits, cancelled cheques, bank statements and contracts. Mr. Speaker, I will almost be satisfied to bring in the first quintal of fish caught in Twillingate and lay it on the table, if they want me to, just to provide proof that the plant is working.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, they will have to wait. They are playing games now, obviously. But when the time comes, we will table whatever information is available on the Twillingate plant.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Fisheries, who

said he would be quite willing to put the first quintal of fish on the table. I would like to see him split it.

Let me say that we on this side are very proud that the Twillingate plant is open. It is nothing more and perhaps nothing less than we would have done, if we had been in power. We kept many plants open. It is what you would expect. But what we do not expect is to see a sweetheart deal as we see here, with loan write-offs, management fee, no lease payment, brokerage fee being paid, to one plant whereas the Universal operation, comprised of four plants, went on the rocks completely. They are starting to pick up the pieces now bit by bit, a very fragmented situation, because this Government turned its back on them completely and refused to help them keep the plants open. How does the Minister justify that in light of the deal he has just given Twillingate?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, you live and learn, I suppose. I never thought I would see the day when any hon. Member opposite, especially those who served in the previous Cabinet, would get up and refer to the opening of a fish plant on the northeast coast, under the circumstances under which it is being reopened, as a sweetheart deal, bearing in mind that these same gentlemen, by the way -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: No, no. - are the people who spawned Sprung.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

I want to remind hon. Members on both sides of the House that when the Speaker rises, they are to please sit immediately. A couple of times now I have been here waiting. I want to remind hon. Members on both sides of the House that Question Period is for asking questions and getting answers or not receiving answers, whatever the case might be. In any event, it is not for debate. There is to be no debate or making of speeches. I ask the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to please finish up his answer quickly.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that it disappoints me to hear people opposite, who were Ministers in the former Government, talking about sweetheart deals and trying to imply that the deal between the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and Dr. Blackwood's company was a sweetheart deal. That is an insult. I take that as an insult, Mr. Speaker, and I think Dr. Blackwood would, too. He is a fine Newfoundlander, doing a good job. Probably one of the best! I would put my money on Ches Blackwood before I would put it on Philip Sprung.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: We would put our money on him, too. And we put one and a half million bucks on Gus Etchegary.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me say to the Minister that if I were betting, I would bet on his side also, and we have no problem with that. Dr. Ches Blackwood is one of the best if not the best operator in the Province, and we have no problem with him going into Twillingate. The question the Minister failed to answer is how can he do a deal on Twillingate he was not willing to do on Fermeuse, Ferryland, Belleoram, St. Mary's, or Riverhead?

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

Mr. Carter: For the very simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that it was an entirely different set of circumstances. The plant in Twillingate was the property of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, a Provincial Government agency. The plants in Fermeuse, Ferryland, St. Mary's, and Belleoram are now the property of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, a Canadian Government Agency. Now, are they suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Province move in and bail out the Federal Government? Are they suggesting that?

By the way, those plants are in receivership and I presume they are being dealt with by the receivers; they have called for a proposal but it is a different circumstance altogether. The Twillingate plant was the property of the Newfoundland Government, therefore, we had a responsibility, at least NLDC had a responsibility to protect their

assets. The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation had a responsibility to protect the assets in that plant.

The Canadian Saltfish Corporation have the same responsibility in dealing with the plants in Fermeuse, St. Mary's and Ferryland, and I would expect them, I would expect Mr. Crosbie, their Federal friend who represents St. John's West and is our Federal Minister in the Federal Government, I would expect Mr. Crosbie to work just as hard to try to find operators for the plants in Fermeuse, Ferryland and St. Mary's, which they own, by the way, and which they control, as we did to find an operator for the plant in Twillingate.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should say to the Minister, if he wants an update on the status of the plants in St. Mary's and Fermeuse, I can give him that after Question Period. However, I would also say to him that he could have salvaged, or this Government could have salvaged the Universal situation if they had moved when requested originally. It would have saved an awful lot of time and effort and concern, and money for the Province in loss of revenue. I knew the answer he was going to give to my last question, because the plants are not owned by the Province. The question I will ask him now is how can he justify, in light of the deal they worked out on Twillingate, leaving plants, such as the plant in Branch and the plant in St. Brides, which are owned by this Government, where people have had to go out on their own with our help and search for

operators, and the operators have had to go in under adverse conditions and try to do repairs with Canada Works money, which we got from the Federal Government not from the Province, where the operator in St. Brides has been trying to -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I ask the hon. gentleman to get to his question please.

Mr. Hearn: I started with the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I forgot! -

Mr. Hearn: - how he can justify where an operator in St. Brides is there under adverse conditions, waiting for over a year to get an answer to his request, whether or not the plant will be sold, and where they are paying a heavy lease to the Province when other people can go into Government facilities without any lease and all kinds of concessions?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, the plant in St. Brides, that is now being negotiated with the Province. I think the owner there, a gentleman who operates a plant in Holyrood, is now looking at the possibility of buying that plant. In Branch, Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to be able to make this announcement later, but I suppose the cat is now out of the bag. There is an operator moving into Branch. The Branch plant will be operating this year; it will be employing people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: I was hoping to wait

until next week and maybe invite the hon. Member to come along with me when we go up and maybe have a meeting. Mr. Speaker, the plant in Branch has been leased to a reputable operator. The Province is assisting that operator to get it operational, and I am very happy to make that announcement. As I am sure the hon. Member would admit, that plant was put there during my previous term as Minister of Fisheries. I take some pride in the fact that I had that plant put there, and I take even more pride now in the fact that I am managing to get it reopened.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Notices of Motion

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children's Act 1972."

0 0 0

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding to Orders of the Day the Chair would like to rule on a point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains, and a subsequent point of

privilege raised by the Opposition House Leader, which in substance was the same point of privilege, namely, in reference to whether a letter was received or not received as the point may be, and the answers in respect to the contents of the alleged letters that the Premier was suppose to have made, and the point of privilege that the answers were not accurate. That substantially was the point of privilege.

With respect to privilege, in general, I want again to quote Maingot, a Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, and supported by several other authorities including Beauchesne 'That a genuine point of privilege is a serious matter not to be reckoned with lightly and accordingly ought to be rare and thus rarely raised in the Legislature.'

With respect to the specific point of privilege I rely mainly on two main quotes. What we have here is clearly a dispute as to allegation of fact, when and whether or not a particular letter was received and answers given in respect to same. I quote and rule accordingly, as so many Speakers before me have in similar situations, Beauchesne, page 13, paragraph 31, subsection (1) 'A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegation of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.'

As to the allegation that the Premier's answer was incorrect and false, I refer hon. Members to Maingot, pages 190 and 191 actually, and that is bringing together the two main quotes that I use, and I quote, "A dispute between two Members about questions of fact said in debate

does not constitute a valid question of privilege because it is a matter of debate. Similarly the alleged lack or unsatisfactory nature of a reply to an oral or a written question is not a question of privilege because the practice of the House does not compel a reply." But more to the point and to this particular specific point of privilege, "an allegation of misleading the House is not out of order or unparliamentary; nor does it amount to a question of privilege. However, an admission by a Member that he misled the House would constitute a matter of disorder, and an admission of deliberately misleading the house would constitute a breach of privilege." So neither of these conditions prevail in this particular situation, so I rule that it was not a point of privilege.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Speaker: It being Private Member's Day; the resolution as introduced by the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes dealing with unemployment or employment as the matter might be is for discussion. The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

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

The resolution as presented, perhaps one of the shortest ever to appear on an Order Paper, is to the point. I think if hon. Members on both sides of the House will look at the resolution they will see that there is nothing there in the sense of trickery or in trying to put the Government on the spot. It is basic. WHEREAS, the present unemployment situation

in the Province is a concern to all; BE IT resolved that the Provincial Government immediately take whatever steps are necessary to assure corrective action. Pretty basic and, I presume, when we get around to the vote in a couple of hours time that all hon. Members will support the resolution.

The resolution was put on the paper because of the severe situation that exists in our Province at the present time in relation to the unemployment situation. It has never been as desperate and perhaps looking ahead to the key time of the year, which is the summer months, there does not seem to be too much improvement in many areas of the Province. If we look at what has happened in relation to addressing the unemployment crisis by the present Government, so far we see very little action. Maybe when they get up to speak a little later on they will inform us of some of the initiatives they have undertaken which, hopefully, will lead to the corrective action that we talk about. And, I am sure will support our request to pursue other corrective measures that will solve some of the unemployment problems.

The Department or area which should be most concerned and which is responsible for addressing the unemployment situation, of course, is the Department of Employment and Labour Relations. What we have seen from that Department so far is basically an insult to the workers of Newfoundland. We saw a watered-down employment generation program which had very little funding. Try as the Minister might, and knowing the Minister, I am sure in relation to her concern for the workers around the

Province that she went to Cabinet and asked for a lot of money to be put into the job generation program to create the badly needed jobs in the Province. But, undoubtedly, the Minister of Finance, with his hand clasped tightly on the purse strings, refused to give her any money, and we saw an employment program with very, very few dollars.

We saw requests coming from all over the Island, because people did have ideas of how to create jobs and many of the ideas of how to solve our problems are out in the field and not in Confederation Building or in Ottawa, but out in the field. Many of these people put in good proposals only to be told by the Minister, not that they were rejected, because very few got rejection slips, I know of one, a unique situation, I suppose there were others, but I am aware of one. Most people were told that their applications are pending. And they have been pending for quite some time. If they ask why are they pending, they are told that the Minister hopes that she will get more money. And we hope that the Minister will get more money, but so far, and the year is gradually progressing, the Minister has not gotten any money and the people have not gotten any jobs.

The Minister, after shelving the programs that we had instituted as a Government, several new programs which operated quite well, created a number of jobs, were extremely beneficial to the Province, to the people who were looking for employment. Many of them turned out to be long term full time jobs because of the initial effort and assistance by Government. The Minister shelved these programs because she did not want to give

us credit, I suppose, for coming up with something that worked. So she brought in her own slightly changed program, the sixty week program with the twenty week gap in between.

Unfortunately in Newfoundland many of our industries, especially in the rural parts of Newfoundland, operate on a seasonal basis, and for many of the firms, it certainly was not to their advantage to hire people for sixty weeks. Twenty weeks, or even thrifty weeks perhaps yes, but not for sixty weeks with a twenty week break in between during the winter as it would happen, where they were paying people full time on their own and receiving no real benefit, because the work was not there, especially in the areas such as the tourism trade or the service sectors, in restaurants, in garages, et cetera.

So the Minister really goofed up on the program generally and brought in a changed, watered down program, which in turn did provide a fair amount of employment if she had money enough to take care of several of the requests. I know most Districts that I am aware of, and of course these would only be the Tory Districts, and I am not sure what percentage of programs we got, but most of them came in with around fifteen to twenty per cent of the applications which were approved, and most of the rest had to be rejected. If that holds true right across the board, if fairness and balance prevails and all Districts were treated the same way, that meant that seventy-five or eighty per cent of the requests that came into the Minister had to be rejected because she did not have any money, and that is unfortunate.

The youth employment programs also; very little funding to take care of the needs. And what is happening, and I am afraid that one of those days we are going to have no youth unemployment, not because there are a lot of jobs there for our young people, but simply because there are not a lot of young people there for the jobs. If you check the highways and the boats and the planes you will find young people leaving the Province in droves going all over the country.

Most of the Members, and I presume Members on the other side, are getting calls from people asking about relocation allowances, the job opportunities in other provinces, and they no longer have faith in the ability of this Government to provide any jobs for them. Instead of bringing back the 35,000 Newfoundlanders who are up along, they would now be joined by many of their friends, family and neighbors.

Other areas, many of those who are left behind are trying to scramble along on their own or with the help of Federal Make Work Programs. Many of the new jobs that are there today are there because of Federal input, not because of the Provincial input. Many of those who cannot find work have to resort to Social Services. The Minister of Social Services does his part to aggravate the situation by accepting a cut in the Community Development Program of several million dollars, which makes it impossible for a lot of these people who instead of being home drawing welfare payments, found work on Community Development Programs and quite often, in fact a large percentage of these people ended up in the full time work

force, which was beneficial to them and the Province generally. But because of cut backs in that program, once again we see a slipping back into the old type welfare system that we have had in the past.

If we look at the budget of the Government generally, in several Departments we see cuts in the salary components, where in several Departments we have fewer jobs. Even in their own Departments under their direct control, we see a number of jobs being axed, professional people being turfed out. Many of them for political reasons, of course, but others perhaps because of the Government's wish to eliminate people from the work force. In the fishery you see a complete and utter disaster and we can, rightly to a point, blame the downturn in the fishery as a result of poor management, and mismanagement of the cod stocks in particular.

The fishery, generally, because there is a downturn in many other sectors of the fishery besides the cod fishery, the northern cod, in particular, and fewer people are employed there, but a number of these jobs could be saved with some initiative by the Province. Perhaps, from our line of questioning today we see where in certain areas, like in the employment generation programs, in certain areas, apparently, the Government does take some initiative, and in light, or in consultation and co-operation with the recovery commission, the Minister said, you got Twillingate plant open. I wonder what the recovery commission did in several other areas to try to keep the plants open, the only source of employment in many parts of the Province? The answer to that, of

course, is a complete and utter blank, they did absolutely nothing. When the fishermen in an area, the plant workers, or the local committees, find some operator to go in and operate the plant, then this Government takes some credit for it, but people know the difference.

The Deputy Minister and the Minister have said, plants must close. Plants closing mean people must be unemployed. There are many ways of keeping fish plants open. Because of a 25 per cent cutback in the northern cod, in the TAC, it does not necessarily mean that a plant has to close completely. If some of those larger plants close they will never open again, so you are not just closing a plant and putting people out of work for the summer, you are putting them out of work for good. You are closing down an area of the Province, or in the case of the Provincial Government, trying to close down several areas of the Province.

The present Government has attacked the adjustment program brought in by the Federal Government. No one has said it is going to solve all our problems, but unless the Members opposite, especially the Minister of Fisheries, knows a little bit more about it than he has shown, then they have not gone into the program very much because the program is basically a directed program and will prove to have fair value in the areas to which it is directed. There are a number of other areas, of course, in relation to the fishery that will have to be addressed by the Federal Government, and the pressure should be coming on from the Province, because we have learned in the past, and Members

know, that people in Ottawa do not have all the answers for our problems down here, and unless the solutions are pointed out, as well as the problems, then perhaps we are not going to find solutions. We do not see solutions coming from this Province in relation to the overall problem in the fishery. We saw a wish list, just like a Christmas shopping list, being sent up to Ottawa, that had very little to do with the problems which the Government of Ottawa was trying to deal. Consequently, unless we see some leadership and initiative from the Government along these lines, the rural areas of Newfoundland are gradually going to slide into oblivion.

The Premier's stand on Meech Lake has perhaps been the most detrimental thing that has happened - I was going to say to the Province, but perhaps to the country. It is only now that the chickens are starting to come home to roost, and it is unfortunate that the Premier did not listen a little more carefully to the advice from the Member for Pleasantville, whom I am sure would have told him to handle it in a slightly different situation. The Member for Pleasantville has an extremely good handle on the Meech Lake Agreement and the long-term implications of it. His approach to it was the most reasonable I saw on that side. Nobody else knew very much about it anyway, except the Premier, who professes to know a lot, but as he is seen right now had absolutely no real understanding of the Meech Lake Agreement. The stand that the Premier has taken has not only destroyed, perhaps, the chance for the Province to progress, but has now been the key factor in what

could be the break up of the country. That was the straw that broke the camel's back.

But what else has it done? What has that got to do with job generation? The Premier's attitude towards the Federal Government, not only in relation to the Meech Lake Accord, but generally speaking: the Premier has approached the Federal Government the same way as he approaches his caucus, the same way as he approaches the House of Assembly, the same way as he approaches the people of Newfoundland; 'I have now arrived, I am the lord and saviour of this Province, I know it all, I will lead you through the wilderness, I will part the waters, and take you across the Straits,' is perhaps what he should be saying, or perhaps shove you across, because he will not lead, he just tells you what to do and where to go.

I said one time the Premier reminds me of the old days when we were growing up, when we were kids and you were given cod liver oil, and nobody liked cod liver oil, but your mother would say, take it. And of course you would ask the question, why should I take it? And the answer would always be, it is good for you. So take it. I know best. And the Premier is so very much like that. Whatever he says, look, this is good for you, this is right, I know best, so you just take it, accept it, do not answer me back, and, of course, consequently the term 'Cod Liver Clyde' is starting to stick, because the issuance of cod liver oil is very much the same way as the Premier, except cod liver oil was perhaps good for you, but what the Premier tells us is not always necessary so, because I have a lot more faith in

my mother, God Bless her, than I do in the Premier, and I am sure all of us do, I notice several of the Members over there smiling, and they agree with what I am saying. The unfortunate thing about it is that they are not allowed to say it in caucus.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: Because if some of the Members opposite had their way, when they look around them, when they get phone calls from their constituents telling them about the jobs that are no longer there, about the plants that are no longer open, about the people on welfare that cannot get on a project now, and cannot make some extra money, about the people who worked in a certain Department or on a Government job who have not been called back, when they get calls like that they are 'upset, but this is the way of the Premier and the Minister of Finance, that you cut and scrounge and you scrimp and you save, and you try to say at the end of the year, we have balanced the Budget.

An Hon. Member: That is a long time ago.

Mr. Hearn: Balanced the Budget on the back of poor people. That is not the way to balance the Budget. The Minister of Finance added to the problem, of course, by bringing in the payroll tax. And does the payroll tax create new jobs? Yes, he might say. It means we are going to have to hire an extra five or six people down in the Department of Finance to compute all these dollars. First of all, we will have to take on a lot of temporaries to figure out the mess and to get it straightened out to see how we are going to collect all these

dollars. And when we get that straightened away then we will take on a few people to collect and distribute the money. But in the meantime, because a number of companies out there have to pay this dreaded, horrible tax, they are going to have to layoff people, many more than the people who will be hired in the Department of Finance.

And to solve all of our problems, of course, the Premier brought in the Royal Commission. He looked around his Cabinet and he did not see anybody who had any solutions. He looked at the junior Minister who made a mess of things in the House for him sometime ago, Development, and he said, I cannot trust him to do the job, so we must bring in somebody from outside. He even looked at his caucus, I understand, and he had a couple of people there that he had some faith in, but he knew what would happen if he brought these in and gave them any power, you would have all kinds of large scale walkouts by the incompetents in Cabinet, so he had to solve the problem by going outside. He couldn't go to the well educated articulate Member for Bonavista South and say look: I am going to give you responsibilities because of the jealousies of the senior Members in Cabinet. He couldn't go to the Member for Trinity South, another well educated person, or the Meech Lake expert from Pleasantville. He couldn't count on these people because he would lose his senior advisers, so he had to go outside and he had to bring in Dr. House and his Commission.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'll get into that. I will get a few minutes later on and we will get into the House saga. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Murphy: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have to concur that the general topic of the resolution presented by the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, is certainly a concern to all of us, and before he stood in his place I would have hoped his delivery would have been without attack, without vengeance, venom and picking on people. Picking on people who are sincerely trying to improve the lot of the workers in this Province, picking on the Premier in his attitude towards Meech, picking on the Minister of Development and having snide sneers at other hon. Ministers and Members, does nothing for the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, does nothing for his presentation and gives this hon. House really, really difficulty, or gives Members on this side great difficulty in supporting his resolution. You know, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be very difficult because every time I have an opportunity to rise in this House, the sad scenario is that something of a very negative impact takes place in the District that I represent, that great District of St. John's South. Only this week we found out that 210 permanent jobs which exist at the dockyard, the St. John's dockyard, the historical St. John's dockyard, one of the oldest dockyards in North America, will be gone as of tomorrow or Friday at the latest.

Now, we all were in this House

when National Sea, from its Halifax office, announced the closure of the plant on the Southside, and in the tremendous amount of anxiety over what we knew as a Provincial Government, what our friends opposite knew, and what the Feds really knew when we played in a guessing game, was the tremendous demise of the TAC and the impact it had, not only on St. John's, but on Trepassey, on Grand Bank, and on Gaultois. Those were direct impacts, Mr. Speaker, but we found out as time went on, the tremendous impact that the great Federal decisions, the great Federal decision makers would impact not only on this one city and four towns, but would tremendously impact on the fishery in general throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government had to sit and try to find a solution to handle that very, very difficult problem. It approached the Federal papacy, the hon. Minister for St. John's West, whom we would have thought at that time would have carried the cross, for not only a fish plant, two fish plants in his District, but for the rest of the Province that was suffering the anguish. Then to find out that Mr. Crosbie was totally without substance and it is only this week, seven long months after, that he comes with a camouflaged package of nothing, all wrapped up, that 95 per cent of it would come to us anyway in our fair share of the coin from the Federal coffers, and he brings it down and our friends opposite turn around and say: It's a wonderful deal for this Province, knowing full well that it is nothing but a sham and a shame.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Marystown was on its knees tomorrow, if the yard

in Marystown was crumbling through lack of work, or they had work and the equipment to do the work wasn't capable of turning out the pipes and the steel and the plate and what have you, required to do that, the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West would be here with a 5,000-name petition - and rightfully so - and present it in the lap of the Minister of Development of this Province, saying, here, Mr. Minister, you are responsible for the demise of Marystown. But this very single day, Mr. Speaker - and the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes talks about employment development in this Province - the union is on the doorstep of the very same Minister of Development, hoping in frustration that the Provincial Government now could help and contribute a cash flow to the yard in St. John's South to keep it afloat. This is not a yard belonging to the Provincial Government, but a yard, a Crown corporation belonging to the Federal Government.

Again, where is our boisterous friend, this great champion of Newfoundland, this great champion of St. John's West? I have absolutely no idea, not does the union, and I would be awfully surprised if the manager of the yard knew where Mr. Crosbie was; certainly, they do not know where his response is, to keep that yard open.

You know, Mr. Speaker, here is the sad scenario. Our Members opposite, when they were in Government, and that very same St. John's dockyard, when it was in trouble and people were going through the gates with their layoff notices, they came to the aid of the yard through the synchrolift dollars and, as the

Provincial Government, helped substantiate some work for the dockyard. Now, the dockyard, although it is in my District, accommodates a tremendous amount of Members on this side and Members opposite. I think the hon. the Member for Carbonear has twenty-five or thirty of his constituents working there. I know the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, the Minister of Mines and Energy, they all have people who work in that yard. The hon. the Member for Harbour Main has about fifty boilermakers working in that yard, and he sits in his place because he is afraid to disagree, he is afraid to say something, he is afraid to tell the media how disappointed he is in his colleague in Ottawa, who has done absolutely nothing. The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern is in the same boat, and he knows it only too well.

So, here we have a disaster occurring in St. John's this very week -

An Hon. Member: What are you doing about it?

An Hon. Member: Shame on you!

Mr. Murphy: Aha! Mr. Speaker, one thing you can be sure of about our hon. friends opposite, if you throw the right worm, they are bound to take it. 'What are you doing about it?' I was trying, Mr. Speaker, with great intensity, to get them to say it, and they took it again, like our friend from Burin - Placentia West took it that day when he said, 'All-plants-open,' and I said, 'Let me find something here.' And the Leader of the Opposition came flying through the doors when I started reading out the names of the plants that closed. Do you

remember?

I will tell you what we are doing about it, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Minister of Development, without one ounce of jurisdiction over the St. John's dockyard, received the union this morning and committed this Government's support to the best of his ability.

An Hon. Member: How much?

Mr. Murphy: Just relax! Relax! We know a certain cash flow is needed. We are waiting for the proposal that is going to be presented to this Government from another great friend of Newfoundland, Mr. Barrett, who was appointed by Mr. Crosbie, and some other prominent businessmen in St. John's who are not exactly known to be great supporters of this Government; however, be that as it may, I would thank God on my knees today if every Tory businessman in this Province would resurrect that dockyard.

Now, coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, last week, the chairman of the St. John's dockyard - I think it was on Thursday, he and another board member, boarded an aircraft and were off to Ottawa, meeting with the hon. John, and Friday, we hear the layoff announcement, a core yard that handles somewhere between 270 up to in peak, when the contracts are ripe, in excess of 500 jobs. As of this Friday the St. John's Dockyard, 100 and plus years old, and if you go down there some of the equipment will prove that to you, there is the commitment that they gave over the years, not only the Tory Government, but the Liberal Government from 1949, a total shame. That is all it is.

The hon. the Member for St. John's

East Extern well knows. The Minister of Development received the union this morning and told the media what this Government is prepared to do. I will let the Minister, in his own good time, and/or through the media or through the House whatever, tell you what he is prepared to do when he receives the Federal package, and what the Feds are committed to do to hold on to 210 solid jobs that spill out into St. John's and spill out into the Districts all throughout the Avalon Peninsula, including St. Mary's - The Capes. The hon. Member for Harbour Main knows too well the amount of money that is left in his District from work at the dockyard, and we all have a vested interest in this specific area, and obviously we all have a vested interest throughout the Province because it handles vessels both from Labrador and from all over the Island.

You know it is funny, this is Private Member's Day, Mr. Speaker, and right behind Oral Questions the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes gets up straight-faced with his resolution.

An Hon. Member: He is honest.

Mr. Murphy: Oh, yes, no question about it. Never would I question the integrity - I tell the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern, never would I question the integrity and honesty of the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes. He is -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, 210 jobs going down the drain on Friday in a Province that does not need 2 jobs going down the drain. Hear

me now! Hear me! For fifteen feet, all right, this particular yard needs about \$10 million, somewhere between \$10 million and \$15 million of cash flow, all right, to put the proper equipment in to handle the Egyptian contract, the Egyptian contract is worth \$110 million, and the Feds cannot come up with the \$10 million of cash flow needed to acquire the \$110 million worth of work. What it says, Mr. Speaker, is this -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: The hon. Member from St. John's West, who is in the Federal Government, has committed to Halifax a heck of a lot more than he has committed to this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Murphy: The Clara Smallwood, Mr. Speaker, - what is the name of the other boat?

An Hon. Member: The Caribou.

Mr. Murphy: The Caribou. For fifteen feet and the steps out of the St. John's dockyard we could do refit work on both those large vessels.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Murphy: For those few dollars. And no, what is the attitude, if you do not have the capability than surely heavens we cannot advance you the cash. Now these are the friends of our friends opposite, these are the friends of the Opposition who can pick up the phone and receive all kinds of fisheries information, all kinds of other information from Ottawa, but receive absolutely nothing for this

Province in holding on to basic, sound, solid work. And the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern knows exactly what I am saying. I am really and truly, Mr. Speaker, shocked, I suppose, is as good as any word to use, that our friends in Ottawa could be so despondent as to cry, I suppose, to cry. The hon. the Member for Grand Bank knows the anguish, the suffering, the mental anguish Fishery Products delivered on the people in his District.

Now, there are young men and women working at the St. John's dockyard who are ready, as in the hon. Member's hometown, to buy homes, ready to make an investment, and now they cannot do it.

An Hon. Member: Some of them have.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, some of them have. There is the 'sad scenario. And for that few dollars, Mr. Speaker, 210 to 220 permanent jobs will go out the narrows of St. John's.

Now that is about \$15 million less than was spent on other employment endeavors which never had a record, never showed any record, but that is the kind of thinking the Federal Tories apply to a yard which has worked and worked year after year after year and provided sound and solid jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, and I say it on the 23rd day of May, 1990, beware! Beware! because there is the word privatization, and the dastardly deed they did with the railway, is now about to be done through Marine Atlantic to the dockyard.

Slowly but surely, in the minds of the Federal Tories, the whole Dockyard in St. John's South is about to self destruct. It will be privatized and somebody will

reap off it for a few years. The hon. the Member for Grand Bank is shaking his head. He knows what I am saying is right. And they will walk away with a bag over their shoulder, and that will be the end of the dockyard.

An Hon. Member: What about the 23rd of June?

Mr. Murphy: I am glad you brought that up. You see, you bring up enough stuff and they will respond. The 23rd of June is a point of principle, of character on which the Premier and Members in this House stand. And I will tell hon. Members something else, which they know only too well, and that is that 75 per cent of Canadians totally support the position of the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland.

Now, if we have to golliwog to Ottawa to get what is our fair share of Canada, being a partner in this Confederation, then shame! Then shame! And the Meech Lake Accord is a point of character, a point of principle, and a point where Newfoundland, and I say this in this House today, would be better off on a meal a day. Every Newfoundlander, all of us, would be better off on a meal a day than we would having anything to do with the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Matthews: We will not have a meal a day.

Mr. Murphy: You see, the hon. Member for Grand Bank is prepared to sell his soul, I suspect. The hon. Member will have to answer for that, not me.

But the Meech Lake Accord is just one other avenue, Mr. Speaker, our friends opposite have lost their

minds on, because they are saying to themselves, how in heaven's name can you expect this Liberal Government of Newfoundland to receive any goodies from Uncle Ottawa?

Mr. Matthews: No, no. I didn't say that.

Mr. Murphy: Well that is the inference, Mr. Speaker. That is the inference. How can you expect to receive any goodies from Ottawa when you will not do what you are told? If we are not an equal partner in this Confederation, then we should stop and think. But we certainly do not want to be any more than an equal partner, and that is all the whole issue is basically about.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Well, we will see. Time will tell. The hon. Member for Grand Falls knows that time will tell.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before my time expires, I am very concerned about the dockyard, and the hon. Member for Grand Bank knows that feeling. It has hit me twice in less than a year that over 500 jobs in my District have gone out the window. They have gone out the window for one reason, Mr. Speaker, and that one reason is the lack of support from the hon. John Crosbie. Now, that is the reason.

Mr. Simms: Are you trying to get some press coverage again?

Mr. Murphy: No, I am not trying to get any press. We will talk about silviculture jobs, that gets you press.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Sure! Sure! Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Murphy: The hon. the Member for Grand Falls has one thing on his side, he has been around a long time.

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would like to add an amendment.

An Hon. Member: No leave.

Mr. Murphy: It doesn't matter. The hon. the Member for Carbonear will add it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, never let it be said that I would not give the hon. Member a minute or two to clue up. I will give him leave. Does he want sixty seconds to clue up his remarks?

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

Mr. Murphy: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. the Member for Harbour Main for his courtesy.

I would basically concur with the resolution from the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes. However, it has some Tory loopholes or pitfalls in it, so I would like to move an amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker. It

says, 'Whereas the present unemployment situation in the Province is a concern to all -

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

It is the Chair's understanding that the hon. the Member for St. John's South had leave of the House for -

Mr. Doyle: I gave him sixty seconds. I withdraw that leave now. I am withdrawing that leave.

Mr. R. Aylward: Leave is withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: You gave him sixty seconds.

Mr. Simms: No, it is withdrawn.

Mr. Murphy: A wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Simms: Sit down, boy! Sit down!

Mr. Doyle: It is my time he is eating into.

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to the hon. the Member for St. John's South for the last twenty minutes and the Member's speech was really typical, I think, of the contributions to date that Government has made in reducing unemployment. He was loud and he was full of empty rhetoric. Government has been doing the same thing, Mr. Speaker, trying to divert attention away from the real problems we have in this Province, the most important problem in the Province being unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly one of the most if not the most important resolution to come before the House of Assembly in a long, long time, because it addresses in a very, very fundamental way the most horrendous problem any individual could have, any province could have, and that is the whole problem of unemployment.

It is not a wordy resolution, it is not a provocative resolution. When you get right down to it, it is not a partisan resolution in any way. It does not attempt, incidentally, to back the Government into a corner at all, it is a very simple, straightforward, two-sentence resolution that, number one, identifies the problem we have, 'Whereas the present unemployment situation in the Province is a concern to all,' it identifies the problem in one sentence and, number two, it recommends action to solve it. 'Be it resolved that the Provincial Government will immediately take whatever steps are necessary to assure corrective action.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be very, very difficult indeed for the Member for St. John's South, or Members opposite, to find fault with that resolution; it would be very, very difficult indeed for Members on either side of the House to vote against that resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been a year since the new Administration - I have to stop calling the Administration the 'new' Administration. It is not a new Administration, it is rapidly becoming an old Administration. It is going on two years in power right now. That is hardly a new

Administration. The honeymoon is over. They have brought down two Budgets, and anyone in this Province looking at the two Budgets the Government has brought down over that one-year and two-month period would have to be very, very disappointed. There are some good things in the Minister's Budget, I would say to him, but anyone who is unemployed in this Province, who is looking for a job today, would have to be very, very disappointed in the minimal effort the Minister of Finance and the Government have made in addressing what is the most horrendous social problem we have in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is a very, very horrendous social problem.

Now, I know the Government don't want to hear that. We keep repeating it and repeating it and repeating it, and we are going to keep repeating it until the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations finally sits up and begins to take notice of the fact that we have the highest unemployment rate in the whole country and there is nobody really doing anything about it. Now, I could support the Government on a number of initiatives it has taken over the last twelve or thirteen month period, on a lot of issues which have been extremely difficult to deal with, but I believe the true indicator of any Government's worth is how it deals with social problems and how it deals with unemployment, which is a social problem.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: I say to the Minister of Social Services that he would have a whole lot less social service recipients in the

Province, he would have a whole lot less transition houses and drug and alcohol abuse centres in the Province if the unemployment rate was at an acceptable level. He would have a whole lot less to deal with. Because unemployment is a social problem and it is a very horrendous social problem. If a person is going to have any dignity, if they are going to have any self-worth at all, they have to know they have a job to get up and go to in the morning, to go to work, and know that when Friday evening rolls around, or the end of the month rolls around, they have a paycheck coming in. If an individual is going to have any self-worth, he has to have a job, Mr. Speaker.

The economy of this Province, as Members are aware, is in the worse mess it has been in for years and there certainly appears to be a lack of concern by the Government. They do not seem to be addressing the problem in any way. And instead of tackling the problem head on as you would expect the Government to do, as you would expect the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to do, what have they done? They have farmed out that responsibility to an Economic Recovery Commission. Instead of acknowledging a devastating, horrendous problem, what do we see? We see a Government in its first year of office, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, reducing the only employment program she had. And I will keep repeating that. I have said it so many times I realize the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is getting sick of hearing it, but I am going to keep repeating it until somebody finally sits up and takes notice. What do we see the Minister of

Employment and Labour Relations doing? In her first budget she reduced the only employment program she had from \$7 million down to \$2.9 million. Now that is really acknowledging the fact that we have an unemployment problem in this Province. That really acknowledges that fact. Instead of the Government rolling up its sleeves and getting at the problem, it sits on its hands and it waits for federal handouts and federal bailouts. I would say to the Government it is not good enough for the Government to be acting in that way. It is shameful, it is a slap in the face for the unemployed people in the Province, and it is an abdication, when you get right down to it, an abdication of the Government's responsibility to create employment.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, the economy of the Province is in shambles. Just recently, we heard the announcement that bankruptcies in the Province are up around 140 per cent, a record for the history of Newfoundland, and that, in itself, is feeding the unemployment problem. When you have that many bankruptcies occurring in the Province, obviously you have a lot of people who are being laid off as a consequence of that. The economy is getting worse every day, and that is not only being voiced by people on this side of the House, it is being voiced by very, very responsible groups, people like the Board of Trade, and people like the Investment Dealers Association of Canada. Mr. Speaker, what did the Investment Dealers Association of Canada have to say about the economy of Newfoundland? Now, Members opposite are always saying that we over here tend to criticize a

lot. But what have we done in the last number of years to address the unemployment problem? It doesn't add a lot of credibility, I suppose, for people on this side of the House to say what we have done to address the problem in Newfoundland, but this little booklet here, I would recommend to all Members of the House of Assembly. It is called, An Economic Outlook of Newfoundland and Labrador, and it was put out by the Investment Dealers Association of Canada. This is dated October 1989, almost a year ago now. And what did the Investment Dealers Association of Canada have to say about the economy of Newfoundland, not over the last year or two years or three years, but they said for the last six year period? What did the Investment Dealers Association of Canada have to say? It said 'The Provincial economy grew by 3.8 per cent in real terms last year.' That is two years ago I guess, because this came out in October of 1989. 'It grew by 3.8 per cent in real terms last year, underpinned by good performance in the mining, forestry, construction and the fishing industry. The Newfoundland economy expanded at 3.8 per cent in real terms. Economic growth in the Province's goods and service producing industries has generated three consecutive years of employment gains. Last year, both full time and seasonal employment grew by 5.5 per cent over the levels a year earlier, which was the largest gains recorded in the country.' The largest gains recorded in the country! Mr. Speaker, that was performance. That was performance!

We have not seen that performance by this Government over the last year, and it is doubtful whether

we will see it in the immediate future. Mr. Speaker, the Government has to get down to pulling up its socks and helping the unemployed people in the Province. The Minister told us last week that the only employment program she had, worth approximately \$2.9 million, all the money has been used up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) from those people?

Mr. Doyle: Pardon me?

An Hon. Member: Is there a more current report from those people?

Mr. Doyle: I don't know. This is the most current one I have. It came out in October of 1989. Now, there could be one out since that, but I believe it comes out only once a year, if I am not mistaken. But getting back to the employment issues.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: I picked the worst one?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: No, no.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) your report?

Mr. Doyle: It is not my report. The Investment Dealers Association of Canada out that report. It wasn't put out by a partisan group, it wasn't put out by any Government or any Opposition or any group in Canada who has any particular allegiance or any affiliation to any Government Department, it was put out by a totally independent group. They are often referred to as the watchdogs of the economy, The Investment Dealers Association of

Canada. That's what they said, that Newfoundland had real growth for six consecutive years.

Mr. Furey: What about the Conference Board of Canada?

Mr. Doyle: The Conference Board of Canada? Well, I don't know, I don't have their report.

Mr. Furey: It says that we will be the only (inaudible) Province to grow by 2.2 per cent.

Mr. Doyle: Well, we'll see. We'll see.

Some Hon. Members: If? What was the 'if'?

Mr. Doyle: If Hibernia goes ahead.

An Hon. Member: Hibernia?

Mr. Doyle: Yes. I wouldn't doubt but that's true. I would say to the Minister I wouldn't doubt but that's true, if Hibernia goes ahead.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a moment ago, the Minister laid a real egg in the House last week, dropped a real bombshell in here when she came in and told us the \$2.9 million which had been allocated for employment opportunities in the Province had all been used up. And if that wasn't enough, we had the Minister tell us, as well, that Government is going to be monitoring the employment situation in the Province - Government is going to be monitoring - and if the need becomes apparent - I believe that is as close as I could come without going through Hansard, but she said if the need becomes apparent, then obviously we will put more money into employment programs. Now, I would ask the

Minister, in view of the fact that we have the latest stats on unemployment in the Province showing an increase of 1.4 per cent, a 1.4 per cent increase in the unemployment rate, we are all wondering, the people of the Province are wondering if the need is apparent now, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to start putting a few more dollars into job creation. As the Leader of the Opposition mentioned last week, out-migration in the Province is up tremendously.

We asked the Minister of Employment about that and her response was, 'Well, we don't know anything about out-migration.' But people are leaving the Province in droves, looking for work wherever they can across the mainland. The unemployment rate is up 1.4 per cent but, Mr. Speaker, we are in a time of year now when unemployment traditionally is on the decrease: you have the construction companies starting up work; you have the fishing industry, what is left of it, gearing up; and you have the medium and small businesses gearing up for their work, as well. In spite of that, in spite of this increased activity which takes place every spring anyway, you have an alarming increase in the unemployment rate, 1.4 per cent, and that represents in my view, and certainly it should represent in the view of the Government, a real crisis in the Newfoundland economy. The Government is going to have to stop sitting on its hands and get down to work.

Meech Lake is very, very important, I know, to the people in Newfoundland and to the people of Canada generally, but there are other things as important as well,

Mr. Speaker, like putting food on the table. A lot of people have not been able to do that in Newfoundland over the last year because we see Government preoccupied with downsizing the fishery, a Government which has no alternate plans, no alternate plans at all for the people who are going to be displaced in the fishery, a Government which does not have a true appreciation anyway of what the fishery means to Newfoundland and Labrador.

Again, the economic outlook. The Investment Dealers Association in Newfoundland gives a pretty good précis, if you will, of what the fishery means to Newfoundland and Labrador. The Members should get it and read it. It says, 'The fishery, encompassing both primary fishing and secondary processing, is the mainstay of the Provincial economy representing 23 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product in the goods producing sector, and 8 per cent of the total GDP. The fishery alone accounts for about 40 per cent of total employment in the goods producing sector in Newfoundland and Labrador.' Mr. Speaker, that is what the fishery represents to Newfoundland.

And Government cannot continue to farm out its responsibilities to an Economic Recovery Commission. They say the mandate of the Economic Recovery Commission is a ten year period. Well, that is fine. But the problem is here and now, and these problems have to be dealt with here and now. People are suffering and they cannot wait for a ten year period. I was saying to the Minister of Employment over the last couple of weeks, this is where the temporary Employment Programs come in. If the Economic Recovery Commission is going to come in with a great

plan to create long-term employment, well, that is fine and dandy. We will all live in hope of that. But this is where your temporary employment programs come in, because people cannot postpone putting food on the table for a ten year period.

It is interesting to look at what the Economic Recovery Commission said last week in its report. They said, 'We are involved in a long-term process and we offer no miracle solutions. But we are not so naive as to believe we can accomplish our mandate by ourselves. Economic recovery is everybody's business.' And it is everybody's business. It's the Government's business, they should be told, it is the Unemployment Department's business, and it is the Premier's business.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Government has farmed out its responsibility to an Economic Recovery Team and jobs are disappearing faster. I should say to the Minister of Development, jobs are disappearing faster in the Province than Doug House or he or anyone else can replace them. Jobs are disappearing in the Civil Service; countless jobs are disappearing in the fishery; jobs are disappearing every day through bankruptcies; jobs at Long Harbour are disappearing; the Member for St. John's South told us today he is going to lose 210 jobs before Friday at the dockyard.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Doyle: He told us he is going to lose 210 jobs at the dockyard before Friday. Before Friday, he said, they are going to be lost. We have jobs in Grand Falls going, jobs in the fishery, jobs in the dockyard, jobs in Long Harbour,

jobs in the Civil Service, countless jobs going through bankruptcies, and in the middle of all that, we see the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations cancelling her \$7 million Employment Program and replacing it with a \$2.9 million program.

Ms Verge: And that was all used up before (inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: And that was all used up before they even got one-quarter of their applications dealt with. So every day, Mr. Speaker, we see another tale of woe in the Province of Newfoundland. Now, no one can criticize the Government for the jobs at Long Harbour, or even, probably, the jobs at Grand Falls. But what they should be criticized for is their lack of response, a real lack of response.

The Member for St. John's South said today he was very happy to let us all know that the Provincial Government has responded in a very real way. I was expecting him to announce that they had put \$10 million into the dockyard, but his great announcement was that the Minister of Development met with the union. Now quite possibly, before Friday rolls around, we will see a big grant made available by the Government to the dockyard to try and preserve those jobs down there. But, Mr. Speaker, the House Commission cannot do it all. So far, the sum total of what we have seen from the House Commission is a shopping list that went to Ottawa for \$300 million or \$400 million worth of projects.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, in cluing up I would say to Members opposite that they are going to have to do something. They are going to have to roll up their sleeves and get down to the business, pull up their socks and get down to the business of employment creation in this Province while we still have a few people around here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, for the organization called the Economic Recovery Commission being so insignificant in creating jobs around this Province, it seems to me that hon. Members on the other side have a tendency to continue to labour on and on and on about the terrible job the Economic Recovery Commission is doing. I would think if they were doing such a terrible job the Opposition would drop it and would not bring it up in the House. But they know, of course, that they are not doing such a terrible job. They are doing things in this Province which needed to be done. I suggest that at this point in time, as my hon. colleague said a few minutes ago, it really does not matter. I think we have to try everything at this particular point in our history to create employment, and if that means creating an Economic Recovery Commission or any commission to go out and try to diversify the economy to create employment, so be it. I praise Dr. House and the Economic Recovery Team for what they are doing. I am positive that Members opposite will be proven wrong in the end, but they will still complain anyway.

I am not up today to be critical, but I think back a few years and I think about the unemployment rate of Newfoundland. It was not that long ago, and I was trying to think today exactly when it was we had that 23.4 per cent unemployment rate in the Province. I believe it was back somewhere in the early 1980s. And then I look up through, right up until today •I suppose, and everybody knows the unemployment rate in Newfoundland has been pretty well double the National average. Even back in 1981 it was double the National average, I guess. It still is double the National average. And the previous Government and the one before that and the one before that dealt with the same problems. Ever since 1949 we have had a high percentage of unemployment in the Province. And the hon. Members on the other side, and the hon. ex-Premier we have there, I am sure, in the short period he was in, the major problem he faced in Newfoundland was unemployment. I am sure the previous Premier, Mr. Peckford, had the same problem as well.

Of course, we are no different, because basically nothing has happened in the past twenty years to change the unemployment problem we have in Newfoundland. We have reached the point now in Newfoundland, I think, where we have in my estimation, I am being quite honest about it, a Government now that has finally tackled the problem head-on regardless of the political implications. I think that is why we get comments from our Minister of Finance and comments from the Premier that we have no other choice but to diversify the economy of Newfoundland to create those necessary jobs.

I represent the District of Carbonear. Carbonear District, I guess, is not a lot different than a number of other Districts. I do not compare my District to my hon. colleague from Ferryland's District or St. Mary's - The Capes, because they are struck with a particular problem at this particular time. It affects large numbers of people. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries a month or so ago was faced with the problem of losing his fish plant, the major fish plant in his District of Twillingate. He was talking about losing 500 jobs. Well, to lose 500 jobs on New World Island you are going to devastate the whole Island. I am not saying that I can afford or I am of that much difference that I can afford to lose a fish plant in my District, heaven forbid that I do, but my District is probably a little bit more diversified than some of the hon. Member's Districts that I mentioned.

I do have though, Mr. Speaker, a serious number of people in my District who rely on the 10/42 system. A number of people in the Province, and I think most people who are working in the Province or not most people but some people who are working in the Province, look at those people who are on unemployment insurance and who have to find ten weeks and now, of course, fourteen weeks, as being second-class citizens. I hear the comment quite often that all they want is ten weeks work and they would not take a full-time job if offered. I do not believe in that. I do not believe that at all. In fact, I can prove it. If there was meaningful work provided on a 52 week basis I am sure that 99.9 per cent of the people in Newfoundland, who are forced to go to the unemployment rolls right

now, would only be too glad to take those jobs and would, certainly, go out and take them at any wage, as far as I am concerned.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to our unemployment situation in this Province is one of keeping plants open. If you remember, I spoke last year and I made some comments relating to if a plant was viable then a plant should remain open, but it should remain open on its own steam, on its own initiative. I think the day has come where keeping plants open just to keep people employed, and plants that are losing money or are not economically viable and they are being subsidized by Federal or Provincial Government, I think that day is gone. It has to go, because we just cannot continue pumping money into it. I think the Federal Government too believes that to a certain extent. But then when I see the response program or what was in the response program that was announced some weeks ago, a \$90 million package that is going to be spread over five years for five provinces, I can only say that maybe they believe it, but they are certainly not in tune with the economic, social and employment problems that we have in Newfoundland. Because if they were, and if Mr. Crosbie, who represents us up there, and I sort of in a way can concur with my hon. friend for St. John's South that if Mr. Crosbie, and he should know what is going on in Newfoundland, that \$95 million or \$90 million package for those five provinces should have been more like \$900 million for Newfoundland alone, and it is disappointing.

I want to get another comment in here too, and I have been waiting for the opportunity, it is not

really directly related, I suppose, to the topic today, but I read an article just recently, a Hansard report, of a committee that was headed up by the hon. Jack Marshall. He met in Halifax with Mr. Cummings, who used to be President of NatSea, and they were talking about the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks and getting jurisdiction over the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank, and his comment was that the only reason anybody was looking for, the only reason that Newfoundland and maybe Ottawa were looking for control of the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks would be to provide more fish quota to Nova Scotia. I am hoping that somebody will address that one of these days because that is sort of confusing to me. I am not sure where that gentleman was coming from, and I am not sure if it was true or not. If it is true, it is sort of disappointing, because I have been led to believe that if we had control over the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks then we would have control over more fish we could supply, it would ultimately open up more fish stocks to Newfoundland, and then, of course, create more employment.

I had an unusual comment made to me just recently by a fish plant owner and the comment was, now is the time to get into the fishery. And I sort of thought it was amusing because when everybody else is preaching doom and gloom in the fishery, you get some fish plant owner coming out and saying that now is the time to get in, and I had to think about that one. And when I think about it, it makes sense, because I believe that most people in the fishing industry out there today believe and have their confidence put in the Minister of Fisheries, the Provincial one, and maybe somewhat

in the Federal Fisheries as well, to the extent where they are going to make the fishery in Newfoundland a more viable operation, therefore if you can get into the fishery now and survive you will have a much better chance of making a go of it down the road.

I mentioned unemployment insurance to you just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to at that time to mention something else too that a lot of unemployment insurance in our Province comes from the Federal Government Job Development Grants, and not the Section 25s because they are a little different. You have to be on unemployment to qualify for them. I do not know if hon. Members realize it or not, but job development grants, and the old LIP grants we used to call them years ago are gone. I am having a lot of problems in my area right now with groups and organizations who have been used to applying for job development grants and being able to hire people for short periods of time, ten, fifteen, twenty weeks so they can qualify. So I guess that puts a number of people out into the work force now looking for work that would normally, every year or every so often, get on these make work jobs and make work programs, and that is causing I guess, our unemployment rate to rise as well. Now I am not sure, as a Provincial Government Member, that these job development grants, some of them in the past, have been all that profitable or all that productive.

But I will say from my experience in the Conception Bay North area that we have had some good ones, and when I say good ones, I mean, that they were productive grants

that provided something for the area or the community, and I am saddened to hear that those job development grants have gone. Not gone to the extent that they have disappeared but they have become more training, there is more of a training element in it now than actual work, and it makes it that more difficult for people to get in on those programs and find necessary work and, of course, to provide the little bit of extras that a lot of communities and a lot of areas around the Province could take advantage of.

More responsibility, Mr. Speaker, has now to be put on the shoulders of the fish plant owners, and I believe that is happening too. I have been following very closely some of the comments and some of the newspaper articles that are being passed around or distributed. Comments that are being made by the business community in Newfoundland. And I think, thank God, Mr. Speaker, that the day when the fish plant thinks they are going to survive by coming in to this Government, or any Government, and asking for a handout just to keep them open, I think that day is gone, and rightfully so.

I agree with that policy, and I hope and pray that this Government sticks with that policy, that good money is not thrown after bad. Because over the past twenty-five years, it would be interesting to see the millions and millions of dollars that have been put into fish plants, and Government knowing that that money was thrown away. When you look at the Southern Shore and see what happened down there, and what the Salfish Corporation lost in that particular plant, alone, it makes you wonder what the rationale and

the criteria were at the time when those loans or those grants were given, in order to acquire one of those.

An Hon. Member: You wonder where the money went.

Mr. Reid: I wonder where the money went, yes, a good question.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, as I said, has taken the approach of diversification and, at the same time, they have taken the approach that if they find, whether it be in the fishing industry or any other industry, that a business is not viable, they are not putting dollars into a business just for the sake of keeping people employed. And, I think, if we continue along that line, eventually, we will tighten up our economy and we will be better off for it in the end.

In the fishery, over the past, I guess, number of years, the lack of supply has always been a problem, poor management in the case of a number of fish plants and, of course, the influx of Provincial Government money into fish plants are all problems that have been created by previous Governments, and I guess, we, as a Government will have to contend with those problems for a number of years.

I was talking mainly about the fishing industry, but then, there have been comments made here today about the dockyard in St. John's, the Marystown shipyard, the paper mills in both Corner Brook and Grand Falls, silviculture in central Newfoundland and in Mount Pearl, all over the Province, C.N. workers, Long Harbour being laid off, so it is not a question of just the fishery. Even if the

fishery were a booming industry, even if our quotas, our total allowable catch, next year, went to 300,000, it wouldn't really matter, because even if we had every fisherman working and every plant worker in the Province working, we would still have a serious amount of unemployment in the Province.

I think the problem of unemployment, in general, has to be address, and it has to be addressed on a Province-wide basis and not just on the fishery, but in all the industries we deal with.

We cannot continue to rely on ten weeks, because nobody really wants it; but you have to remember that, in a lot of cases, people go after ten weeks because they have been conditioned into accepting the fact that they will be lucky if they get ten weeks. So it is important to get the ten weeks to begin with.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be a solution to this problem, a problem that wasn't created, as I said, last April. It is a problem we have had for generations in Newfoundland, and I really don't think, by our being critical of the Opposition, or the Opposition being critical of the Government, that we are going to ever find ourselves in a situation by fighting, pulling both ends against the middle, where we are going to succeed in diversifying the economy in Newfoundland and providing suitable, sensible employment for our residents.

I am hoping and I am praying - I promised never to mention the word, but I am hoping and I am praying for Hibernia, for the Lower Churchill, for the trans-Island transmission line and

for small business and tourism to get on the move in Newfoundland, so that I can go to my constituents who are after me every day for a job and say, boy, I will put in a word for you here, or I will find you a job somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problems with the resolution, other than the fact that I would like to, at this particular point in time, change some of the words in the resolution by offering an amendment to you. I move this, and this amendment is seconded by the Member for St. John's South, it shall read, 'to move, Whereas the present unemployment situation of the Province is a concern to all, be it resolved that the Provincial Government continue to work towards a resolution to the unemployment problem.' So submitted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Could the Chair have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. Reid: Yes, I can give you an extra copy.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, there is really not a lot wrong with the gesture of the resolution, other than the fact that I take exception to the fact that it leaves the impression that there has not been anything done prior to now. All I am saying, in my amendment, is that we continue to work towards a suitable solution to our economic and unemployment problems in this Province.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I believe my time is up.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair would like to take a short recess.

A point of order, the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just to help Your Honour, we might argue that this changes substantially the intent of the original resolution. Because the original resolution clearly says "...the Provincial Government immediately take whatever steps are necessary to assure corrective action." Whereas, this amendment suggests that the Government continue to work towards a resolution to the unemployment (inaudible). A significant difference there and we would argue that negates the purpose of our resolution.

Maybe Your Honour might want to consider that.

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, we would also like to make a very brief submission.

In actual fact, what we have done is we have speeded up the process. What we are saying is there does not have to be a time lag before we take action. That we continue to take the action that we have been taking and continue to solve the problem. That this is an ongoing process. It is in process right now and will be five minutes after the House closes. So, Mr. Speaker, it involves a time lag as well.

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

Mr. Hearn: To that point of order, since it is my resolution, I submit that it substantially changes it. Because what we are basically doing is asking them to do something. There is no

evidence that anything is being done. They are asking that we continue to do nothing. That, certainly is not going to solve the unemployment situation.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is going to take a short recess and consult with the -

Recess

Mr. Speaker: I refer to our Standing Order 36: "A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding other words." Based on our Standing Order 36, Our ruling is it is not an amendment and is out of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

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

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words on what continues to be the main motion.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: No, the Speaker, has just given his ruling that the amendment was out of order, I say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, so therefore we are debating the resolution as put down by my colleague for St Mary's - The Capes. Be it resolved that the Provincial Government immediately take whatever steps are necessary to assure corrective action addressing the horrendous unemployment problem facing the Province. Mr. Speaker, in having a few words to say on this

particular resolution I think there are two or three things that I have noticed in the debate so far that are worthy of note, or perhaps it is better said, things that have not happened that are worthy of note. First of all, after my time has elapsed there will be about ten minutes or so left for a speaker from the Government side, before my colleague who put down the resolution under our rules must rise to close debate, and unless somebody speaking for the Ministry uses that seven or eight minutes that will be left in the interim, there will not have been, so far - well, it is ten after now so I am allowed 4:30.

An Hon. Member: 4:28.

Mr. Rideout: Well, it is 4:28, so it will be eight or ten minutes. The point is that up until now there has been nobody from the Ministry speak to this particular resolution. The Minister responsible for Employment and Labour Relations in the Province has not, as of yet, spoken to this resolution that calls on the Government to immediately take steps to reduce and correct the horrendous unemployment problem in the Province.

Maybe it will be the Government House Leader, we shall see, or maybe it will be another Government backbencher, but up until this point in time, at least, there has not been anybody speak for the Ministry on this important resolution. I would have thought that right off the top there would have been, preferably, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, that is who is supposed to speak for the Government on matters related to unemployment and

employment in the Province, but that was not to be the case, Mr. Speaker, so we shall see what happens. The other thing that I believe is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt by the Government to amend this resolution. This resolution is very straightforward, it does not condemn nor praise the Government. It is neutral, Mr. Speaker. It is as non-partisan and neutral as, I suppose, a person putting it down and people speaking to it occupying partisan positions can be.

There was no condemnation nor no praise of the Government. It didn't say the Government had lacked in action or had excelled in action. All the resolution has done, Mr. Speaker, is to call upon the Government to immediately take whatever steps are necessary. How more innocuous, how more simple, how much kinder can you be to the Government from an opposition perspective, than to put down a resolution that is totally void of any condemnation, totally void of any criticism, totally void of anything negative to the Government and yet, Mr. Speaker, having laboured, having -

Dr. Kitchen: It's void period.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is void, is what's between the Minister of Finance's ears, with comments like Kentucky Fried garbage, and you have them by the short ones, and let them drink beer; closing down restaurants and putting tens and tens of people out of business, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance would be better off to keep quiet. Every time he opens his mouth there is another foot in mouth job being done by that Minister, but the point I am

making until I was rudely interrupted by the Minister of Apologies, was simply this: The Government couldn't even take the lack of criticism that's in this particular resolution as a positive sign that we wanted the House to adopt a positive measure, calling on the Government to take whatever, whatever they might be, whatever corrective actions are necessary immediately to address the unemployment problem in the Province.

The Government had not been able to leave well enough alone, not been able to take the resolution in the spirit in which it was put down, not been able to handle a positive resolution, had to try to come back with an amendment that would have - rightly picked up by your Honour - but would have had the effect of asking the Government to continue to work towards a resolution to the unemployment problem. Mr. Speaker, I suppose any Government worth its salt would continue to work towards that, but this resolution is not much more definitive, but it calls on a Government that hasn't yet put down a master plan, it calls on a Government that hasn't yet developed a master plan to begin to do one, Mr. Speaker, to immediately begin to take corrective action to address the unemployment problem in the Province.

That's what the resolution calls for, and I would hope that when the resolution is voted on, I would expect that there wouldn't be a Member in this place who would vote against that resolution. It's not partisan in nature, it doesn't condemn, it just calls on the Government to take immediate action to correct

the unemployment problem in the Province. Now if a Government, Mr. Speaker, if a Government cannot take that kind of suggestion, if a Government cannot take that kind of positive support in unanimity from the House of Assembly, then I have to say, I mean, what is the point, there is no point whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to address a few items raised by Members opposite when they rose to speak to this particular resolution. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations I would have thought, as I said earlier, would have led off for the Government on this resolution. It's a resolution that is dedicated to a problem for which the Minister has responsibility, and we have seen in this particular Budget that the House is still debating under another proceeding on other days, that the response of this Minister, at a time when unemployment has been going up now for five or six months consecutively, the response of this Minister has been to cap the only Employment Generation Program that the Government has. And in questions or under questioning from Members of this side of the House, the response has been that it was not a priority. The Minister used the word 'priority', Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions in this House last week, in particular, in telling us that unemployment, even though it was up to 18.6 or 18.7 or 18.8 per cent again in April month, even though it had risen 1.4 per cent over the same time period last year, the Minister was saying to the unemployed in this Province that an Employment Generation Program was not high enough on the Government's priority list to warrant further funding.

So therefore she had to cap the funding at \$2.9 million and condemn, Mr. Speaker, those people out there who were looking toward the Government for some type of leadership in helping them out of the employment mess that they are facing right now, and still and all, Mr. Speaker, that Minister would not, in this particular debate when there was an opportune time to do so, that Minister would not rise in this debate and tell us whether or not the Government is considering some level. We asked the Minister last week, and she said they would continue to monitor the situation. But is the some level when the Government will again inject some funding into the Employment Generation Program to help alleviate the problem faced by 18 per cent or 19 per cent of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are now seeking employment? The Government reaction is, oh, we do not deal in Band-Aids. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you have a cut a Band-Aid is better than nothing. And while you are developing something long term, perhaps it will be necessary to use a few Band-Aids, and if the Government has to use a few Band-Aids and the Minister has to use them, well then that is what should be done, Mr. Speaker.

But no not this Minister, not this Government standing true blue as they are, Mr. Speaker, they just cap it, nothing new. On top of that what was worse, Mr. Speaker, we found out that over the last several weeks all the funding is run out, we are only a month and a couple of weeks, six or seven weeks into the new fiscal year - there is no new money unless there is slippage, and therefore the unemployed of this Province have nothing from this Government, nothing, absolutely nothing to

look forward to in terms of any relieve, in terms of employment generation over the next number of weeks and months, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Minister of Finance can laugh at that. He is getting \$90,000 or \$100,000 a year, he is okay, Mr. Speaker, but there are people in this Province not as okay as the Minister of Finance is.

An Hon. Member: You do not know.

Mr. Rideout: I do know. I am getting the same.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about comments made by the hon. gentleman for St. John's South. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the situation facing the St. John's Dockyard, and I have a lot of sympathy for the position that the hon. gentleman finds himself in. But, Mr. Speaker, when we were the Government of this Province and there was a Liberal Government in Ottawa who would not assist the St. John's Dockyard in modernization we acted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Murphy: I said that.

Mr. Rideout: I know you said it in a very half-hearted, tainted political partisan way. I heard what the hon. gentleman said. But the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that when a Federal Liberal Government refused to recognize the need to modernize the St. John's Dockyard by putting in a synchrolift, the poor old Province found the money, Mr. Speaker, through a combination, I believe, of equity and loan guarantees, to give to Marine Atlantic who were the owners then or CN Marine were the owners then, I guess, we found the money, Mr. Speaker, on top of every other

crisis, we had to face a legitimate need and to address a legitimate need at the St. John's dockyard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government is not content to do that. This Government says it is owned by a Federal Crown corporation. So it is. And so the Federal Crown corporation and their Federal masters should be held accountable and they should act, Mr. Speaker. But it is also within the power and the influence and the authority of this Government to act if it so wishes, Mr. Speaker. And that is the point I want to make. I believe we went something like \$20 million or certainly several millions, \$12 million was it? I know it was several millions of dollars to put a new synchrolift in at that yard to make it more modern and, hopefully, be able to attract business to make it viable and provide a steady number of jobs for a number of people.

So we did that, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud that we did it. I think, it is possible that if we had not done it the St. John's Dockyard, even though it is facing difficulties today, probably would not even be in business today, Mr. Speaker. So I think we did the right thing and, I think, it is incumbent on this Government to do the right thing and help out as well, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very intrigued by some comments made by the Member for Carbonear. Particularly, as it relates to industrial development in the Province in general, I suppose, but more particularly as it relates to financial support to primary industries in the Province for example, the fishery. The

same would apply to agriculture and if there is new mining developments the same would apply to them and so on. But the Member was talking in particular about financial support for the fishery. The Member, Mr. Speaker, made it abundantly clear, and I have heard him say that before in this House, that it is the position of this Government which he supports, that unless those industries, in particular the people involved in the fishery, can stand on their own then they must fall.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, I suppose, a great free enterprise philosophy that most of us in normal circumstances would be able to identify with. But the reality of much of rural Newfoundland and Labrador is not based on normal circumstances, Mr. Speaker. If we had taken that attitude when we were Government with Earle's Fisheries in Carbonear they would not be in business today. If we had taken that attitude with the Harbour Grace Fishing Company that would not be in business today. If we had taken that attitude with Blue Ocean Products they would not be in business today. If we had taken that attitude with dozens and dozens of other fish companies, because they were caught in a resource squeeze, or because they were caught in a market squeeze, or because they were experiencing bad management situations, if we had taken that attitude Mr. Speaker, then they would not be in the business today.

An. hon. Member: Most of them are not.

Mr. Rideout: Most of them are in the business today, Mr. Speaker, what about the Harbour Grace Fishing Company today? what about

Blue Ocean -

An Hon. Member: That's the company that went bankrupt, wasn't it?

Mr. Rideout: Pardon?

No. We put Moores in bankruptcy. Right, that is what we did, Mr. Speaker, and then provided assistance for another group to go in there.

The hon. Minister Mr. Speaker, the mad-doctor, the only politician that I know of who had to be flung out of a political party by resolution at an annual general meeting, is riding roughshod over the business population of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, every time he opens his mouth, every time that Minister opens his mouth, he does more damage to either the service sector, he does more damage to people in the primary sector, he does damage to someone, Mr. Speaker, and intergovernmental relations. That Minister is always doing damage somewhere. If he continues with the attitude he is displaying towards the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador, we are not going to have small independent fish companies around this Province very much longer, Mr. Speaker. They are facing a resource crisis now. A resource crisis that will be solved when the stocks come back, Mr. Speaker.

It is incumbent upon the Government to help them through that crisis. I mean, so what if you have \$10 million or \$15 million or \$20 million of loan guarantees out to those companies. We used to have them and at any given time you might pay out on two or three. I mean,

you are sustaining thousands of jobs in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, but this Government is totally against it. Little Bay Islands - we have them up the Southern Shore, we have them over in Piccadilly, we have them down in Belleoram, we have them down in Doyles. We have dozens and dozens of small, independent operators in this Province, who could create and have, in fact, over the years, created hundreds and hundreds of jobs, who are looking for support but not getting it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Except for Twillingate.

Mr. Rideout: Well that was the point of the questions today. What was this deal? And if it could be offered to Twillingate, why couldn't it be offered to other communities that find themselves in similar circumstances, Mr. Speaker? But the reaction of the Government is, oh, you are all against Twillingate, just like the reaction of the Government last week when we asked about the conditions on the FPI loan, oh, you are against Grand Bank. I mean, they still haven't answered that. But one of these days, Mr. Speaker, it will come home to roost that we have to support primary industry in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, not take the attitude displayed by the hon. the Member for Carbonear. Because if we take that attitude in most of this Province, the end result is not what the Member said, that we would tighten up our economy, we would tighten up our economy to the point where the population base of this Province is moved somewhere else, Mr. Speaker. That has been the reality of Newfoundland and Labrador for decades and decades and decades, and it will be for

some time to come, despite what the Economic Recovery Commission may or may not achieve. If it achieves something, we will welcome it, but we haven't seen anything so far. We cannot point to any success by the Economic Recovery Commission yet, Mr. Speaker.

I read through, I think it was, a twenty-two page document put out by Dr. House at a press conference at one of the downtown hotels a week or ten days ago, and it was the biggest litany of apologies I have ever seen in my life. We haven't had time to do this, we haven't had time to do that. Government can't do this. The private sector has to do that. Mr. Speaker, it was a litany of failure, that's what it was. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I believe, is timely, it doesn't condemn the Government, it just calls on the Government to act. It deserves the support of every Member in this House, and I hope, when the vote is put, Mr. Speaker, on the motion, as put on the Order Paper by my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes, that it will receive the unanimous endorsement of this House that it deserves.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't have a lot of time and I don't intend to rant and rave, Mr. Speaker.

Down through the years, we have heard a lot of ranting and raving about unemployment. I believe it was in 1982 that Members opposite campaigned on the 40,000 instant

jobs they were going to create. We have heard a lot of ranting and raving, the 40,000 jobs that never materialized.

During the last four years, Mr. Speaker, sitting in Opposition, in the wilderness, I tallied up, and I believe if my memory serves me correctly - and it may not - if it does serve me correctly, I believe they announced 370,000 new jobs in four years.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: We have heard a lot of ranting and raving about unemployment from Members opposite. I don't intend to do that. I don't intend to do any of that, at all. What I intend to do, Mr. Speaker, is to simply go over a few figures that explain the situation as it exists in this Province.

What I would like to do, is have a look at the employment situation in this Province and do a comparison. The comparison I have chosen to do, Mr. Speaker, is the January to March averages, the first quarter averages this year, compared to the first quarter averages last year. I would like to point these out, and do the comparison of January/March, 1989 - January/March, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, in this Province, the labour force during that time increased by 3.9 per cent. Employment went up 2.8 per cent. There were more people employed in this Province during the first quarter of 1990 than the first quarter of 1989. However, Mr. Speaker, unemployment also went up a couple of thousand, which accounted for an increase in the unemployment rate from the first quarter of 1989 to the first

quarter of 1990, an increase in the unemployment rate of about 7/10 of a percentage point. So there has been since the first quarter of 1989 compared to the first quarter of 1990 an increase in the unemployment rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you might wonder why I would even mention that, an increase in the unemployment rate. What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is put that in perspective, because we are in an economy that is not entirely of our own making. We are in an economy that is a national, in fact international economy. What I would like to do is compare the same figures during that same period in another one of the Atlantic Provinces, because by and large we are subject to the same kinds of forces, and we have some little influence over it, but by and large we are subject to the same kind of forces.

Lets take Prince Edward Island, and compare Newfoundland to Prince Edward Island in that same time. Mr. Speaker, the labour force, go back to that. In Newfoundland, from 1989 to 1990 the labour force increased here by 3.9 per cent, and in Prince Edward Island it went up only 1.7 per cent, so they did not have such a large increase in their labour force. The employment in Newfoundland in that period increased by 2.8 per cent. In Prince Edward Island the employment decreased by 2 per cent in that same time. We did much better than Prince Edward Island. In terms of unemployment we did have an increase of about 5 per cent in unemployment numbers in that time frame, and in Prince Edward Island they had an increase of 20 per cent. And Mr. Speaker, that translated into an increase in the unemployment rate in Prince

Edward Island in that same period of time compared to our increase of 7/10 of a per cent, in Prince Edward Island they increased 3.2 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, during that period of time, even though we are subject to the same general kinds of influences, we have fared much better than Prince Edward Island during that same time. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an indication here. Lest Members opposite think that I am simply picking Prince Edward Island because it is so small and subject to fluctuation, and that Prince Edward Island does not matter very much, why don't we have a look at Nova Scotia. Lets have a look at Nova Scotia, and see how Nova Scotia fared in that same period of time compared to Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that same period of time in Nova Scotia the labour force increased 2.3 per cent to our 3.9 per cent, again they did not have such a large increase in the labour force, so you would think they would find it easier to create jobs and provide the jobs for that increase. The employment in Nova Scotia went up during that year period 6/10 of 1 per cent, and the employment in Newfoundland went up close to 3 per cent, 2.8 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment in Newfoundland as I have said, unfortunately, increased by 5.3 per cent in terms of numbers from 1989 to 1990. In Nova Scotia it increased 13.9 per cent, almost 14 per cent, almost three times what it increased in Newfoundland. And that translated, Mr. Speaker, to a rise in the unemployment rate in the first quarter of 1989 to the first quarter of 1990 of 1.3 percentage points in Nova Scotia compared to .7 percentage points

in Newfoundland. Now I just point these things out, Mr. Speaker, simply because its important that when you are talking about unemployment you put things in perspective, and I can say without a shadow of doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have fared better than the other Atlantic Provinces in terms of unemployment during the last year, from the first quarter of 1989 to the first quarter of 1990 we have, there is no doubt about it. Nova Scotia, is perhaps more significant because there are larger numbers of people and Nova Scotia is normally considered to be a growth area.

And we have fared better than Prince Edward Island, but we also fared much better than Nova Scotia in that same time period. So, Mr. Speaker, obviously we have fared better than Nova Scotia in terms of unemployment and employment in the last twelve month period from the first quarter of 1989 to the first quarter of 1990.

But, Mr. Speaker, that does not tell the whole story. It is easy for me to take the figures and show the people, tell the people the truth, that we have fared better during the last year than the other Atlantic Provinces. I can say that, we have fared better. But that does not tell the whole story because, Mr. Speaker, what have we been saying for the last year in terms of employment? What is it we have been saying? We have been saying that the 350,000 or 370,000 short term, part time, whatever it is, jobs that Members Opposite claimed they created in four years, is not what we want to do. What we want to do is try to create the climate where there are more full time jobs in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me throw another figure at you. It deals with full time employment, which is where we are coming from, what we want to do. During the first three months of 1990 full year employment rose by 6000. Full time employment rose by 6000.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Speaker, there had to be some -

An Hon. Member: How many went down? How many did it lose?

Mr. Baker: Okay, the part time employment. Let us look at the part time employment, it went down by 1000. Part time employment went down by 1000 and that is a fact.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is full time employment. Our programs are geared towards full time employment being created in this Province, and obviously something is working. Members Opposite tend to take the attitude that nothing has been done in the last year. Well, something happened. We out-performed Nova Scotia, we out-performed P.E.I., we are creating full time jobs, and you cannot argue with that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Speaker, because of that - if I can be allowed to speak.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes on a point of order.

Mr. Hearn: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is trying to mislead the House or not, but over the last five or six minutes we have had -

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, over the last five or six minutes we have had the House Leader stand up and quote a pile of statistics. He has not named his source, he has not tabled the information, they do not jive with any of the realistic figures that we have. And what he is trying to do is to convince the House and his uneducated colleagues that -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment. Some of his colleagues are educated. But what the Member is trying to do is to convince the House that this Government has, in fact, done something to create jobs.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

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

There is no point of order.

Mr. Hearn: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

This is just a disagreement.

Mr. Hearn: I have not made my point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Could you clue up in a few seconds?

Mr. Hearn: My point, Mr. Speaker, the point of order, until I was so

rudely interrupted by the gentleman opposite was that the House Leader is trying, unintentionally perhaps, to mislead the House with information that will affect the resolution as it is put on the Order Paper, and that is extremely serious. He hasn't tabled it. Perhaps it is a figment of his imagination. But the facts and figures he lays in front of us today, without tabling them or naming his source, have that effect upon the Members who are listening and, consequently, could have an effect on the vote. That is an extremely serious situation. Because they didn't get away -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order!

Mr. Hearn: They didn't get away with trying to amend the resolution. They tried to amend the resolution by changing it, and now he is trying to interpret the resolution by using false figures.

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

There is no point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order?

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a legitimate point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think we have found in recent days, in fact, that when the Minister of Social Services was quoting information, he was ordered by the Chair to table the documents from which he was quoting. This applies, according

to the rules, to a Minister of the Crown. The President of Treasury Board being a Minister of the Crown, of course, would be in the same predicament, the same position as the Minister of Social Services, the same pickle as the Minister of Social Services and, therefore, the Minister should table his documentation from which he is quoting, as well. I suggest your Honour should rule on that.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is willing to rule, but I will hear one more submission.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that point of order. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious they can't take the heat. It is quite obvious they can't take the heat, they have to play their little games. Mr. Speaker, they have to play their little games. This is what is happening here and it has to do with the point of order. This is what is happening here, that Members opposite were trying, and it has to do with the order of the House, they were trying to kill the time I had left so I couldn't do what I wanted to do with the resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what's happened here. They have misused points of order and they intended to continue to until my time was up. They were misusing points of order to try to stifle correct information. Now, there were two points of order raised, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to what the Opposition House Leader said. I really find it amusing that they have to pull those little tricks. Mr. Speaker, I stood in my place, as everybody here can attest. I did not pick up a document and read from it. I quoted figures which are correct figures and are accurate figures and which are available to any Members opposite

who want to do the proper research. Obviously it is not in their interest to do the proper research, Mr. Speaker, because obviously they didn't do it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no document that I am quoting, there is no mysterious document, these are figures which are readily available to all Members who want to take the time and the trouble to go and research them. Mr. Speaker, the point about this whole thing is that if they knew the figures, they would realize that their resolution simply does not make sense. Because things are happening. We are now doing things to correct the unemployment problem in this Province. They know that and they are afraid to admit it.

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

His Honour was in the Chair when the hon. the Minister of Social Services was reading from a document which was a published document, and His Honour ruled at that time that it had to be tabled. His Honour did not notice the Government House Leader reading from any document; I noted he was quoting statistics. According to Beauchesne hon. Members are allowed to have notes on their desks but not to actually read from documents. I rule there is no point of order.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We certainly respect your ruling. We were under the impression that the Member, not knowing his capacity for retaining figures, was quoting from the document and was perhaps trying to

interfere with the intent of the resolution. But he has fully explained that to the House, we accept his explanation, and we will get on with the shortened summary.

Maybe when the House Leader was speaking he should have indicated some of the things the Government has done to help the unemployment situation in the Province. There is a short list here. The Private Sector Program, which in 1988-89 had \$6.2 million in it, was cut out completely and substituted eventually by a \$2.9 million program; the Graduate Employment Program, \$1.6 million last year, this year it was cut by \$600,000; the Student Employment Program was cut by 33 1/3 per cent; the Youth Employment Strategy vote was cut from \$1.8 million to \$1.6 million; Social Assistance Employment Initiatives \$2 million, eliminated; the Forestry Program, the Silviculture Program at Wooddale was cut out, eliminating not only jobs but perhaps the future of the forestry in the Province, if we are talking about long-term planning.

Then we see the Economic Development Committee in the Department of Education going outside the Province to buy all their computers which affected the jobs of people in our Province. As I said before to them, we do not need computers, they can unplug them. The writing is on the wall when it comes to what is happening with the unemployment figures in the Province. The tourism booklets which were printed were printed outside of Province. All these are jobs going outside the Province. The Occupational Integration Program for Women was cut. So we see program after program after

program after program, good solid initiatives, being cut by the Government opposite. But I do not want to be critical. Perhaps for awhile we will give the hon. gentlemen a few things to think about to create some jobs.

Just looking down the array of Ministers, one of the things the Minister of Health could probably do to create some jobs would be to continue the nursing projects his Department has taken up. I was going to say started, but it was started by us and continued by the Minister, with a tremendous amount of success; - where we have co-ordinated home care projects in different parts of the Province, provided worthwhile jobs in areas, and providing top-notch home care in rural areas of the Province, in particular.

Mr. Decker: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Health on a point of order.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker would not knowingly mislead this House and I would not dare accuse him of doing so. But he talks about this Nursing Program which is down in his District. Now he is trying to take credit for his Government starting that program. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. It is a program which we put in our Budget this year. It is a fact that the nurses did try to get that when the previous Government was in power, and no doubt had the previous Government stayed in power they still would have gotten it - I am not trying to say that. But the fact of the matter is, it is a program which is being funded

by this present Administration in this year's Budget, Mr. Speaker. Knowing how upright the hon. Member is, I want to make sure he does not do inadvertently what he would not do deliberately. Therefore, I do not want him to mislead the House; I am sure he would never deliberately mislead the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. Member is just trying to clarify what the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes was saying.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is quite evident that as I raise the different things which should be done, the continuation of things we started and what have you, we are going to get debate from the Members on it. So, if they are not going to take the positive points we have to offer and suggestions for creating real jobs, I will close debate, Mr. Speaker, and call for the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Simms: Ready for the question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favor of the resolution 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against the resolution 'Nay'.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

Division

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

All those in favour of the motion, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Baker), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Gover, Mr. Penney, the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren), the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. 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, Mrs. Verge, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. Matthews, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. A. Snow, Mr. S. Winsor, Mr. Power, Mr. Langdon, Mr. Hynes.

CLERK (Miss Duff): Mr. Speaker, the vote is thirty-seven for the motion and none against.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to advise hon. Members that tomorrow we will continue on with Bill 31, I believe, which is the one we finished on on Tuesday. When that is dealt with, we will move to the main Budget Speech itself.

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

Mr. Simms: I ask the Government House Leader - how shall I word this? - is it his intention or does he have an inkling as to whether or not tomorrow at 5:00 p.m., for planning purposes, the Government intends to defeat the motion for adjournment at five o'clock and, therefore, we will be sitting tomorrow night? Members would obviously like to know so they can do their planning or whatever might be necessary for meetings.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the Opposition House Leader knows, it is very difficult to predict what might happen in the House of Assembly, and I say that in all honesty. I have no idea what is going to happen tomorrow in the first three hours; I have no idea how many petitions there may be; I have no idea how many Bills we can cover, or whether we can get through the Budget debate or whatever. I do not know how much progress we will make.

I would like to advise hon. Members of the House that we do have at least twenty pieces of legislation to get through

sometime before the middle of July or the end of June. I intend to ask hon. Members to take full advantage of any time they may have to debate the Budget and to handle these pieces of legislation.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot really say. I would just like to say that much to inform hon. Members of at least where I am coming from.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, unlike my colleagues on this side, I am used to negotiating and having discussions with the President of the Council and I can tell you precisely what he just said.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: I thank the President of the Council for now confirming that we will be sitting tomorrow night.

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