



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 44

VERBATIM REPORT

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Before commencing today's proceedings, I have been asked by the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation to announce that two visitors from his district, Miss Rachel Dumont and her sister Alice - Miss Rachel Dumont is the Carnival Queen 1973 in Labrador City. I trust that your stay here will be interesting and informative.

PETITIONS:

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, on Firday, Budget Day, I gave notice that I would be raising a question of privilege. I regret that I was not able to raise it yesterday but I was unable to have the Hansards in time for that and obviously the Hansard was relevant to the point. I now raise it at the first opportunity I have. It would not have been the right thing to have raised it on Friday.

The question, Sir, is founded upon the fact that the Premier (I regret he is not in his seat but we are unfortunately accustomed to that) on Thursday evening past in dealing with the resignation from the cabinet and from the House of the former member for Hermitage and the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Cheeseman, in so doing, the Premier misrepresented grossly the proceedings of the House. I submit, Sir, that that is a breach of the privileges of the House. One can find adequate citations in Beauchesne to support that contention.

The Premier's statement was made outside the Chamber, Sir. I believe it was made at a press conference held on the eight floor of this building, it was not made in the House. His statement as reported in Friday's issue of the "Evening Telegram" and similar statements were carried on CBC in the "Here and Now Programme" on Thursday evening. The Premier's statement and I am now quoting from the "Evening Telegram" "Only three days ago," said the Premier. "Mr. Cheeseman was referred to in the legislature as 'the most incompetent minister the Government of Newfoundland has seen.' This is the sort of thing that will drive good

men, men who do not have to put up with it, out of politics."

Mr. Moores did not identify the individual who attacked Mr. Cheeseman in the House, although Mr. Neary was quoted as calling the former Fisheries Minister incompetent. It goes on then to point out that Mr. Neary, the honourable member for Bell Island, in fact did not say that the former gentleman from Hermitage, Mr. Cheeseman, was incompetent.

I now have the Hansard of that portion of the debate and none of the members, Mr. Speaker, who spoke in that debate, none, not one, not any, not either, not any said that the minister was incompetent. There were remarks made about the fact that he was disillusioned, downhearted, dejected, disappointed, that the Department of Fisheries had been downgraded. There were also remarks made that the minister, as he then was, was the weakest minister in the cabinet at this moment and it is the weakest department at this moment. Again, those statements were made.

We have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where the Premier of this province has breached the privilege of this House by going outside the House and misrepresenting what went on in the chamber. He misrepresented it either deliberately or carelessly. I am in no position to say which but I submit that since this is a question affecting the privileges of the House, not of any individual member as such but all of us in the House, we have a right, Sir, to have our proceedings adequately reported and accurately reported. That right is especially great when a man who is leader of the House, the Premier of the Province, is doing the reporting.

I submit therefore, Sir, that there is a question of privilege. I submit therefore that on that basis the Premier should withdraw his statement and should indicate to the House that he regrets having made his statement. I am prepared to believe that he made the statement carelessly. I am not prepared at this stage at least to say that he made it maliciously. I submit that there is a question of

privilege and I submit that action should follow.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's argument has been heard and it will be taken under advisement. I hope to be able to advise the House on it tomorrow.

MR. A. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave at this time to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Grand Falls and Windsor. This petition was circulated in the area by the Grand Falls Rod and Gun Club and contains nearly 900 names. The purpose of the petition is to inform the government of the feelings of the people in Grand Falls District in regard to the issuance of caribou licenses.

As we know, our three main herds are located on the Buchans Plateau which is area (2), the Grey River Area (3), LaPoile Area (1). In at least one of these areas, Sir, as many as seventy percent of the licenses issued are going to nonresident hunters. I further understand that in area (4), the sale of licenses to nonresident hunters has been discontinued this year. The reason for this apparently was because there was a tremendous demand from the residents in this area. The people of Grand Falls District are concerned that the same thinking was not applied to areas (1, 2 and 3) when there were over 800 people last year who could not get licenses in these areas.

It is further requested, Sir, that I present this petition to this honourable House prior to the date for the draw for licenses which is April 4, 1973, which is tomorrow. They are requesting, Sir, that this date be advanced until the prayer of this petition can be considered and dealt with fairly.

It is further requested that the residents of Newfoundland be given preference over nonresidents in the awarding of big game licenses. It is further requested that the present system of awarding moose and caribou licenses be altered commencing immediately, so that licenses issued to nonresidents not exceed twenty percent of the total licenses available in any given area.

Sir, as I said before, this petition

is signed by almost 900 residents. The petition was circulated for a very short period of time. From the representation that I have had in the past year from the Grand Falls district, I believe, Sir, if sufficient time were available to circulate this petition, it would have been signed by as many as five or six thousand people. It has been a matter of great concern in this area for some time.

There is another problem in addition to the issuance of licenses, which relates to licenses issued to hunting lodge operators. Apparently this year because some of the regulations have been changed, some of the existing boundaries have been changed and some of the lodge owners in the Grand Falls District this year will not be able to operate. Sir, anyone who is familiar with these lodge owners know that they receive bookings from people in the U.S. and the Mainland of Canada as early as January each year. Apparently they were not made aware of these changes. They have now been placed at a considerable disadvantage. They have spent a great deal of time, they have gone to a considerable expense preparing for the hunting season and I am informed that it will create a considerable hardship and loss of income to them this year.

So, once again, Sir, I am requesting on their behalf that the draw for licenses tomorrow be cancelled until this petition can be considered and reviewed. I ask that, Sir, not only on behalf of the people who have signed this petition but in fact on behalf of the approximately 20,000 people who I represent in this House. I request that this petition be tabled and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. S.A. NEARY: I rise to support the petition presented by the member for Grand Falls on behalf of 900 residents in the Grand Falls, Windsor area who want the caribou licensing regulations changed.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member left it until today to present the petition. I understand that the honourable member did not receive the petition until recently but the announcement has already been made on radio and television (I am not sure if it has been in the newspapers) that the draw will take place tomorrow. I only hope that the member is successful in getting the minister to postpone the draw for caribou licences until this matter is straightened out. This is a very controversial matter in Central Newfoundland, Sir, and I think a lot of people in this province are concerned about it.

I had another request recently from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 974 in Buchans, on the same matter. They said that they would like to see a bar on American hunters who come to our province and destroy our game animals. They destroy our animals by the thousands just for the trophies and leave the meat to spoil.

People in Central Newfoundland, Sir, and in other parts of the province are very concerned about this and we support the prayer of the petition and we trust that the minister responsible will be able to defer the caribou licence draw, that was supposed to take place tomorrow, until some future date.

MR. G. M. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the people of the Town Council of Bay Roberts and Coley's Point. The prayer of this petition is to seek the upgrading of Klondike Road which connects Coley's Point with Bay Roberts. There had been a fatal accident there about three years ago and there this winter there has been another accident which occurred. Over this past three years there have been several accidents. While I have this petition in my possession, I think myself that it should be placed on the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

The Town of Bay Roberts have already received on capital works programme, since this petition had been put out, \$50,000 to cover

this project. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to present this petition on behalf of the people of Coley's Point and Bay Roberts. I am also happy to know that they have the amount of \$50,000 on the capital works project; \$40,000 for labour and \$10,000 for materials. I hope that this could be said for every district in the island of this province, not only for the Community of Bay Roberts. We would be much better off to abide and work for those that need it and also services to communities to which we belong. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: I think the honourable member made a good point there when he said that this would make a good make-work project. I agree with him, Sir. I trust that the Minister of Finance is not as inflexible as he might be over this year's estimates and will be able to find the money -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member - Standing Order 97: "There shall be no debate on a petition, unless the House has it under consideration.

MR. NEARY: What I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I trust that the Minister of Finance will be able to find the resources to upgrade and pave this road, to be able to grant the prayer of the petition. That is all I am saying, Sir. We support the petition.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, if I may make an announcement -

MR. A. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present another petition on behalf of the Local Improvement District of Buchans. This petition has been signed by some 1,249 residents of the Towns of Buchans, Millertown, Buchans Junction and Howley. The prayer of the petition is to request the government to construct a road from Buchans to Howley or to complete the approximate twenty miles of road left to be constructed to the West Coast.

As we all know, Sir, the people of Buchans have for many years lived with the possibility that the mine there would close down, thus

leaving the town a virtual ghost town. The latest projection are that the mine has a life expectancy of about five years. In view of that, Sir, it is felt that it is time for the government to direct their attention to the future of this area. It is felt that with a road constructed to the West Coast and also to connect with the road being constructed from Burgeo, that the Buchans Area could become a service centre for people travelling through this area. In the future, when the road could be upgraded to acceptable standards, the CN bus service, in addition to the service which exists now, could be diverted through this area, providing a much needed service to this area and also saving a considerable travelling distance for the people travelling across Newfoundland.

It would also mean, Sir, that there would be cheaper freight service, by using this road, to many thousands of people in Newfoundland, not only people living in the Buchans or Central Newfoundland Area. Also in the Red Indian Lake Area, we have one of Newfoundland's greatest historic and scenic spots which could easily be developed into one of the provinces great tourist attraction areas .

Sir, the people of this area have always been an independent and proud people and have made a great contribution to the Provincial Treasury. I feel, Sir, that it is not unreasonable that they request the government to direct attention to this area because, Sir, if the town should close down, the people are not interested in living on welfare. Already the people of this town have taken the initiative to form a development association to assess the potential for development in the area. All they are asking, Sir, is that the government show a little concern and give them a little co-operation.

I take great pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition and request that it now be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER(Min. of Education): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this petition of the people of Buchans. Buchans, of course, has had a number of problems lately. I am happy to say that the two schools are open today, the furnaces were installed last night and that they are now open.

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen frequently asked questions about it. I must retract it, Mr. Speaker, it was out of order for me to announce that the two schools are now open and that the boilers are hooked up. It was out of order and I retract it but I cannot disconnect the boilers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member is out of order. He has admitted that he was out of order. However, it is apparently a circuitous device to make a statement for which leave was denied. It is not a procedure on which the Chair will frown a great deal today. It is not to be encouraged in the future.

MR. P.S.THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Grand Falls on behalf of the residents of Buchans, Millertown, Buchans Junction and Howley.

Mr. Speaker, the reconstruction and I trust eventually the pavement of this road, which will possibly be reconstructed by the present administration and paved by the incoming Liberal Administration, within another couple or three years, this will undoubtedly cut down the time involved in transporting the goods from Western Newfoundland to Eastern Newfoundland and therefore it will be an economic boost to the economy of Eastern Newfoundland. It will give our friends on the West Coast and of course us in return a shorter distance to travel back and forth from the West to East Coast of Newfoundland. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will do all in his power to find enough money

within his present estimates, small as they may be, to have some work done on this road this year. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if in his estimates there is no money, maybe the minister could try to hurry up the negotiations with Ottawa and come to an agreement such as the previous government had, as far as the reconstructing and paving the trunk roads which, as we all know, are in very bad need of reconstruction and paving.

Also while the minister is in Ottawa, I trust that he will talk to the people there and come to some kind of an agreement like the previous Smallwood Administration had for reconstructing and improving the Trans Canada Highway. There are now in the province at least two sections of the Trans Canada

Highway which are not up to Trans Canada standards. Mr. Speaker, we on this side wholeheartedly support the petition presented. I am disappointed he did not shut me up.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the next order of the day I would like to direct hon. members to page eighty-four, article ninety-one, subsection (1) of Beauchesne, concerning the matter of the ministerial statement which reads as follows: "When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment of the House, it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the Chiefs of recognized groups are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed under any Standing Order." So the latter part of that subsection would be irrelevant to the particular point which we are discussing. The hon. the Minister of Education would be quite in order to make a ministerial statement between presenting petitions and presenting reports of standing and select committees.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has this perplexity once again, I really do not know what brought this up. I have not heard a point of order raised and I know Your Honour is quite in order to originate points on Your Honour's own hook as it were but I mean that is fair enough. Beauchesne applies only when our own orders or precedents are silent. As a matter of fact that precise precedent to which Your Honour just referred, which Your Honour just read, has been held time and time again in this House not to apply. Although I will give credit where credit is due, the present government do permit the practise of comments from the other side, their precedessors did not, rightly or wrongly but they did not. The hon. Minister of Education asked leave to revert because the rules of our House, Sir, the precedents of our House, I do not think it is

in standing orders, are that statements are made only when the orders of the day are called. It does not matter what Beauchesne says, Sir, our precedents are clear, crystal clear and the majority can change it. The majority can vote this House out of existence if they wish. The hon. gentleman asked leave to revert and for my part, rightly or wrongly but within my rights as a member, I said no, in view of the harrassment, the deliberate campaign that we are witnessing to strangle debate in this House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would permit, the point raised by the Chair was merely one of information as to what was concluded in Beauchesne and it would appear to be relevant. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is entering into a long debate on a matter of opinion from the Chair for which there is no need for him to make this statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour trotted out this ruling and there are five hundred pages in Beauchesne any one of which Your Honour could have read from, any one of which would have been as relevant as this. What I started by asking was what - I mean the hon. gentleman asked leave. We refused leave, rightly or wrongly I refused the unanimous consent, and then Your Honour reads a citation from Beauchesne. Now was there a point of order? Is Your Honour making a ruling? What are you up to? That is what I am asking. I am looking for guidance if you wish and I am quite deadly serious. I respect the Chair, Mr. Speaker, as much as any member in this House but the Chair in this House or anywhere else gets the respect it deserves, no more and no less. Now all I ask is if Your Honour would tell us apropos of what was this interesting little reference to Beauchesne meant.

MR. SPEAKER: A gratuitous comment of the Chair.

MOTIONS:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN(MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Forests I give notice that I will

on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Law With Respect To The Marketing Of Natural Products," and I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Department of Labrador Affairs Act."

HON. C.W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of this hon. House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Indenture Entered Into Between The Government, Newfoundland Steel (1968) Company Limited And Lundrigans Limited With Respect To The Termination Of The Agreement Forming The Schedule To The Government-Newfoundland Steel (1968) Company Limited-Lundrigans Limited (Agreement) Act, 1969, And To Make Statutory Provision Respecting Matters Connected Therewith."

MR. ROBERTS: That is the short title, is it?

MR. DOODY: That is the short title of the bill, Your Honour.

HON. DR. A.I. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave in this House to present a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Health and Public Welfare Act."

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And Kennco Explorations(Canada) Limited."

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I would like to ask the minister if he would inform the hon. House what the government's policy is on compulsory arbitration as a method in settling labour disputes in the province.

HON. W.G. DAWE (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): I think the hon. member is well aware as are all the rest of us here in this House that we do not have any compulsory arbitration.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I ask the minister what the policy of the government was. The minister has already made a statement outside the House. Would the minister care to clarify the public statement he made outside the House?

MR. DAWE: I was asked if we were considering it. We are considering all kinds of things. We can talk about that and so on, the pros and cons.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. In view of the fact that we are on the verge of embarking upon a second oil refinery in Placentia Bay could the minister inform this House if there have been an ecology study carried out in the area? If not, is there one being carried? If not, will there be one carried out?

HON. T.V. HICKEY (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT):

Mr. Speaker, I will need some time to take that question under advisement and come up with the answer for the hon. gentleman.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, all I need is just a simple answer. The minister must know if there is one being carried out or not.

MR. HICKEY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. THOMS: Point of order, go away with you.

MR. HICKEY: I will give the hon. gentleman the information if he wants it. Does he want to be bluffed or does he want the facts?

MR. THOMS: Just yes or not, that is all I am asking.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North has the right to ask a question and the minister has given an acceptable response. The hon. member for Bonavista North might put his question on the order paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works -

AN HON. MEMBER: Order! Order!

MR. NEARY: Order what? Ham and eggs. Mr. Speaker, I would like to

ask the Minister of Public Works what action if any his department has taken on a request from the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees to have the reserve parking abolished around the Confederation Building.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE(MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES): Mr. Speaker,

I have no such request at the moment. I have no such request.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the acting Premier and I believe it is the Minister of Justice. I asked the minister two or three days ago if he could inform this House when the Cook Report was to be tabled and he said he would look into the situation for me. So I am wondering if he has any information at this time.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture will be back in his place hopefully before the end of this week and certainly by and at that time he will be in a position to report to this House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of Public Works. Is the minister aware that representatives of Branch 9 of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees met with the minister's deputy minister on March 12, 1973 concerning reserved parking around Confederation Building and had a second meeting on March 16, 1973 with the Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works? Is the minister also aware that a deadline has been set on getting an answer on this matter of April 16 of the present month? Is the minister aware of these facts, Mr. Speaker?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question 116 asked by the hon. member for White Bay South on the order paper of March 7. I would also like to redirect a number of questions which have been directed to me by the member for White Bay South. First on the order paper of March 28 there is question number 200 about the electrification of Petit Forte that is for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Question number 201

and 202, 203, 204, 205, 206 and 212 on the Order Paper of March 30th. These have all to be directed to the departments that are responsible for them. I have no knowledge of the answers.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: At the present time, yes. If you redirect the others.

MR. W. ROWE: Is the honourable minister redirecting or is he requiring leave. I want an answer to redirect.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order. I do not think these questions need to be redirected as such. If I may be allowed to explain what happened. It is, these questions were asked of the Minister of Economic Development as the portfolio then was. At that time, Sir, ruralelectrification and tourism were under the Economic Development Department.

Now, with restructuring - and this is a generic point really, Mr. Speaker, because there will be a number of questions in this - with the restructuring exercise these departments of course have been sumdered. There is now a Minister of Tourism and accordingly the old tourist development division of the Economic Development Department has been transfered.

I might add, as my colleague has just told, we were advised by the officals of the House - we sought council on this, Sir - to put questions on the Order Paper addressed to the minister because really until Monday of this week there was a minister of Economic Development. There was no Minister of Tourism, no Minister of Industrial Development until the legislation became effective. Now there are a number of questions in the same position, I would suggest, Sir, that Your Honour may wish to consider merely ruling that they are readdressed. They were put on the Order Paper properly. We sought advise of Your Honour's officals who said to put them on addressed to the ministers who are responsible as of the time they are asked. If the government choose to switch responsibilities, that is fair enough but the ministers should take note and answer them. I think that is a reasonable request and perhaps Your Honour

wants to take it under advisement. That is fine. If not, perhaps Your Honour could merely take notice of it and ask the ministers to govern themselves accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is well taken. It is the procedure which we will follow.

HON. L.D. BARRY: (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer in reply to question No. 200 asked by the honourable member from White Bay South. The answer is that there will be an amount sufficient to provide a diesel plant in Petit Forte in the 1973 estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, while we are on that. During the Interim Estimates with respect to the Energy and Mines Department I asked about rural electrification with respect of St. Carrolls. The honourable gentleman said that he did not have the answer. That is fair enough but he said that he would take it up with the appropriate officials and have the answer. I wonder if he has the answer now. That was a fortnight or so ago.

MR. BARRY: I will get it for you.

MR. ROBERTS: If the minister could let me know, I would be grateful but if not, I will wait on the estimates.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Head (5), Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, does the minister wish to open with a statement? Okay, that is fine. Well, I do not so much at this stage wish to ask a question as to try to get to the bottom of a very perplexing situation. I refer to the policy of this administration with respect to collective bargaining in particular but in general to the whole area of labour relation. I was rather hoping the minister might have a statement of policy. He does not. At least he did not begin with one. We may coax one out of him. I hope so. Certainly we shall try.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only statement of policy of which I am aware, which sets forth the policy of the present administration with respect to labour relations generally - there may have been one issued during the October election - but there was the statement made by the minister's predecessor, the honourable gentleman from St. Barbes South, at the annual convention of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, which met here in St. John's last August, the most recent annual convention of the Federation of Labour.

Now, at that meeting - there was some considerable interest in it because the Premier had undertaken to appear and at the last minute, as is so often his way, had cancelled out and there was a considerable furor. Indeed, I believe the Premier of the Province was censured by the Confederation of Labour, censured quite strongly. They were quite upset that he had not honoured them by appearing but rather he had sent his colleague, the then Minister of Labour. Now, the present minister cannot be faulted for that. He at that stage was Minister of Supply and Services in those Elysian days. We have since come down somewhat in that field and he has gone up to be Minister of Manpower. In that statement read by his predecessor there were quite a number of commitments made in respect of legislative action, some of them arising from the Cohen Commission Report, others of them arising just from the general policy statement.

Mr. Chairman. I serve notice now that there are eleven members on the other side, the rules of the committee say there must be fourteen, I am prepared to call a quorum call at any point when there are not fourteen men on the other side. The rules say that I may leave and any other member may leave. We are discussing the expenditure of public funds, Sir. There are thirty-one gentlemen eligible to sit on that side. I am sorry, thirty because Your Honour is not in that position. Your Honour is above the fray. If there are not fourteen, we will have a quorum call. I am not trying to interrupt the committee but there are thirty members over

there. We have a good representation of ministers but if they are not interested enough in the expenditure process to be here, let us have a quorum call, Mr. Chairman, please. Let there be fourteen in this House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes we are.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful to know that there is a quorum. I hope we shall at all times during the estimates procedure. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to make my remarks without the heckling from the crackies on the other side?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is quite correct. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor and has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, as I was saying -

HON. T.V. HICKEY: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): I am sorry if I have interrupted the honourable gentleman. The only question I raise is, Are not members on the other side members of this House? Do they not constitute a quorum with the number on this side or are honourable gentlemen allowed to just vacate the Chamber? I would like a ruling, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, honourable gentlemen are allowed to leave the House at any time. Yes, that is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I hope the press will take notice because as we say it was the honourable gentlemen when they were over here who invented this technique and perfected it. We have tried to learn it. I am not saying that it is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, as I was saying - I agree that there should be fourteen here. This is the heart and guts of the whole parliamentary process, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: We have kept up our share during the debate. One fourth of us are here now, at least another fourth are standing outside. Considering that my colleague from Labrador North is in Labrador attending a meeting of the project group, considering that my colleague from Fogo buried his mother yesterday, I suppose we can understand him not being here. The gentleman from Twillingate is at home on urgent family business and the five of us other than that are here.

Mr. Chairman, the ministry, through the lips of the then Minister of Labour, at the Federation of Labour Conference made a major statement of their labour relations policy, and may I say there were some very good points in it. I believe that the then minister, speaking for the ministry, undertook to sponsor legislation that would end the *exparte* injunction in labour relations matters. This is something which every union member of Newfoundland and I suppose every union member across Canada would welcome because these injunctions - injunctions have a purpose, and *exparte* injunctions have a purpose. But the way in which *exparte* injunctions are being used in labour relations matters in this province and throughout generally is as a weapon of strike-breaking, as a means of harrassing.

If a strike is legal, then it may go ahead. But one gets the *exparte* injunctions on the picketing. If a strike is illegal then it should not go ahead. Of course it should not. We have a royal commission investigation on that now and I have no doubt will report back to say that when a strike is illegal it is illegal, it is unlawful or wildcat, to use the common term.

The ministry undertook to sponsor legislation to abolish these injunctions. We have not seen it yet. Indeed, Sir, we have not seen -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, I asked the minister to make a policy statement.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance says it is being drafted. Well the ministry have been in office now a year and some, this is the second session, the third really, but the second since the election of March 24, 1972 which they have appeared. Last year understandably they did not have a great deal of time to sponsor a great deal of legislation, Much of the legislation which came through last year was legislation that had evolved in the normal course.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not have any legislation this year either. The House is not over, true, it may go on for weeks or months yet. The session has not ended but we are now two months into the session. We have had notice given of ninety or one hundred pieces of legislation. Maybe as many as six of those have been substantial pieces of legislation. None of them effecting the Department of Labour, as it was, or the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, with the sole exception of the act with respect to employment, where one has a substantial lay-off there must be four, eight or twelve weeks' notice for termination.

That is a very good piece of legislation, needed, not noticeably progressive nor forward looking, it has been done in other jurisdictions but it has now been done in Newfoundland and it is a good thing. Other than that we have heard nothing from the department.

Then far more seriously, and I would ask the minister if he would tell us where the matter stands, not just ex parte injunctions but the whole spectrum of legislation, what is coming out of the Cohen Report. We had the Cohen Report tabled, a great massive document. Then we were told by the minister, and I say again not the present minister by his predecessor, "the sins of the father are visited upon the children even to the third and fourth generations," we were

MR. ROBERTS: told by the minister that he had set up committees and called a press conferences with great glory, and Information Newfoundland announced it, that we were having a committee of employer representatives and a committee of employee representatives, and that they would look at the Cohen Report and that they would then make recommendations and from that the government would, after consideration, produce legislation.

We have had the Cohen Report for over a year now, Sir. The committees presumably have been at work. We have not heard anything out of them since. Information Newfoundland seems to have disappeared from the face of the earth as far as that aspect of the Labour Department is concerned. All we get from them now are these nice little notices about settlement of strikes or appointments of conciliation officers. All very fine but nothing more to it.

Then we get the Minister of Finance's Budget Speech in which there is held out a definite threat to those bargaining collectively with the government, either as employer or as paymaster, because in the case of the teachers and in the case of the hospital workers the government are not the employer. The employer in each case are boards. The government are the paymasters. The government provide the cash and the government have the final word. They must have it. They should have it on the salary rates to be paid.

So we have the threat, the stated threat in the Budget Speech and no honeyed words about the necessity to say - it is not new. It has been said before. Indeed when we were the administration it was said and we were laughed at. Saying it does not make it true and saying it again does not make it any less true or any more untrue. It is quite true. We can only have in Newfoundland what we can afford. That is straight-forward.

MR. ROBERTS: But the way in which it was stated, the context, the whole message delivered by the government, the Minister of Finance was their mouthpiece, but by the government, by the ministry, was to the civil service and to the teachers and to the firemen and to the police, not to the doctors. The doctors waltzed in and got their raise and off they went. We did not hear any talk then. We see \$1.1 million increase in the Medicare vote. I do not know what it was all for. We are told \$800,000 of it is for the 300 doctors on fee-for-service in this province. Are there 300 at present? About 300. That is \$2,500 each. That is not bad, 4.7 per cent, that is fine. That just shows how high they were if an average of \$2,500 is less than five per cent. That shows that they were making twenty times that, which of course is \$50,000 each.

AN HON. MEMBER: British Columbia gave 11.7 per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: Right, British Columbia gave 11.7 per cent. Good for British Columbia, bully for British Columbia, but we are not the Government of British Columbia, we are the Government of Newfoundland. Of course they have an NDP Government out there. They had a Social Credit Government until the recent election.

DR. ROWE: Do you want our doctors to go to British Columbia?

MR. ROBERTS: Do I want our doctors to go to British Columbia? British Columbia has the highest doctor-patient ratio in Canada. Maybe they are going to get more, and if doctors are concerned only with money, if we have come to the stage in the medical world where doctors are concerned only with money, then we have come to a pretty sad state. I will deal with the Minister of Health on his estimates because I think that we have a -

MR. MURPHY: A threat.

MR. ROBERTS: A threat be darned. The honourable gentleman from Halifax has let the Nova Scotian air get to him again. The gentleman from Malawi is back. Threat, threat, threat - listen to him. He does not even believe it himself, Mr. Chairman, let alone -

MR. ROBERTS: Now, as I was saying before the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre, Halifax, and Malawi interrupted, let me come back, we have not had any statement from the minister since he has been in office as to where this legislation stands or as to what we may expect. Then we have the Budget Speech which contains in it a threat, a clear and unmistakable threat. It has been so interpreted by the employee groups at whom it was directed, a clear and unmistakable threat to do what? This - Ladies and gentlemen we have cut out a certain amount of money in the estimates, if you do not like it, if that is not enough, if you are not prepared to settle for that, then well and good you can like it or lump it, if we give you any more there will have to be tax increases and you can answer to the people of Newfoundland for that.

There could not be a clearer threat. There is no way in which there could be a clearer threat. The police have been told that if they do not like \$110,600 extra, \$500 a man for 200 constables, unless we have an increase in the complement of the force, they have been told that if they do not like that \$500 per man figure, they can either lump it or there will be tax increases and every policeman will go around with, on his sleeve I suppose there will be a little saying, "We got a raise and there is a tax increase."

MR. CROSBIE: That is untrue and you know it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, it is not untrue. Well, Mr. Chairman, is Your Honour now going to play the game and enforce the rules or -

MR. CROSBIE: That is a lie, speak the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact the honourable gentleman from St. John's West has used language that is perhaps unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, perhaps the Minister of Finance might wish to rephrase his comments concerning the -

MR. CROSBIE: A terminological inexactitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable Leader of the Opposition will permit, the honourable Leader of the opposition is debating Head 501-01 and it is quite in order to do so and it is quite out of order for him to be interrupted when he is making statements on that subject.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, with his usual ill grace when anybody scores a point against him, has once again shown himself in his true colours.

Now as I was saying, there is a definite threat implied in the Budget, a clearly stated threat to the public service groups - the police, the firemen, the teachers, who for this purpose are public service

hospital workers who again for this purpose are public servants and to the general civil service at large. The threat is, that if they do not take what they are given and be grateful for it, there will be tax increases and by heavens they will bear the blame. There will be painted on every fire truck: "Your S.S.A. is going up one percent to give us a raise." The policemen will carry little banners saying instead of Newfoundland Constabulary, it will say; "Eight percent S.S.A. to give us a raise" and we will have a new course in the curriculum instruction division and the teachers, instead of opening Schools with prayers will open schools with; "We got a raise but because of that you are going to have to pay more gasoline tax."

That is disturbing enough, disturbing enough for an administration to adopt this attitude. They are in the midst of bargaining. I think bargaining is now open with each of these groups. Negotiations are going on, offers, counteroffers going back and forth and in the middle of that process the government publicly, deliberately, (nothing careless about a prepared and printed speech it is a calculated act of policy) issue a threat and every public service negotiator now knows that he is negotiating under that threat. Most of them have chosen to disregard it and so they should. I would like the Minister of Manpower, if he would, to reaffirm and I believe he will, that this administration stands committed to free collective bargaining and that this threat does not represent the policy of the administration.

Furthermore...

MR. CROSBIE: What does it represent? It is a statement in the Budget Speech. (remainder inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if it does represent the policy of the administration, then let them be men enough to admit it.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not a threat.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman, the Finance Minister, knows he is on tender ground and it is always when he is on

tender ground he turns bully.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will deal with you in a minute.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, they can deal with me in a minute or in an hour, Sir. The Minister of Finance is far more accustomed to dealing with people in an hour than in a minute. There we are, we have a deliberate threat. This administration came to office, Sir, holding out that they were committed to free collective bargaining and once again they have promised much and delivered nothing. It is becoming the hallmark of the Tory Government. They shafted the mothers last year, they are shafting the students this year and the labour unions will get it next year. If shaft...

HON. A.J.MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from St. John's Centre try to abide by the rules of this House?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but we do not have to stand for that kind of stuff.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from St. John's Centre, please abide by the rules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If any of the honourable gentlemen to my left have points of order, they are requested to raise them in the customary manner and the Chair will rule on them. At the present time the honourable the Leader of the Opposition appears to be quite in order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, last year they shafted the mothers, this year they will shaft the students and the civil service are next in line. If shaft is an inelegant word, as it is, and if it is an unparliamentary word, as I believe it is not, then I might point out that it is the very same minister whose salary we are now discussing who first brought this word into the political context in Newfoundland, when he strolled out of the Premier's office one happy day and looked at a waiting reporter (true the

reporter worked for a scurrilous journal, a yellow rag or maybe the minister was having an off day, a convenient explanation for any sins of omission or commission) and said; "Boy, I know how it feels to get shafted now." That speaks wonders.

The labour movement is finding out how it feels—

MR. DAWE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: There is no such thing, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable gentleman wishes to raise a point of order, let him.

MR. DAWE: I raise a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: All right.

MR. DAWE: The honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to constantly refer to that word shafted as though it were something vulgar. If the honourable gentleman would kindly take the trouble to look up any dictionary, he will discover that to be shafted means to be hit by an arrow or a spear.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I did not say it was vulgar. The honourable gentleman seems to feel - I said it was inelegant and it is inelegant. It is a most inelegant phrase, because if the honourable gentleman -

MR. DAWE: Webster used it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable gentleman cares to check a current dictionary, he will find that there is another meaning to shaft, another meaning.

MR. DAWE: That is in the colloquial dictionary.

MR. ROBERTS: Certainly and we all speak colloquial English. But at any rate, I am not saying it is vulgar. Far be it from me to say. If a gentleman such as the minister use it, I should not think for a minute it was vulgar. I think it is probably the sort of thing, Sir, that one could use in a sermon.

As I said, it was inelegant and it certainly was an inelegant phrase. The honourable gentleman has no point of order, He is a little tender. The honourable gentleman made his point. No, the honourable gentleman got the point of the shaft, that is what happened to the honourable gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the honourable gentleman is presiding over a department, the policy of it is in a shambles, we have no statement of policy other than one made six or eight months ago that apparently has not been carried through. We have nothing on the fishermen's collective union legislation and it is not good legislation I gather; it does not seem to be working. The president of the union, Mr. Richard Cashin, has sent round a brief to all Members of the House of Assembly with some quite good points in it, some good suggestions. Could the minister tell us whether this is going to be amended this session? Can the minister tell us what is going to happen to the whole field of ex parte injunctions? Wildcat strikes, well, we will have a royal commission and they will give us a stunning and penetrating insight into the obvious. They will come back and tell us; "Yep, they are wildcat strikes because they are wildcats."

In any event, it is a way to take care of some friends and to put off action, above all else to put off action. "We are studying it." We had the Cohen Commission that studied it to death. I think if we knew when we appointed the Cohen Commission it would take two and a-half or three years and produced a document that high, which I am sure the minister has read, I have read parts of it, I doubt if anybody else though has really read it. Has the honourable gentleman from Bell Island read the Cohen Commission Report?

MR. NEARY: Parts of it.

MR. ROBERTS: He has read parts of it. I do not think anybody has read it. Professor Cohen did, Mr. Joel Bell the research director did. It is a gold mine of information. To separate the dross from the gold is a difficult procedure. The minister may tell us please what the policy of the administration is and why this threat to the public service who are nearly 30,000 people. Out of a workforce in Newfoundland of 145,000 or 150,000, that is twenty percent of the workforce who are now negotiating under the threat (not a threat of a strike or a lock-out that is part of the collective bargaining process) working and

negotiating under the threat; "Ah ha! we will condemn you before the eyes of the people. We will increase the taxes and we will blame it on you. When the mothers go hungry or the children go hungry, it will be your fault Mr. Teacher or your fault Mr. Policeman because you would not accept what we dished out to you and be grateful for it."

The minister also made a statement today. He was asked about it on orders and on orders he made his usual smart alecky - he has not learned, if he does not know the answer to stand up like other honourable gentlemen do (and we have all been in this position) and say; "I do not know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker," or Mr. Chairman, whoever it is, "I shall attempt to find out." The Minister of Finance last night was good enough to find out several things like that and he knows, the Minister of Finance knows infinitely more than the Minister of Industrial Relations will ever even dream of.

He does not know the answer, and instead of getting up and saying; "I do not but I shall try to find out," what he does is get up and try to be smart alecky and makes a fool of himself. He does not need any help in making a fool of himself, he does it adequately and admirably.

Are this administration about to introduce compulsory arbitration? We have a number of strikes now We have a strike at Bonavista that has been going on for nine or ten months, a legal, lawful strike. We can decry it, we can decry the lack of action by the government. They did not hesitate during an election to step in. We do not hear any talk of it now, we do not see the Premier taking a helicopter to fly to Bonavista Town to enter into that strike. The member for Bonavista South who I am glad to understand is to stay with us, I am glad of that, I think the people of his district will be glad, it means that they get the chance to pass judgement on him in two or three years whenever the election comes.

MR. W.N. POWE: McGill is the loser.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, McGill or which ever university are the losers. But I am glad the honourable gentleman is carrying through. I did not think he was a quitter, I never have and I do not now. He has made some efforts but nobody on the government side has. A delegation comes into town, the Premier is always absent, absent without leave, AWOL, AWOL, absent without leave, He is off somewhere today. Is he in town, by the way?

MR. MARSHALL: He is in the same place the honourable member for White Bay South was.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad to hear the Premier is ill. I did not realize he was ill until the honourable gentleman said so. I thank him. It is nice to know that our Premier gets ill, we all get ill on occasion. He gets ill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is directed to the rule of relevancy, while -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, maybe the fact the Premier is ill has something to do with the minister's salary in Manpower and Industrial Relations. If I were Premier and had a minister like this, I would be ill too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the honourable Leader of the Opposition had to stretch the point of relevancy to the breaking point and I would ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition to direct his remarks directly to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know the Premier is ill and will be back with us shortly. I certainly wish him a speedy and a complete recovery because we do like to see him in the chamber, Sir.

Now as I was saying we have not seen the Premier go posting down the Bonavista Town to intervene in a strike there. It is a lawful strike. It has gone on a long while. It has gone on much too long. One has one's views. Mine are quite simple. I think the company are acting scandalously and infamously. As I understand, the only issue in that strike now is that in Grand Bank they will pay a man or woman doing a certain job "X" dollars and "Y" cents an hour. In Bonavista they will not pay a man or woman doing the same job the same amount of money, they are offering less. That is the only issue, Well if that is the issue it is a scandalous and infamous type of issue for a company to stand on in a province as small as this. But it is a lawful strike. The company are lawfully, completely within their rights to refuse to give in.

We have a strike at St. Lawrence, the CNTU local there, The St. Lawrence Protective Workers' Union are on strike. They are on strike lawfully against ALCAN and their employers. We have a strike at Buchans were the Steel Workers Local are on strike against their employers, ASRSCO, again a lawful strike. Where else do we have strikes now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: But there is no lawful strike at Come by Chance. I am speaking only of lawful strikes. At Harbour Breton we have another lawful strike, the trawler workers there who are members of the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union are on a lawful strike against their employers, the B.C. Packers Plant at Harbour Breton. They have some unlawful strikes on. That is a different thing, the law provides, the labour movement welcomes the correct way to deal with unlawful strikes. That is not *ex parte* injunctions, but there is a correct way to deal with them.

We have these four lawful strikes, there may be some others relatively small but these are the four large ones. They are significant. Two of them are in the mining industry, two of them are in the fishing industry, basic industries. None of them have been on for a long time, except Bonavista that has been on for nine months. The Harbour Breton one is only a couple of weeks old, the St. Lawrence one is a week or ten days and Buchans is -

AN HON. MEMBER: The St. Lawrence one is only two or three days.

MR. ROBERTS: St. Lawrence is only two or three days. Indeed I heard a statement attributed to the company today, Mr. Bursey, their public information spokesman, that the company apparently were willing to negotiate on monetary items whereas previously I understood they had not - so maybe we will see some action there.

The strike in Buchans is only about three weeks old.

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I think it is at least three. It does not matter. It is not very long. The important point is that it is not very long. The one in Bonavista has been on since June, eight or nine months, but the fact that the plant there has closed or would have closed in the seasonal course of events, in November - December anyway, apparently has some effect, I gather there is not any great pressure to get it opened. Apparently it is going to be a month or two before

we see movement there.

But anyway we have this situation, it is serious and nobody would pretend having two of our mines shutdown by strikes and having a large fish plant, a plant which is vital to the progress of one community, to having that one closed by a strike and then having the B.C. Packers Plant at Harbour Breton deprived of their offshore fish by a lawful strike, nobody would deny that that is serious.

But this morning the minister was quoted, and I was astounded to hear him but I did hear his very own voice, on my very own radio, as I was shaving my very own face this morning.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman for Burgeo, he made a speech yesterday the most of which consisted of a vicious personal attack on me. I welcome it because if a man is known by his enemies, I am proud, happy, delighted and pleased to have the gentleman for Burgeo, the only man in this House with an I.Q. of 300, standing against me.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, Sir, the two of us together, the gentleman for Burgeo and myself - that is not parliamentary I will not say it. Anyway the gentleman for Burgeo adds something to the House. He adds something to the House. He certainly does, Sir. He certainly does. He adds spice to the broth.

Now this morning the Minister of Manpower, and I am not quoting him exactly, I did not jot down his words and I did not write it down, said that the government were considering the introduction of legislation in respect of compulsory arbitration.

My colleague, the member for Bell Island, invited the minister to say something about that on Orders of the Day, in response to a question, and the minister confirmed that they were considering it, but then he tried to down play it by saying that they were considering

many things.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is quite a revelation. There have been instances in Newfoundland of compulsory arbitration. The hospital workers at Grand Falls was such an instance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it not? No, they were ordered back to work. Well how was it settled then?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is for you and your colleagues to decide, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, well, okay then the legislation was even weaker but - okay so I will take that back, there was no instance there. There have been none apparently.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: There has been one in - it may make some sense in a public service but I am sure the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre would agree with me that if people are going to go on strike, if they feel that their cause is just and right, the mere fact that that strike is unlawful, it is not going to stop them from walking out. There have been too many instances in Newfoundland and across Canada of that too - and I am not condoning, what is unlawful is unlawful. The fact remains that the law does not take reality into account, the law, as was said in Dickens, Sir, Mr. Bumble I believe said it, "The law is an ass."

But the gentleman this morning referred to considering compulsory arbitration. What put it in mind I suggest was Ontario and British Columbia which recently have moved in the elevator workers' strike. There we had a situation where a strike was on for six months. There was no apparent move towards settlement at all, both sides were adamant in their refusal to move from their position and the positions were poles apart and the strike was having widespread public effect because it meant that every building more than three stories high being built anywhere in these provinces was stopped, construction had stopped

because the elevators were not being put in and eventually the governments of the day decided, in one case the Progressive Conservative in Ontario and I believe the New Democratic Party Government in, David Barrett's government in British Columbia, moved to end the strike. I am not sure about British Columbia but I am sure about Ontario. They said they would move and they did put legislation through the House.

Now, Sir, that might be a reasonable response in given conditions. There may be conditions in Newfoundland at some point where we would have to do that. I for one, as a member of this House, would be prepared if the minister came before us and outlined the circumstances and made a case, I would be prepared to do that if it were the only course of action that we could follow. But surely we have not come to that now. We have some lawful strikes that are inconvenient, seriously inconvenient to the men on strike, hardship possibly to the people in Bonavista who have not had a pay cheque for nine months now, not qualified for unemployment insurance, what money they have is their strike pay, which of course is non-allowable income, and they have had on top of that welfare.

Hardship for Buchans! They have had the trouble with the schools and the hospital. That has been straightened out fortunately, but hardships. Strike pay is infamously less than the men would earn. Hardship I guess for the trawler men down at Harbour Breton. But they feel and they believe that their cause is right and they believe that they will win their cause by going on strike and the law of this province and the public policy of this province gives them the right to do so.

So I will ask the minister if he will either let us into his confidence as to what he is thinking about compulsory arbitration or, and I would infinitely prefer the second, if he would assure us that the administration have no prospect, no thought - I realize that one cannot say what will happen in one month or six months, I do not expect the minister to do that, but as it now stands unless something

develops that we do not see, there is no prospect of bringing in legislation to force compulsory arbitration, legislation to force them back to work, legislation to remove the right to strike, Mr. Chairman, takes it away. It may also take away the companion right to a lockout by the employer. But that is what compulsory arbitration legislation is, it takes away the right to strike.

It says to the worker, you shall not strike. It says, in return we will set up a so-called impartial tribunal, usually three people, one union, one company, a neutral chairman, and their word will be binding on both sides. It will be argued against. The fact remains to do that does take away the right to strike. I invite the minister now, when he returns to the Chamber, to reassure the House, to reassure the people of this province that the administration have no such policy in contemplation. They may be driven to it, if he wants to say that the time may come. The time may come when they are forced by circumstances. They must deal with events as they find them and that may be the only response to a given set of events. But certainly that time has not come now. It is not even in prospect now. These are a few preliminary remarks, Mr. Chairman. We have gone a little long but honourable gentlemen opposite tend to provoke me from my usual good-natured slope and make me loquacious if not eloquent.

The minister seems to have ignored the committee again. I suppose he is gone out on a message. Why do we not occupy our time while we get another quorum called, Sir. The minister is not here anyway. Hold on now! Here comes the minister! Here comes the whip! I thank the honourable gentleman and I thank the honourable minister.

MR. EVANS: To a point of order. I suggest that we bring in Sesame Street here so they can learn to count to fourteen.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the big yellow bird on the other side is a cookie grabber.

Now, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: I am only doing it for his health. Smoking is not good for you. The honourable gentleman will tell the honourable gentleman

from Burgao that smoking is not good for one's health. I am only trying to help the honourable gentleman, I cannot do anything for his mental health. I may be able to do something for his physical health. Now that the minister is back, Sir, I have perhaps gone on a little, but fair enough. I just touched on two or three matters and if he could perhaps reassure the House and the committee and the people of this province, I think it would be a good thing. In any event, I think it is only fair of us to give him a little opportunity, so he is on.

HON. G. DAWE (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations) Mr. Chairman,

last year the former Minister of Labour did outline some plans he had in mind at that time to bring before cabinet for ratification and approval. They included many advantageous amendments as far as the labour movement is concerned in this province. When I took over in December, when I took over the Department of Labour, these amendments, some of them had been drafted, others had not been, I felt that I could not just rush into it and take them all and send them off to the cabinet room and say, "Here are some amendments which were made up. I found them on my desk. What are you going to do about it?" I decided that I would review each one of them. Many of the proposals are very good. They are excellent, I think in keeping with what the labour movement of this province are looking for today. I have here some of the proposals made by the former minister at the Newfoundland Federation of Labour Conference.

The elimination of the ex parte injunction: This is a proposal which is now before cabinet. An amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act to allow the fishermen and farmers to become covered: These are proposals which are also now before cabinet or on the way. I do not know what will happen to these. I do not know what cabinet will do with them. I do not have the ability here or the authority to say that they are going to be approved or that they are going to be rejected. An act which was proposed, The Employment of Children's Act,

has already been passed through this House. The Wage Protection Act is on the way. All these, the honourable minister listed them all - with regard to -

MR. NEARY: Would the honourable minister explain the Wage Protection Act?

MR. DAWE: Well I prefer to let that go until it comes before the House. At that time I will be explained in detail. The honourable member does not know, that is for sure.

There are other clauses in the Labour Relations Act that the labour movement find offensive, that have been proposed to cabinet for amendments. There is also an educational programme which the former minister outlined and suggested to the Federation of Labour last year. It is a good idea. It is an excellent idea. It is one which I hope will be implemented this year. I think it is time that we did educate our young people and it has to start at the high school level; educate them to the benefits of a collective agreement; the proper way in which to proceed, through the grievance procedures. It is time that we educated our people that it is not right, if something happens that you do not agree with, if the foreman or supervisor happens to look at you in a nasty manner, that you do not throw your tools in the air and call your buddies and walk out.

It is time that people right from the Grade IX, X and XI learn the benefits of collective bargaining and the agreement which is brought about as a result of collective bargaining. This is quite a transition for students, to leave high school, to go into a trade school, and a trade school is not that much different from a high school in the hours that they keep, the breaks that they get and so on. It appears to me that perhaps the high school and trade school traditions or habits, if you like, of getting a coffee break in the morning, one in the afternoon, an hour and one-half to

lunch, you are off at four o'clock and if you like, you can walk out or ask the teacher if you can get off at three o'clock and that is it, you just walk out, there is nothing to it. These are traits which apparently are being brought into the labour movement, which are being brought into the work field by these people. Because they do not get the same benefits such as these, when they go out to work, because a supervisor says, "No" you cannot have an hour off. No, you cannot have an extra half hour to lunch," then they become upset over it. This has in the past given rise to many wildcat strikes.

Now we come to the compulsory arbitration. I was asked yesterday by a reporter if we had been discussing compulsory arbitration. We discussed it. We have discussed many things, as I said earlier, in the question period. We cannot discuss alone the good things that unions want on the one hand and say this is what the unions do not want. We cannot discuss that. We must, in my opinion, weigh both sides. We must discuss the good and the bad. How are we going to come to a proper decision if we do not discuss and debate the pros and cons of any proposal? Therefore, I informed the news reporter yesterday that we had discussed it. I did not say that we were considering it, that it would be something that would be proposed to cabinet, because that is not so. We have discussed it. We have talked about. That is as far as it went.

The honourable member mentioned the various strikes we have had in the province, some are legal, others are not. I would like to draw this House's attention to the fact that the people in Wabush have agreed to go back to work and also the fact that I was not given the opportunity to privilege this House by making the announcement here.

The Alcan strike has been on about a day and one-half roughly. Buchans, I think, just over two weeks. I cannot comment on these. To comment on these now I think would be dangerous.

The Bonavista strike has been on for sometime, quite longer than any of us would prefer to see it. The plant I am told may not be able to get open until the end of May because of ice conditions. What will happen there, I do not know. We have a conciliation officer who is very arduously working on this, trying to get the parties back together and he has been working on it for some time, ever since the demonstration at Confederation Building.

We have also on the drafting boards a new Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. The Hospitals Act will be repealed. That was a very bitter piece of legislation brought in by the former administration. With regard to overall policy as far as labour is concerned, I think until I have weighed all the evidence and until I have some decision from cabinet, I can hardly come to this House or to the news media or anybody else and make any public statements as to what exactly is going to be done.

The suggestion that management and labour get together and discuss a new labour code or labour relations act is a very good one and one which the Premier agrees with. He has already told the union movement that he will be only too happy to allow them to sit down with management and draw up some act which would be amicable to both parties. This I am reasonably sure will come about. We would like to establish some guidelines in the meantime for such a get-together. This is what we are working on at the present time. I am sure that the other honourable members have other questions to ask.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have heard for some time that the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, which was the old Department of Labour, has been in a bit of a shambles for the last couple of months. I did not realize, Sir, until listening to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, that the situation was so bad. My honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, asked the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations to state government policy on labour matters in this province. The minister, in attempting to answer some of the points that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition, showed, Mr. Chairman, to me at least, conclusively, his lack of knowledge of labour management relations. The minister is floundering, Sir. The minister does not understand the philosophy of the department.

I hope if I say this, that the minister will not rush out and resign like the hon. Minister of Fisheries did when I discussed the Fisheries Estimates in this House last week.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the honourable minister who occupies that portfolio is not suited for that job. The honourable minister has no background of labour management relations, no experience in that field, Sir. In my opinion, the honourable minister is unsuited for the job, for this important task. It is the first time to my knowledge, Sir, in this province that when the department is being criticized, the minister is being criticized by both labour and management at the same time. There are times, Sir, when the minister and the department will come under attack from either the trade union movement, of which once I was a member myself, or will come under attack by an employer or a group of employers. This is the first time, Sir, to my knowledge, since Confederation, that the minister and the department have come under severe criticism and attack by both labour and management at the same time. Only today, Mr. Chairman, we heard the (Acting) President of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour take the honourable minister to task about his public statement yesterday on compulsory arbitration.

Now, Sir, the honourable minister apparently is not aware that his predecessor, the hon. member for St. Barbe South, when he was Minister of Labour, went down to Hotel Newfoundland, I think it was, and stated emphatically what the policy of the government was going to be for the next twelve months in regard to labour matters and proposed labour legislation that would be brought into this House. Now we learn this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is only now bringing bits and pieces of legislation before cabinet. The minister said (I do not know if I am quoting the minister properly or not) he was not sure what his colleagues would do with this.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, last summer we were told by his predecessor that this is government policy. If it is government policy, I presume the minister, when he was speaking to the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, was speaking on behalf of the government, he was authorized to say certain things. Now the minister tells us that he has to refer these matters to cabinet and he is not sure what the cabinet will do about these proposals. It is inconsistent, Mr. Chairman. It is inconsistent. No wonder the labour movement in Newfoundland today is so disillusioned and disappointed with the Tory Administration who built up their hopes and expectations in two provincial general elections in this province and the Tory Administration have not delivered, Mr. Chairman, in labour matters, no more than they have in all the other promises that they made in two provincial general elections in this province. They have not shaped up, Sir. They have not done anything! The whole Department of Labour is in a shambles, Mr. Chairman. It is in a shambles!

It is a fact, I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the morale of the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations is very low at the present time. The minister is not able to provide the leadership that is necessary in that department because, with all due respect to the minister, he does not have the background for it. Labour and management in this province, Sir, have lost confidence in the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, if the Premier and the government do not do something about it, we are going to be in for a long, hot summer of labour unrest in this province. This is only early April, Sir. We have already seen signs of it. In the month of January I am told there were ten work stoppages with a loss of 19,000 man days. This province cannot afford that, Mr. Chairman.

The other day when I asked the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations during the question and answer period in this honourable House what steps the government were talking to deal with the unusual number of work stoppages that were taking place in this province and the number of work stoppages that would take place during the nine or ten months ahead, the minister said, "Well, I am not a prophet." He could not tell what would happen in the next eight or ten months. Well, Sir, all the minister has to do is go to his files. There is a score sheet kept down in the minister's department because I started it when I was there. It shows precisely, Mr. Chairman, when every contract expires in this province and when negotiations are expected to begin.

The minister should be aware of this. The whole purpose of getting this score sheet, Sir, was so that the conciliation officers and the other officials of the department could be alerted and could move in even before negotiations started. They could move in and see what preliminary work could be done on a new working agreement even before the official negotiations started and the party sat around the bargaining table. This was an objective of mine, Sir. I did not get a chance to finish it. I certainly laid the foundation for it.

Mr. Chairman, all the minister had to do was to pick up where the previous administration left off. Pick up as a matter of fact where his predecessor left off, who was not such a bad Minister of Labour, by the way, Mr. Chairman. He was not such a bad Minister of Labour. He was getting the confidence of the trade union movement and he was getting the confidence of the employees' groups across this province,

MR. NEARY: and then all of a sudden the Premier cut him down in his tracks and transferred him to another department. I think it was a mistake. At least that minister did have some background and understood the philosophy of labour management relations. He had had some experience, had some work experience in these particular matters, had some experience at organizing and had been involved.

But the present minister, Sir, in my opinion, I have to be careful how I say this, the present minister, Sir, has no knowledge whatsoever of labour management relations. This is becoming more obvious every day, Sir.

I hope that the Premier will recognize this fact, before it is too late, before we have much more labour unrest in this province, and do something about it. I do not know, Sir, on the other side of the House who does have experience in these matters. I cannot see anybody over there. All the members are not in their seats, maybe the member for Bonavista South who does understand human rights, maybe he would be more suited for the job.

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's South?

MR. NEARY: No, for Bonavista South. St. John's South, no, looked upon with suspicion.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations did not tell the House what was going to be done about the Cohen Report, that royal commission report that cost what? \$150,000. I think it was upwards of \$175,000. He did not tell us, Sir, and there is a gold mine of information. All the minister has to do is dig in and take the report and read it.

If I were minister of that department at the present time, Sir, I would be a walking encyclopedia on the Cohen Report. But I do not have to pay as much attention to it now as if I were minister of that department. I doubt if the minister has ever taken the time to read it.

MR. NEARY: We heard in the Throne Speech, 1972, after the Tories took over and that crowd formed the administration, we were told that new legislation was going to be introduced regarding the registration of trade unions. We were told there was going to be an amendment to The Trade Union Act. Not yet, Mr. Chairman, no sign of it yet. The minister makes no reference to it today.

We were told also, Sir, that the new administration were going to introduce amendments and revisions to The Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act. Since then, Sir, since that promise was made, we have a presentation from the Newfoundland Fish Food and Allied Workers Union, recommending certain amendments to The Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act. No reference to that yet, Sir. No legislation brought before the House in two sessions.

We were told, Sir, that the legislation governing collective bargaining between employees in the public service and the government would be introduced. The legislation had already been drafted. Apparently it was not satisfactory to the Newfoundland Government Employees Association.

It was already drafted, Sir. Mr. Dyer was appointed to administer this act. The new government, the Tories said, "Well, we will amend it." I have not seen it yet in the House, Sir, no sign of it. The minister made no reference to it today when he was stating government policy.

We were told in that same Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman, that the government would establish a manpower research division and counselling service in the department, a very important matter, no reference by the minister today.

We were told that the government would establish an advisory council on manpower and industrial relations, no reference to it, Mr. Chairman, no reference to it.

MR. NEARY: All the minister did today was to show how inexperienced he is in these matters. He showed his lack of knowledge on labour management relations.

I would like to put the question straight to the minister now, Sir, and I would like to ask him what is going to be done about the Cohen Report. Does the minister, as a government, intend to do anything with the Cohen Report or are they just going to leave it on the shelf down in the minister's office and let it gather up dust?

Mr. Chairman, in the matter of compulsory arbitration, I do not know if the honourable members of this House are aware of it or not, it has been tried in other parts of Canada. It has been tried in a number of other provinces. It has been tried by the Government of Canada, it has been tried in Ottawa, but it just does not work, Sir. Not only labour but management has been shying away from compulsory arbitration.

The minister made a foolish statement when he was on his feet a few moments ago by saying, "What do unions think, we are only to bring in things that are good for them?"

MR. DAWE: That is not what I said at all.

MR. NEARY: That is what the minister said. I wrote it down. He said, "The trade unions think we are only going to bring in things that are good. We have to bring in some bad things too," he said. The minister said they have to accept -

MR. DAWE: Point of order, if those members on the other side are going to expound on statements I said, well let them be accurate, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that. I said that we weigh, we discuss, we discuss things that unions do not like and we discuss things that unions do like. It is only in that way that we can come to a sensible agreement on what proposal to put to Cabinet and before this House.

MR. NEARY: The minister said that they have to accept the good with the bad, Sir. That is what the minister said.

MR. DAWE: He did not.

MR. NEARY: I am looking for my notes. I just cannot lay my hands on them now, but I have them here somewhere.

MR. DAWE: It was in shorthead - so short you cannot see it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, it does deserve to be recognized, The honourable the minister has time for unlimited debate under this heading and if the honourable the member for Bell Island is making statements, which may or may not be inaccurate, with which the minister differs, he has unlimited time in which to reply. So there is no point of order, however the honourable minister has unlimited time in which to make his replies.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, thank you, I am very grateful for your ruling. The minister does have unlimited time and he can get up and make all the speeches on this he wants because we are going to spend some time on this. I am just going to prove how incompetent the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is, Sir. That is the first time in this honourable House that I have made a statement like that, Sir. I

I never used the word incompetent but I am using it now because I think the minister is incompetent. The minister said that they have a list of unions' wants and what they do not want, "and you have to accept the good with the bad," he said. Well Sir, what about employers? Is the minister aware that a large number of employers across this country are also opposed to compulsory arbitration? It takes away the right to strike, Sir.

The minister will discover that not only the trade union movement is opposed to this but a large number of employers are opposed to it because it just does not work. It has not worked in other parts of Canada, it has not worked in the United States and it has not worked in other countries of the world and it will not work in Newfoundland.

MR. DAWE: It will not get a chance.

April 3, 1973

Tape No. 985

NM - 5

MR. NEARY: I have a word of warning to the Tory Administration that they not introduce compulsory arbitration in this province, if they do, Sir,

they will have the fright of their lives. Not only will they have the trade union movement up against them but they will have the employers -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. I think you could even say there are several points of order here but one will probably do. We have been subjected during this debate to a long tirade of speculation and tedious howling on behalf of the hon. member for Bell Island. I do not think it is necessary. I do not think it helps this debate one bit and I would respectfully request Your Honour to rule strongly against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to that point of order. The hon. member for Bell Island, the quality of the debate is not to be judged upon by the Chairman. The hon. the member is being relevant and accordingly I rule that he may continue.

MR. NEARY: The member for St. John's North just gets back from the Canary Islands, supposed to be well rested, Sir, supposed to be able to sit in this House -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member for Bell Island should direct himself to Head 501(01).

MR. NEARY: I will deal with the member for the Canary Islands later, Sir.

So, Mr. Chairman, we want to know what is going to be done about the Cohen Report. Are any of the recommendations of the Cohen Report going to be implemented? Mr. Chairman, we heard the Minister of Education, I think it was about ten days ago, a week or ten days ago, announce in this hon. House that the Department of Education was going to set up a committee to study the demand for special skills or tradesmen in this province. The minister told us that they were going to try and determine what the requirements were for the next couple of years and I think the minister specifically mentioned the oil refinery at Come by Chance and the linerboard mill at Stephenville. Well, Sir, if the minister is going to limit -

MR. DAWK: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, the hon. member is now discussing education estimates and not labour. He is referring to the Minister of Education and the proposal made by the minister at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must confess my ignorance of what was transpiring there, as I was busy making a note of another thing that was certainly irrelevant to this debate. So consequently I am unable to rule on that particular point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that in my opinion it is the duty and the responsibility of the new Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations to undertake at once a study to determine the demand for special skills and/or tradesmen that may be required in all industry, Sir, in this province in the next four or five years. If the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations do not do this, Sir, then I am afraid that Newfoundland will miss the boat, Newfoundlanders will not be trained for the job opportunities that are coming up in this province in the next five to ten years.

I would also like the minister to tell us - Sir, we dragged the information out of him last week that the apprenticeship board had not met since the middle of December. This is a pretty important board, Sir, and this is a very grievous error in my opinion. Not an examination I suppose has been held since mid-December and not a certificate has been issued to any of the large number of apprentices that are getting their journeyman's certificates under the apprenticeship programme of this province. I would like the minister to tell us what is going to be done with the apprenticeship programme and why the government does not require employers to train more apprentices in relation to the number of tradesmen that they have on their payrolls.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from a trade union that

strikes, the blame is being placed on the shoulders of the workers of this province. It has been pointed out to me on numerous occasions, Sir, that this is not so, that management is as much to blame for these strikes, whether they be legal or illegal, as the unions are. That is what I have been told, Sir, and I have had a little bit of correspondence pointing that out to me. They just do not only say, Sir, that management should share the blame but the unions have taken a positive approach to this problem. They have suggested to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations that the only way to resolve this serious problem is through education. I agree with them, Sir. I agree with them. As a matter of fact I made a recommendation to the minister's predecessor several months ago that a meeting be held between labour and management, headed up by the Minister of Labour at the time, to discuss wildcat strikes in this province, and that was one of the recommendations that came out of this conference, Sir, that more emphasis be laid on employer-employee education. It was never done. The conference was held. Some good recommendations came out of it but they were never acted on and instead the government decided to appoint a well-to-do lawyer to investigate wildcat strikes in this province, another gentleman who has no background, absolutely no experience in these matters, and he is expected to make recommendations on wildcat strikes. The gentleman happens to be a first cousin of mine, Sir, but that is no excuse. I call the shots as I see them, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think anything will come of it although it will probably cost the taxpayers of this province a few thousand dollars for travelling, for lawyers fees and what have you, but nothing will

I will not name who made a suggestion to me some time ago, just to show you, Sir, just to prove the point that I made a few moments ago about what they think of the present Minister of Labour and the Department of Labour. He said, "We propose that the Government of Newfoundland -

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member prepared to table that?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to table it.

MR. DAWE: Then he should not refer to it and he should not read it.

MR. NEARY: I will refer to any document I like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My understanding of the committee is that it has been the rule for some time and I presume it will remain so that private members are not permitted to table things in the House. Presumably it could be done with the concurrence of the whole House. However, the hon. member will not be compelled to table it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am just using this as an illustration of what the trade union movement across this province -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is contrary to parliamentary practice for members to be permitted to quote from documents that they do not identify and are not prepared to table. If the hon. the member is now quoting from a document which is critical of the Minister of Labour, signed by some union or has some comment in it, then the document should be tabled if it is to be quoted from, otherwise it should not be quoted from.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is certainly a debatable point and there does appear to be some merit in the argument of the Minister of Finance. I am not prepared to rule on it at this time. However, maybe the hon. member could proceed with other points that he may have to make or he may wish to -

MR. NEARY: It is not really that important, Mr. Chairman. I have been told, Sir, that most unions across this island today and in Labrador feel that the blame for strikes, especially the wildcat

come out of it, Sir. The only real cure if there is a cure - I doubt very much if there is a cure for wildcat strike, Sir. I do not think that you can legislate people back to work. The only approach that I can see to the problem is through education.

The minister got up this afternoon and told us, Sir, that his predecessor had referred to labour education in this province and that the minister hoped to see something done about it this year. The minister was not even aware, Sir, that in this year's estimates, under heading V-1107, \$10,000 is allocated for labour education. I would like to ask the minister now what they have in mind, what it is they are going to do for this \$10,000. Are they going to run their own education programme? Are they going to try to change the curriculum in the schools? What is it they are going to do, Mr. Chairman? We would like to know. There is \$10,000 here for labour education. What is it for? Could the minister give us a breakdown of it? He did not even know it was there until I brought it to his attention this moment.

Sir, I do not know if the minister has been making notes there or not but there are a number of questions that I put to the honourable minister and maybe I will just sit down now and let him answer some of these questions. Then when he is finished, I may have a few more to ask him. My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition has already raised the matter of ex parte injunctions and only yesterday, Sir, we saw an injunction issued against the strikers at Come By Chance. This was supposed to be done away with. We were told in the Throne Speech, back on March 1, 1972, that was one of the first things the Tory Administration was going to do, eliminate the ex parte injunction. It has not been done yet, Sir. All we have seen in this House so far are little bits and pieces of insignificant, trivial, trifling legislation. Now I want the minister to be man enough to stand in this House and state precisely what the government policy is on labour matters in this province and when we can expect the amendments and the new pieces

of legislation that we were promised in two Throne Speeches in this honourable House.

The minister got up and made another foolish statement, Sir. I cannot help but comment on it. It was so foolish I suppose I should ignore it. "Coffee breaks have caused more wildcat strikes than anything else." What foolishness, Mr. Chairman. When there is a wildcat strike it is a much more serious matter than a coffee break, much more serious matter, Sir. If the minister would only just take time to do a little research, he would find out that it is not coffee breaks that cause wildcat strikes. Is it a coffee break that is causing the wildcat strike down at Come By Chance, Sir? That is costing \$100,000 a day I am told? Was that a coffee break that caused that? No, Sir, it was not a coffee break and I could tell this honourable House what caused that strike. They would not like it. The government representative on the site down there had some connection, Sir, with that strike. I cannot prove it but I have been told. Writing his secret, confidential reports to the Premier and making commitments to workers that he had no authority to make. That is one of the main causes of that strike down there today, Sir, that is causing so much hardship and costing that project so much money. Another gentleman who was completely ignorant of the labour management relations, knows nothing at all, was sent down to Come By Chance as a representative of the government, a go-between between labour and management. All he did was cause trouble, Sir. I think the government should state the real cause of that strike at Come By Chance.

Another thing that I would like to ask the honourable minister, Sir. What is the honourable minister's department or what is the government doing about the discrimination against Newfoundland workers on some of these projects? We saw it and heard about it in Steventown and morale out there is pretty low at the present time, Sir. We saw it happen at Churchill Falls and now we see it happening at Come By Chance, Sir, where Americans and Mainland workers are coming

into this province and getting preferential treatment. I am not against Mainlanders and I am not against American workers coming into this province. It is absolutely necessary in some instances to import workers in here because we do not have the trades and we do not have the skills available in Newfoundland. One could argue, if all the Newfoundlanders were sent home from Ontario it would have a pretty drastic effect upon the economy of this province. That may be true, Sir, and I am not arguing against Mainland workers. What I am saying is this, Mr. Chairman: Where our workers have equal qualifications to Mainlanders or American workers, they should not be discriminated against, they should get the same pay, the same working conditions and the same fringe benefits.

I am told, Sir - I do not know if it is true or not but I would like for the honourable minister to tell me because I am sure the honourable minister, if he is doing his job, should have looked into this - I am told that Newfoundlanders working side by side by Mainlanders and Americans at Come By Chance get the same rate of pay here, they get their check here, both are paid an equal amount but then there is another check sent to the home of the Mainlander whether he be from Quebec or Ontario. I would like to find out if this is true or not, Sir. It is discrimination. It should not be allowed to continue. It is another reason for the strike at Come By Chance today. Newfoundlanders are getting browned off with this, Sir. Newfoundlanders do the work, are quite capable, they have the qualifications, quite competent and able to do the work - nine chances out of ten they have to show these imports what to do. But who receives the benefits? The imports, Sir. That is wrong. If it is happening, it should be discontinued. I hope the minister will be able to enlighten us on that matter and tell us that it is not so.

I am not just making this statement, Sir, to start a war between Newfoundlanders and Mainlanders coming in here. That is no

not the purpose of it, Sir. The Human Rights Association should take it up, if it is happening. They should not have to be told. They should take it up automatically, if it is happening. I have heard about it. I have had a number of workers come and tell me about it. I am told that it is true. I hope it is not. I certainly want to have it investigated. I might even suggest to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations that a study be made of this, that if necessary set up a royal commission to investigate this to see if it is happening because if it is, Sir, it is wrong and it should be stopped. It should not be tolerated for five minutes. Newfoundlanders are as good as the best. They should not be treated as second rate workers. Whether it is in Labrador City or Wabush or Churchill Falls or Come By Chance or Steenville, it does not make any difference. Our workers can hold their own, Sir, with the best of them. They should be paid equal pay for equal work with Mainlanders and Americans.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Human Rights are going to look into it. Well done! Another step forward for Human Rights. Sir, it is a pretty serious matter and you will always have labour unrest on these projects as long as that is allowed to happen, Sir. You will always have labour unrest. You will have one worker after the other worker's throat. You will have supervisors that are brought in from the Mainland that are distrusted, that are looked upon with suspicion. The reason that I am taking so long on this point is because I think it is pretty important. I just want to make myself clear. I am not against - I want to repeat this, Mr. Chairman, I am not against Mainlanders coming in here working on our projects. In Quebec I understand you have to get a work permit, over right next to my honourable friend's district in Labrador West, if you want to work in Shefferville.

In Mount Wright you have to get a work permit from the Province of Quebec. Not so in Newfoundland. Not so, Sir. You can come in here and go to work, and I will say that it is a good thing. I am not in favour of workful permits, although I would like to see Newfoundlanders get the preference if they have the qualifications to do the job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I do not know where the fault lies, Mr. Chairman, but it is happening, it has happened and it will happen in the future unless we do something about it, unless we stand up on our hind legs and say, no, we are not going to tolerate this.

The Minister of Finance encountered that in the Linerboard Mill in Stephenville. I do not know if he was able to rectify it or not. But it is happening today, Sir, and it should be stopped. I do not mind one bit, Mr. Chairman, about employers bringing in bricklayers or pipefitters or any other trade, if they are needed. If they cannot be found in Newfoundland, I have no objection to that, the work has to be done. But, Sir, they cannot produce any better than Newfoundlanders can and they should not be given preferential treatment and isolation pay, better transportation arrangements than Newfoundlanders, better fringe benefits, better vacation with pay and so forth and so on, all the way down the line. One cheque here and one cheque paid in Montreal. It has to stop, Sir. That is partly the reason for the poor employee/employer relations that we have today at Come by Chance. That is one of the reasons for it.

The people who are dealing in these matters do not understand the local psychology. They do not, Mr. Chairman. They are used to bargaining in the big cities. They do not understand the local psychology, Sir. And apparently they are not prepared to take the advice of the local people. We have responsible union leaders in this province. They are trying to do the best they can but they cannot

do it all, Sir, they have to have some co-operation from the employer.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to belabour this point but I cannot help but say this, how stupid it was for the employer at Come by Chance to grant an increase in pay, better working conditions, better fringe benefits to one union and then not to expect the other unions to want the same thing. Once they open up the door, Mr. Chairman, they do not have any choice, they have to grant the same concessions to every worker on that project, the workers will not accept anything less, court injunctions or no court injunctions. They are only fighting for their rights, Sir.

It was a mistake, I am not saying it was a mistake to give a certain group of employees an increase in pay. That is not a mistake, Sir, that is always in order, especially when we see the cost of living escalating the way it is today. But one thing, Sir, that they must keep in mind, if you give it to one group you have to give it to everybody. The situation at Come by Chance, in my opinion, will never be resolved until that happens. The employer down there, the master contractor can dig his heels in if he wants, the workers at Come by Chance will settle for nothing less, Sir. What is happening now is rather unfortunate, it is tragic. As a matter of fact, you almost have got a labour war going on at Come by Chance, one union fighting the other, due to a stupid blunder, in my opinion, on the part of the contractor. It is costing not only the worker but it is costing the project itself a substantial amount of money, Sir.

I would like to hear the minister's comment on this matter. So, Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat now and I will listen to what the honourable minister has to say and if there are any other questions then I will ask him, following his remarks.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if I could take the time of the committee for a few minutes, it is easy to see, Mr. Chairman, that we are certainly not witnessing any request for information from the honourable gentleman opposite. What we are listening to and what we are hearing

of course are political harangues. The honourable gentleman who is just pretending to ask questions, has not asked a question. All he is doing is up abusing and haranguing for political reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not in order, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: This is quite in order, Sir. We just listened to the honourable gentleman now for almost an hour, almost an hour.

Now the honourable gentleman suggested to the Minister of Labour, and I thought it was quite remarkable, that he should pick up where his predecessors left off. If the honourable gentleman is referring to his Liberal predecessor, then he has quite a distance down to stoop before he starts to pick up, because it was the honourable gentleman's administration that for years, that for years would have nothing to do with the labour movement, that attempted to crush the labour movement, that ignored the labour movement, It was the honourable gentleman's leader, the leader of the past administration, Mr. Smallwood, who would not attend the Newfoundland Federation of Labour Meetings, would not go to their annual meeting, would not speak to them, would not receive them into the cabinet room, for years, and who brought in the legislation in 1966 to crush the hospital workers after doing the IWA in a few years earlier. This is the group across the House now, the official opposition, who have the nerve to get up and get on with the guff that we have heard from the honourable gentleman opposite.

He wanted to know, Mr. Chairman, what the government has done about Labour Relations. Well what the government have done about Labour Relations is first that it increased the minimum wage to \$1.50 an hour, last year. Then we brought in and implemented in the civil service something that the previous administration did not do, apparently would not do, that is we instituted the principle of equal pay for equal work in government service, made it retroactive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: It is the flat truth, the past administration refused to do it and this year we passed and implemented the rule of equal

pay for women with men in government services of Newfoundland and made it retroactive to September 30, 1971. If the honourable gentleman denies it, he lies through his teeth. He completely lies. That was not in effect, it was brought into effect last summer and now in the public service of Newfoundland the women who do the same work as men receive equal pay and we made it retroactive to September 30, 1971. The honourable gentleman gave lip-service to the principle and never instituted, never instituted it in government service. That is something that the new administration have done.

What else have they done? I will not mention everything. But what are some of the other things that have been done? There is now being drafted, being worked on, a new Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. Honourable gentlemen opposite in their administration introduced legislation to this House in 1970 and had it passed through the House that was completely repugnant completely reprehensible as far as the public service employees groups were concerned, NAPE, because it left almost all power to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, to the cabinet, the cabinet to do everything by regulation. The legislation was just a skeleton and the government could decide by order-in-council, under the legislation, what applied and what did not apply, who could be certified and who could not be certified, who could strike and who could not strike. That legislation was never proclaimed. It was passed in 1970, the last administration was defeated in October 1971. They struggled and clung to power by their fingernails and their toenails until January 18 of 1972 and still had not proclaimed the legislation. We have not proclaimed it because we are not going to proclaim it, the act is repugnant. A new act is being drafted where all these vast powers given to cabinet to operate by order-in-council will be replaced by detailed provisions in the legislation. That legislation will be becoming before the House at this session.

What else are we doing in the Labour Relations Field, Mr. Chairman? There will be presented to the House at this session and

it is being worked on now for several months, legislation for Teachers Collective Bargaining. There has been a tremendous amount of work done on that. We introduced and had passed through the House legislation concerning notice for the termination so that when an industry wants to terminate or wants to close up, it has to give notice and give eight weeks or twelve weeks notice or pay the employees if they do not receive the notice. The honourable Leader of the Opposition sort of gave a little sneer at that this afternoon, in his usual little nasty way, when he said this was not a bad piece of legislation but it did not break any ground,

was only copied from another province, as though it were just a mere nothing, as though that little sneer meant that it was just no good at all. Why did not the honourable gentlemen opposite introduce it when they were in office? They did not bother to introduce it. That legislation was in effect I believe in Ontario. The legislation brought before this House, Ontario was the example for it. But that does not mean to say, Mr. Chairman, - the fact is that it was not law before we introduced it to the House and it was not law until it was enacted by the House. It had to be our will and our desire to correct that situation that caused it to be enacted into law. So any little sneers about where it originated from or you know, it was not pioneering, are quite irrelevant and not to the point. That is something else that we have done in labour relations.

The labour bodies in this province know today that they have free access to the government. There is no ill-will between the government and the labour movement. They have free access. They are not boycotted. Nobody is trying to stamp on them. Nobody is trying to do them down. They can have what politics they like. They do not have to kowtow to us. They can be as independent and say what they like. That is the new atmosphere in this province. Two or three years ago, unless you were going to say the right thing, you kept your mouth shut. That has all been changed.

The honourable gentlemen opposite are glorying in the wildcat strikes. Pure mischievousness! The more wildcat strikes there are, it appears the more delighted the honourable member gets. Well there are a lot of wildcat strikes, Mr. Chairman. I am afraid that our Minister of Labour is not going to be able

to stop that. He is not a one-man superman. If there is general unrest, if the relations between employers and employees are so bad, (apparently there are wildcat strikes, as there are at Come-by-Chance) this is not something the Minister of Labour can cure by himself. He can only provide a service or his people can only provide a service and attempt to get the parties together and conciliate it and get the thing resolved.

The Minister of Labour cannot be held responsible for every strike in the province. In fact he cannot be held responsible for any strike that takes place in the province. He provides a service and does his best and the rest depends upon the reasonableness of the contending parties and how good the relationships are between them.

The Cohen Report: The honourable gentleman gets on about the Cohen Report which was received last year. The Cohen Report is a disappointment. I will give my own opinion on that. It is turgid, difficult to read, bifurcated mishmash. It was not what anybody expected. It took years. It was Chief Justice Rand who was originally appointed in 1966 or 1967. That dragged on for several years. Then former Justice Rand died and Mr. Cohen was appointed and he dragged on for two or three years. All the while that they were dragging on, the Liberal Administration were very, very happy to be able to say; "Well, we have a royal commission study on this. We have a royal commission. We will not take any stand on this matter. It is in the hands of Chief Justice Rand. Now it is in the hands of Mr. Cohen." Well it is out of Mr. Cohen's hands now. It was a pity that four or five years went into it. There are suggestions in it that the Department of Labour are working on. There is legislation before the cabinet now, proposed legislation. The minister cannot give the details to this House now, the details of that legislation. Do not worry about the ex parte injunction. The government said that that was going to be changed and it will be.

The details of what is in the legislation the minister cannot give this House until the legislation is presented to the House and until the cabinet has given final approval.

The honourable gentleman mentioned an injunction yesterday . What relevance it has, I do not know. That was not an ex parte injunction, I do happen to know that. That matter was argued by both parties before the court issued it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman - well morale was mentioned about workers and so on but they are not looking for information. We know that what this is a propaganda parade. It is too bad, Mr. Chairman, that because of the Goebbels technique, the technique of the repeated exaggeration, the repeated distortion, the half-truth, the half-falsehood, repeated over and over, which is the technique of the official opposition, that I have to bring this point up again. It was discussed here last night. It will be discussed I suppose another half a dozen times. The Leader of the Opposition discussed it today, his own snide and jejune manner. The honourable gentleman does not understand that word. He does not know whether it is parliamentary or not. I thought I would be safe.

Now to come back to the silly point that the honourable Leader of the Opposition got into with, "We have threatened the unions; we have threatened the teachers, the firemen, the policemen and the civil service union." It is too bad that it is only a two party system. If the official opposition opposite are the only alternative that this government have, it is a sad, sad shape that the province is in today. To think that the only alternative to us is right there, which is a prospect that would almost make one flee the province in despair. The honourable gentleman opposite - there might be some hope in him. What has been said? What are these wild threats, these shakings that have terrified

and disrupted the collective bargaining process with the teachers and the civil servants? Well it has not disrupted it at all because the sessions are going on. They have not been disrupted at all. We are informing the people of Newfoundland, whom we represent, and whom the budget deals with and who ultimately pay the bills.

I will read it again: It must be made perfectly clear to the public that if the demands for increased social services and if the demands for increased wages in the public service, that is the \$25,000, are in excess of those presently provided for in the 1973-1974 budget, it will be necessary for the government to contemplate (not necessary for the government to do it) before the end of the coming fiscal year an interim budget requiring tax increases or reductions in existing government programmes. It would all depend, Mr. Chairman, on how reasonable the settlements are and what reasonably happened and how much is provided in the budget and what happens during the year. This action would be taken, if necessary, because we must maintain the current account surplus to offset the current account deficit of last year and to manage responsibly the finances of the Province of Newfoundland. There is no threat in that. It is a statement of fact. It is a bit of common sense. Is it not obvious that there are some constraints on the government, on every government, that it cannot just continue to give increase after increase or increased payments and allowances and so on, that it has some financial constraints, and no province more than this province. That is what that is a statement of. That sets the perimeters of what this government can do. Otherwise the people of Newfoundland have to be asked to pay the ante. They are already heavily taxed and they are not going to be too pleased if they have to pay further in taxes than is absolutely necessary. That is all that the budget speech states. The people that are

negotiating would understand that. There is nothing wrong with our relationship with them. Collective bargaining is proceeding normally. All the mischevious suggestions and wild statements of the opposition are not going to change that and they will remain just what they are, attempts to make trouble, not expressions of concern, attempts to create trouble, that are going to be unsuccessful and are unsuccessful now.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I stand on a point of privilege of the House of Assembly. The point of privilege is that the rules of this House are not being adhered to. In this debate the hon. Leader of the Opposition called the hon. Minister of Finance a liar. As I understand it, a "lie" is an unparliamentary word in this House. I also heard the hon. Minister of Finance reply make rebuttal by saying that it was a lie what the hon. Leader of the Opposition was saying. My point is that if we are going to abide by the rules, we should abide by the rules at all times. These honourable members concerned, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Minister of Finance, should retract these statements or be suspended from the House of Assembly.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be suspended. I will withdraw that from my statement. I will just prove it later on .

MR. ROBERTS: I am prepared to withdraw mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Bonavista South, in my opinion, is perfectly correct. The rules however state that the language, as far as the word lie or liar, calls for prompt interference from the Chair, and the Chair, probably being perhaps over worked, lulled by the debate, missed it and the debate had gone on so that the time for interference, while it could have interfered, chose not to, and I thank the honourable member for Bonavista South for bringing the matter to the House's attention.

The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I have a very few words to say on the general principles of the department whose estimates we are now beginning to debate.

I tend to agree with the opening remarks made by the honourable gentleman from St. John's West when he mentioned that probably the reasons why we are having all the problems within the labour movement today are because of things that have been done before by previous administrations with regard to the labour movement and regulations pertaining thereto.

If we are witnessing too many wildcat strikes today, it is because - you know a wildcat strike is not a thing that erupts over night, it is a psychological condition that is brought about after a period of years of frustration and neglect. I think the reason for having these strikes today is because the people in the labour movement have been forced to live under and try to operate and work under such strictures.

The regulations and legislation brought in and continued by the previous administrations - I am not going to apologize for the previous administration, I do not think they have done very much in the way of correcting those mistakes yet.

We remember what happened with the IWA, a blot on our history as a people. Remember the hospital workers and remember

MR. MARTIN: the people in this House who voted against the hospital workers.

We remember too how just very, very shortly, very few short months ago when the last administration, the Liberal Administration tried desperately to use every means at its disposal to discourage the organization of the fishermen into their own union.

I might say that we have seen nothing from this administration to change our opinion, because the legislation that was on the books then remained there right now.

The questions that I would like to ask of the honourable minister, there are six of them and I will just briefly list them so that I do not get into prolonging this debate that has gone on too long already.

I would like to know what has happened to the Fisheries Advisory Committee. We were told that this was being worked on. I would like to know to what extent and when we can expect to see this committee set up.

I would like to know what has happened to the Labour Standard Committee that was promised away back in December. I would like to know the state and the intentions of this administration with regard to the Apprenticeship Board and what its fate might be.

The ex parte injunctions I believe the honourable the Minister of Finance said that something was being done about them. I hope this means that they are going to be done away with, that this piece of legislation is going to be done away with.

The whole matter of labour relations and labour education I really, sincerely, Mr. Chairman, do not think that anybody in this administration who sit on the other side of the House have any concept at all of what has to be done to try to make things a little bit easier between the labour movement and management.

MR. MARTIN: What has to be done is the whole labour code, all of the legislation has to be turked out and a whole new code and regulations drawn up.

The regulations as they stand today favour management threefold and until we stop looking after party healers and get down to looking after the people who make up the labour movement, we are going to continue to have labour unrest and we are going to continue to have wildcat strikes.

MR. DAWE: You mentioned three boards - the advisory board, the apprenticeship board and -

MR. MARTIN: The labour standards committee.

The last point that I would like to question the hon. minister on is whether or not this province is prepared to take steps similar to that which have been taken in Quebec, the infamous Quebec decree, whereby you must have a work permit in order to get jobs. That is a denial of all human rights and privileges. But if we are going to continue to see our people in this province denied jobs while people from across the border come in and take them and not do anything in retaliation, then you are letting down the people who are looking for employment in this province.

I will have a few other things to say on the various aspects of this department's operation as we go along. But these are the questions that I raise now and I hope the hon. minister can do something about them.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the questions raised by my friend, the hon. member for Labrador South, with regard to the fishery advisory board, my department is actively working on that right now and I hope that very shortly we will have something on that, something more concrete. I am sorry we do not already. We have been working on quite a lot of things, a lot of amendments, a lot of acts and this sort of thing and this, of course, is one of them - you cannot do it all the one time and you cannot do it all in a very short period of time.

The apprenticeship board is still in effect. As a matter of fact the chairman is still being paid. He is still signing certificates, despite what the hon. member for Bell Island says. The examinations are carrying on the same as ever and certificates are being issued the same as ever. The chairman, as I said, is still active in that regard. The basic function of this apprenticeship board I think is in the thirty-nine subcommittees. As you know these subcommittees are directly related to and close to each individual trade. It is a grass-root sort of thing. The people who are on these subcommittees are people who are out

working in the trade. They meet to decide on certain certification and examinations and so on, procedures and forms and this sort of thing. Therefore the work of the apprenticeship board is not being impeded. The apprenticeship board itself, when it sat, ratified only what subcommittees suggested and recommended to them. The subcommittees now are still making the decisions as they always have done but instead of going to the apprenticeship board for rubber stamping they are now submitting the thing to the director of apprenticeship training, which under the act is quite legal. I think it is 9(c), if I can recall correctly, of the Apprenticeship Act gives the director that authority or gives the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council the authority to appoint him in that capacity.

MR. MARTIN: Do you have plans to do away with the board eventually?

MR. DAWE: Well, the only reason this whole matter came up is because it was recommended in the White Paper that the apprenticeship board itself be abolished. Before doing that, I sent out feelers to labour and to management and so on and we have been getting replies back and we still are getting some back with regard to views by the labour people on the abolition of the apprenticeship board. The board has not yet been abolished. We are working it in, in relation to another setup that we have in mind, which I think will be quite acceptable to the labour movement. As a matter of fact, I think it would be perhaps preferential to these people. It is something in gear again that is in preparation and very shortly we will be asking for the ratification of cabinet on it.

The labour standards committee is also in the same state. It is practically ready to be established. I would think that within the next few weeks that we should be in a position whereby we can have that set up, but it certainly will be set up, and all three of them.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister a couple of questions. Could the minister inform us what is the position

his department is taking in relation to the strike at the fish plant in Bonsvista? This strike has been going on now for at least ten months and there appears to be, or at least in the eye of the general public there appears to be no conversing at all between the two parties. I am not quite sure if the Department of Labour is involved at all. Could the minister tell us if his department is involved and if there is any progress along these lines

and, if there is not any progress, does this government have any intention of taking over the Bonavista Plant the same as they did in Burgeo because I am sure the government set a very dangerous precedent there when they did act in such a way in Burgeo?

Also, Mr. Speaker, when these good people from the plant at Bonavista visited this building some time ago, someone - I am not sure who, it was either the minister or the minister through the Minister of Justice had some police on hand here in the building during the visit of these people. Now, I understand there is possibly another demonstration being planned either in or in front of this building, in a short period of time, not by these people but by another group. I am wondering if it is the government's policy also to bring out the police in this matter.

Personally I believe this is an insult to the people. I think these people are good people. They are -

MR. DAWE: A point of order. This comes under the Department of Justice not the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I suggest the honourable member ask the Justice Department.

MR. THOMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is what I am asking the minister. Is his department involved in this? Did he order these police or was it the Department of Justice? I am asking the minister to clarify this position.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not need to clarify it. The honourable the member for Bonavista North is fully aware of the situation because Your Honour, the Speaker, advised or he told me that he advised the honourable the member for Bonavista North that the two or three additional men who were in the building that afternoon came without the knowledge of the Minister of Labour, without my knowledge, and apparently it has been a practice followed by the House. Those in charge of security made the request. Now, I am not going to debate whether it should have or should not have been. The honourable the member for Bonavista North, I am told

by Mr. Speaker, was advised of this the following morning yet he still persists in asking this question, "Was it the Minister of Labour or was it the Minister of Justice?". Now, let me repeat so that no one will be mistaken. No request came from either the honourable Minister of Industrial Relations nor from the Minister of Justice. The clear and unmistakable duty of those responsible for law enforcement if difficulties are apprehended and can be foreseen is to try and obviate them. In this case, I could foresee no difficulties, no possibly whatsoever of there being any breach of the peace.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I respond to another comment made by the honourable the member for Bonavista North with respect to Burgeo. May I remind him that it was not the Progressive Conservative Government that issued the expropriation order to expropriate and take over the Burgeo Fish Plant. That expropriation order was issued and announced in November 1971, some time after the election of October. That principle again cannot be attributed to us.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is on his feet could the Minister of Justice inform this House if the policy of bringing police to this building will be continued?

MR. HICKMAN: First part inaudible. - to any building at all. The simple fact is that the police have a responsibility that they discharge themselves. They do not have to consult me to make sure that law and order are maintained. The question that I am answering is for the record, which is something that the honourable member has been advised of and was advised of the following morning. I had fully anticipated him to stand in this House in the afternoon and say, "I now have the facts. I withdraw my criticism that I made publicly the evening before." It was not done.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was out of the House for a few minutes I might have missed it but I do not think that I did. Did the minister tell us when he expected to bring legislation to this House based on

recommendations of the Royal Commission, Cohen Report, or any other information? Did he in fact say whether he expects to bring it in during this session of the House or any other session?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Minister of Finance

mentioned that it would be brought in during this session.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the minister is able to keep his commitment in that regard. I was very disappointed in the predecessor of the honourable Minister of Labour when he came out and said that the royal commission on labour legislation in Newfoundland, by Dean Cohen, was no good, useless or was not what it was supposed to be and to hear it again, reiterated by the Minister of Finance today. I suppose I am one of the few men, few people in the world who sat down one night and read this thing through from cover to cover. I must admit, Sir, when I was finished, my two eyes were out on stalks. It is not the easiest piece of reading I have ever had in my life but I do think that this royal commission report is an excellent document. I think it contains some very good recommendations, recommendations which are easy to follow, recommendations which can be very easily translated into legislation. It is beyond me why the present administration has not been able to do something in that regard before now.

Just looking at the thing at random, all the recommendations, Sir, set out in the first fifty pages of the document, some very good recommendations are contained there. The recommendation, for example, that the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council can by regulation define a particular industry in a region in which the board would be empowered to find multi-employer units appropriate for collective bargaining. That kind of thing is easy to translate into legislation, Mr. Chairman.

"Legislation should prohibit an employer from seeking by intimidation or other means to prevent an employee from exercising any right under the act or from testifying in any proceedings." It is all very simple, Sir. "The board should be given authority to hold a vote where the evidence of membership is somewhat less than that statutorily required, if he has reason to believe that the employees fear the consequences of joining the union," for example.

This goes on for twenty or thirty pages all set out quite clearly. For example; "In the area of dispute settlement the public authority, namely the government, should be prepared to assist parties in accommodating their differences without recourse to work stoppage but in a manner which will not encourage the parties to abdicate their principal responsibility for bargaining to a successful conclusion on terms of employment." Then they set out, Sir, in the royal commission report, four short paragraphs as to how that should be done.

In the area of arbitration, for example; the recommendation is that the parties to disputes would do well to experiment with arbitration as a means of settling unresolved issues after good faith bargaining and the government should consider suitable measures to support or encourage such experimentation. There is nothing mandatory about it, it is not saying that the government should enforce mandatory arbitration but it says; "perhaps there is need for an experiment in this field, where parties, after negotiation, can then subject their grievances or their disputes to arbitration."

"It should be made an unfair labour practice for an employer to take disciplinary action against an employee because he has refused to perform the duties of another employee who is engaged in a legal strike."

To avoid the misuse of injunctions, they recommend that the ex parte injunction or ex parte orders be done away with. That is set out in three or four lines, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, this document is eminently suited in my estimation for translation, almost directly, into legislation. I cannot understand why it has taken this government, which has become known as a do-little or do-nothing government, so long to get some legislation before this House with regard to labour relations and the Trade Union Act or the Labour Relations Act.

Back on October 6, the minister's predecessor made a

statement concerning certain things that he was going to have introduced into the House. That was six months ago, Mr. Chairman, almost to the day, six months ago and still nothing before this House with regard to amendments or a new act in fact, the Labour Relations Act, a new act bringing our labour legislation in this province up to date.

I am glad to hear that the minister has indicated that there will be legislation before the House this session. When I do not know. The Order Paper is singularly free of anything of importance at the moment. There may be one or two items there but nothing of great significance. I hope that he does get an opportunity to bring it in relatively early because it is a matter which should be debated at some length in this House. It should take up some time and it would be well worth the effort when the time is spent on that particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit down without

making some reference to the honourable the Minister of Finance. He stands up in this House at every opportunity and, in my estimation, Sir, gives a pathetic display of what a minister should not be doing. He gets up here, Sir, and tries to defend, in a pathetic manner, a disastrous budget which he brought before this House two or three days ago, a budget in which there was contained not even a veiled threat, not even an indirect threat but a direct threat to public employees in this province that if they were to try and negotiate for more than is actually set down in the estimates then they would have to bear the burden on their backs, the public outcry on their backs when new taxes had to be increased.

When that same Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, blithesomely and gleefully talks about \$6 million or more than \$6 million surplus on current account, he talks in terms of people who are trying to negotiate in good faith for half decent wages and income for themselves. He talks about them having to bear the public vituperation I suppose for any tax increases he might have to bring in later on during this session or during this present financial year. He tried to say that he did not say that, and he read his budget again and there it was, Mr. Chairman, clearly stated, not even veiled, not even indirect but a direct threat to the public servants in this province.

I also have to make some comment, Sir, about how he talks about how this government has free access to it by members of the trade unions. That may be so in respect of some unions, Mr. Chairman, but I know of at least two unions, the leaders of at least two unions in this province who have tried with very little success over a period of up to six months to get a meeting with the Premier of this Province concerning some problems that were affecting their unions and negotiations and things generally and were, up to the last time I spoke to them, unsuccessful in seeing the Premier.

I remember one of them used the Minister of Fisheries as a liaison to the Premier with no success whatsoever. One of them, I believe Mr. Cashin the President of the Fishermen's Unions

around the province, came out publicly some weeks ago and stated that he had been unable to get any access to the Premier at all, that he had been trying to see the Premier and had not been able to see him.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not hear the Minister of Finance trying to get up here in this House and defend the indefensible, to defend this government's action with regard to accessibility to any member of the public, be it trade unions or anything else because they are not accessible to these people, Mr. Chairman. They are not accessible. It is impossible for people who have real, genuine problems to get to see the Leader of the administration of this province within a reasonably short period of time.

I could not forebear, Mr. Chairman, from making that comment because it is a fact. They cannot see the Premier and they cannot get their ideas across to him.

Now, Sir, a more local matter that I would like to bring to the -

MR. MURPHY: Would the honourable member permit one question?

MR. ROWE, W.N. I will be finished in one moment now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this off my chest.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Good enough.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I would like to get this off my chest before six o'clock is called.

MR. MURPHY: I am wondering if they were refused by the Department of Labour to see them, which was the department that he -

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well, I can answer that. I do not know. My answer to that question, I do not know but the Premier of this Province, Mr. Chairman, should be accessible to interested groups.

MR. MURPHY: The times have changed in three years.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Times have changed, Sir, the former leader of the administration was accessible to anybody who wanted to see him. The leader of the present administration, Mr. Chairman, is not accessible

to anybody who wants to see him. That is the difference.

But there is a local matter affecting my own constituency of White Bay South. I have received a statement, Sir, which I will not table. But it is a statement which I received from the members of Local 7190 of the United Steel Workers of America Union, in Rambler Mine up there. Ming Mine and the Rambler Mine

MR. WM. ROWE: Rambler Mines in which they mention that we, the members of local 7190 at Rambler Mines, complain as to the mine inspector coming into the mine to make inspections with just a company official with him. We feel there should be allowed some member or officer of the union to travel through the mine to see what is going on regarding safety.

I just throw that out to the minister in order that he might be aware of it. This is a complaint which we have received on this side of the House from members of that union.

I was glancing down through the Manpower and Industrial Relations and I did not see any particular head that I could bring that up, so I thought I would bring it to the minister's attention, especially in view of the fact that there are one or two other complaints as well.

"We also expect," says this spokesman for the union, "We also expect him (that is the mine inspector) when he comes in to do justice, not to just pass over something just to please the company because that is mostly what is done. They come in the mine, they do not take any tests of the scoop trams" (I believe that is Mr. Chairman) "that are used underground. They let the company boss take tests and then throw them down the shaft. There is a lot of poison monoxide in the mine."

That is an opinion of a union member, a union officer, which he has brought to my attention, and I just make public reference to it for the minister's benefit because if this sort of thing is going on, I think the minister should look into it in his department.

He goes on to say that we, the members of local 7190, feel that the personnel manager for safety, the safety manager I guess, Mr. Chairman, should not be hired by the company. He should be hired by the government or the safety division, I do not quite follow that, Mr. Speaker, but he makes the point that he should

MR. WM. ROWE: be hired by the government, where justice will be done to both the membership and the company.

These seem to be, Mr. Chairman, relatively sensible comments made by these members of that local. Maybe they would be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Mines, rather than the Minister of Labour, but since they came from a union member or union members, two or three names there that I will not mention for obvious reasons.

MR. BARRY: Could you let us have now a copy of the points?

MR. WM. ROWE: Right. I will do that, Mr. Chairman. But I bring it up here today because we are talking about Labour estimates and this came from a union and there has been labour difficulties down there in Rambler Mines, at one time, as a matter of fact, the mine manager, now deceased, unfortunately, killed in an accident, but two or three years ago I remember he was actually driven out of Bay Verte by the members of the union because there was so strong a feeling up there with regard to him. If we can forestall any of that kind of action by looking after some of these reasonable recommendations by the members of the union there, then I am all for it.

I would not say - well the man is dead now so we should not say much about it, I suppose, but when he was driven out by the members of the union, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the members of the union had a great deal of validity in their case at that time.

So I would hate to see anything like that flare up again. It costs the province money, it costs the people involved money and it affects the viability of the mines themselves. I bring it up now because we are discussing Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, does he want to reply to the points raised?

There are one or two other minor points that I wish to

MR. ROBERTS: raise and I suspect, other than that, that will probably take care of the Labour Department or whatever it is called, Manpower and Industrial Relations Department. But if the minister wants to reply before we break for supper, I will sit down and let him have a crack at it.

Well shall we call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

At eight o'clock we can come back and have a look at these estimates. It should not take very long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 45

VERBATIM REPORT

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The Committee of Supply resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

Head V - Manpower and Industrial Relations - Head 501(01):

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the minister's salary carries there are one or two other questions that I would like to put to the minister. First of all, Sir, I would like to ask the minister if the government propose to increase the minimum wage in 1973.

I would also like to ask the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I might remind members, Mr. Chairman, when some of the members of the present government were on this side of the hon. House I think they suggested that the minimum wage should be increased to \$2.00 an hour. I would like to hear these members comment on the minimum wage now to see how they feel about it now, Sir. So I would like for the minister to tell us whether it is going to increase in 1973 because we were promised in the throne speech, Sir, in March 1972, the one day session when we had the political platform, when the government unveiled their political platform in this hon. House, we were told that the minimum wage would be reviewed periodically, and there has only been one review to my knowledge. So I think that we are due now, Mr. Chairman, for another review of the minimum wage and I would like to know what the government's policy is on this. I would also like to know, Mr. Chairman, because the Workman's Compensation Board comes under the jurisdiction of the hon. minister, although it has always been a question mark whether or not the minister can direct the Workman's Compensation Board. I think the Workman's

Compensation Board merely comes under the Minister of Labour for the purposes of reporting to this House. The minister is a link between the Workman's Compensation Board and the House, and the Minister of Justice is nodding yes to that.

So I would like to ask the minister who reports to the House for the Workman's Compensation Board what the government is doing with the Workman's Compensation Committee Report that I presume is in their hands by now? Will there be any changes in the Workman's Compensation Act this year, Sir? I had a piece of correspondence recently from the St. Lawrence Workers Protective Union and they proposed, and I agree with them and I think you will probably get unanimous agreement on this amongst the workers across the province, that the Workman's Compensation Act should be amended so that increases will be based on the cost of living index and so that people will receive periodic increases as the cost of living is announced. I would like to hear the minister's views on this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we had quite a lively and interesting debate on the minister's salary and on the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations generally and I think, Mr. Chairman, that hon. members of this House have now come to the conclusion, and rightly so, that the present minister of that department is a disaster, Sir. This is not a personal matter, Mr. Chairman, and it is not a personal attack. It is a statement of fact, Sir. The minister is a disaster in that department. He has lost the confidence of both labour and management in this province.

MR. DAWE: That is a non-substantiated opinion.

MR. NEARY: It is not a non-substantiated opinion, Sir, and I suggested this afternoon, Sir, that the Premier would be well advised if he thought about a replacement for the hon. minister, with all due respect to the hon. minister, Mr. Chairman. The hon. minister

may be good at some things but this is the kind of a job, Sir, believe me it is and I know what I am talking about as I have experience in these matters and I was a member of the trade union myself for fourteen years, Sir, and I was acting president of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour on one occasion and I was secretary-treasurer of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour on two occasions which is an elected office, Sir, and I know what I am talking about, it is the kind of a job, Sir, where you have to know what you are doing. You have to have experience. You have to have background. The hon. minister, with all due respect to him, he may be good at other things, Sir, but in this particular instance the minister is a disaster. Perhaps if the minister went out and did a course in personnel relations, Sir, he might be able to grasp this job. I think they run a course down here at Memorial University. I did a course over here one time, in the Extension Department at Memorial University, in labour management relations. I have a certificate home to prove it, on my wall, Sir. But the minister has not even told us, Sir, if he is registered for a course in personnel relations, in personnel administration.

So, Sir, I am afraid that at the present time the morale of that department, as I have been told, is in pretty poor shape. We saw the other day where the chief executive officer of the Labour Relations Board resigned, Sir, to take up a position over here at Memorial University. The chief executive officer of the Labour Relations Board, Mr. Chairman, is one of the most important officials in that department. He is an experienced man and it is going to be very difficult to replace that hon. gentleman. Sir, no sooner had restructuring taken place when the Deputy Minister of Labour was kicked upstairs, and I think he was made an adviser to the priorities and planning committee.

MR. DAWE: He got a promotion.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister says a promotion but what about the poor old Labour Department? This gentleman, Sir, as far as I know, had been doing an excellent job, came from the Fishery College, had quite a work experience behind him, grabbed a hold to the department when he came in there as deputy minister, because shortly after I became acting Minister of Labour of that department and I was acting minister for ten months and I was rather impressed with the deputy minister of that department, Sir. But no, do not leave him there, kick him out, kick him upstairs and make him an adviser to the priority and planning committee, whatever that means, Sir, that grandiose title.

Now we have provision in the estimates, Manpower and Industrial Relations, for I think it is two assistant deputy ministers, provision for assistant deputy minister of Manpower and assistant deputy minister of Industrial Relations but no appointments have been made yet, Sir. I think these positions should be filled, at least one of them should be filled. God only knows it is badly needed right now in this province, Sir, when the labour management relations seems to be deteriorating, have deteriorated over the past few months. It is going to get worse. We are going to have, as I said this afternoon, a long hot summer, Sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the minister feels about becoming directly involved in labour disputes personally. I do not think the minister should take sides. I do not advocate that for one minute, Sir, but I believe the minister, whenever possible, at the psychological moment should not hesitate to become involved in a labour dispute and use his good offices the best way he knows how to try to resolve that dispute. There is a technique. I know there is a knack to it, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the officials of the minister's department can advise him when the

psychological moment has arrived, when they feel that the minister's intervention in a strike could probably get the parties back to the bargaining table and resolve the dispute.

I would like to hear the minister's views on that,
Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one other matter before I take my seat and this was a matter that was raised this afternoon by the Minister of Finance in reply to statements made by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, we have hit a new low in this province, in my opinion, as far as labour management relations are concerned, as far as collective bargaining is concerned, when we heard a statement by the Minister of Finance when he brought down his budget on Friday, when he threatened the various groups that are negotiating with the government at the present time, and they are negotiating in good faith, Sir, when he created this fear in the minds of these workers, the teachers, the nurses,

the police, the wardens at the Penitentiary, the workers down at Mental Hospital, the hospital employees. The minister created a fear in their minds that if they held out for what they felt they were entitled to, in the minister would come, in the fall of the year, with a mini-budget and whack on the taxes and then the taxpayers would blame it on the workers who are only, in their opinion, fighting for their rights.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations express his views on this matter because this, Sir, is very damaging. It is going to hurt the negotiations, Sir. It was a grave error of judgement, in my opinion, on the part of the minister to make that statement at this time when negotiations are going on with the teachers and the other groups. I would like to hear what the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations thinks of this.

If the minister had come into this House and said, "Look if we have to, we will cut out the extravagance and the waste. We will cut out the three-quarters of a million dollars next year that we are going to lash out to public relations promoter, Mr. McLean."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Repetition.

MR. NEARY: It is not repetition, Sir. If the honourable minister had said, "We are going to do away with the extravagance and the waste;" that we are going to eliminate Information Newfoundland, that we are going to take these teletype machines out of the news rooms all across this province - Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations that if you add all this up, what McLean is going to get and all this special assistance, executive assistants, high paid flunkies that this government have hired, Sir, it would come to a million dollars. Now, if the Minister of Finance came into the House and said that we are going to do this, he would get some sympathy, Mr. Chairman. He would get some

sympathy from this side of the House. We would say, "Well and good my good and faithful servant, the Minister of Finance. Good for you. Cut out the things that are in the estimates that are not in the interests of the people of Newfoundland. We will save money." After all, Mr. Chairman, the minister saved thirty-one point six million last year and pumped it into the linerboard mill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member has very skillfully maneuvered his speech but has nevertheless digressed from head V-0101 which is Manpower and Industrial Relations. Would the honourable member make his remarks pertinent to the subject?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations will let us have his views on this matter. I would also like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations if he would tell us how far advanced collective bargaining legislation for the teachers of this province has gone? Is it ready to be brought into the House yet or does that come under the Minister of Education? I am not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, if it comes under the Minister of Manpower or the Minister of Education. Could the Minister of Education indicate which department collective bargaining for teachers comes under? What minister would be responsible for it? The Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, I would not think so.

MR. NEARY: Well, in that case, Mr. Chairman, I will wait until we get to the Department of Education estimates before I deal with that matter.

Sir, one of the ministers - I think it was the Minister of Finance - stated this afternoon that the previous Liberal Administration was opposed to fishermen getting organized. What foolishness, Mr. Chairman. What nonsense. I think it was the

Minister of Finance who made that statement.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was the honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the member for Labrador South. It was the member for Labrador South that made it, the member who is trying to suck in with the government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You got sucked in that time.

MR. NEARY: Oh no, I did not. I know what I am talking about. I know whereby I speak.

Sir, I want to state categorically here tonight that we encouraged the fishermen of this province to get organized. So much so, Sir, that we drafted, Mr. Chairman, the first - no I do not think it was the first as a matter of fact I think it was probably the second, I am not quite sure. I do not think that they have it in Nova Scotia and British Columbia. I will make the statement anyway. I think we drafted the first Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act in the whole of Canada. Now, is that being opposed to fishermen getting organized? No, it certainly is not. To make a statement like that in this honourable House is foolish because it is not true.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down now and give the honourable minister a chance to answer some of these points that I have raised.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Carried.

MR. NEARY: Not carried. I am waiting for some answers. Keep quite. We are trying to get some information here. No, it is not carried, Mr. Chairman. I asked the honourable minister about the minimum wage act. I asked the honourable minister about the Workman's Compensation Act. I would like to get answers to these questions.

HON. G. DAWE: (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Chairman, we hear it over and over and over again every time the honourable member gets to his feet, the same old trash, the same thing, repeat, repeat, repeat. He knows as much about minimum wage right now as we do, what we have done. We did what they did not have

the guts to do. That was to increase it. That was to make it mandatory for both men and women.

Now, I have a batch of questions here. I have answered most of them in any event either at question periods or earlier this afternoon. When the honourable member gets up to speak, he reminds me of a steer. You know, he makes a point here and point there and a lot of bull in between. It is a job to answer anything that he has come up with.

Workmens Compensation; we have amendments coming up on that. The Newfoundland Federation of Labour have already made representations to my department, to government and we are always willing to accept recommendations from these groups, always happy to have them come in. That can come in to us any time. They will always find my door open.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Bell Island harp to some extent on the labour movement not being able to get to see the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon. I made no such reference.

MR. DAWE: You have my apology. In other words they have not been able to get in to see the Premier. That is great stuff. Okay. Somebody is not telling the truth. That is okay. Then we will drop that one. That is fine. We will let that one go by the board.

I have answered the honourable gentleman's two questions. He wanted to know about workmens compensation and the minimum wage. So, carry the vote.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have seen some inept performances in my time but I must confess the minister is setting some new standards for ineptness. Let me try him on two more matters.

Last summer in August there was some reference in the press to an inquiry into certain events of the Workmens Compensation Board. It was all very mysterious. There were statements back and forth that there was going to be investigation or that there was not going to be investigation

and I confess that the cuttings which I have, Sir, are from that scurrilous rag, to quote the honourable gentleman for St. John's East, and I believe I am doing him the courtesy of quoting him correctly "that scurrilous rag, that piece of yellow journalism, the "Evening Telegram."

But eventually I gather, reading from a cutting, there was some sort of a committee appointed and the former Magistrate O'Neill was appointed and it was carried out. I wonder if the minister could tell us what has been done? Had the report been received? Indeed, what were the precise terms of reference? There has been to my knowledge no announcement of the terms of reference of this enquiry. I gather it is being held behind closed doors or maybe it is not being held at all, but certainly I noted nothing in the press and I have heard no reference to it from the moment in August when these stories appeared in the newspapers. So could the minister tell us what Magistrate O'Neill was asked to investigate? Has he completed his investigation? If so, what are the results then. While I am on the same lines, I do not see an item in here but is he being paid for this? And if so, what is the amount?

MR. DAWE: There is an investigation into the Workmen's Compensation Board. I do not have the terms of reference here now and I would not certainly wish to speculate upon them. I do not know now exactly what it is going to cost. I do know that the information at the present time is being correlated and the report should be in our hands in the very near future.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, will the minister undertake to make the report public, in view of the fact that the Workmen's Compensation Board, while it is self-financing, is of course an agency of the government of this province. He seems to be getting some coaching.

MR. DAWE: I just wanted to know if they had the report.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I mean I am not in the cabinet, if I were in the

cabinet I presumably could satisfy myself and have other ways of getting information. But would the minister undertake - the populace, now we will hear from the rabble. Would the honourable gentleman like to speak?

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted, would the minister indicate whether this report will be made public?

MR. DAWE: At the present time I do not know if it will be made public or not. I do not think it is a decision for me to make. It will be one which will be made collectively and we will be able to answer your question later.

MR. ROBERTS: Well as I have said, Mr. Chairman, ineptness is becoming a word, Oh, well we shall go on patiently.

I do not see an item in the estimates, Sir, for the Apprenticeship Board. The minister may think he has got off but there is another year coming and we will deal with it then. I am willing to give him the benefit of the doubt. He is relatively new to the portfolio. In view of his performance in the House to date, I think it would be a kindness to give the fellow a little time.

Now as I was saying, I do not see an item in the estimates further down, Mr. Chairman, for the Apprenticeship Board. There are a number of possible subheads under which it might come but since I cannot see a ready item perhaps I may be permitted to deal with a question on this.

I understand the Apprenticeship Board is to be abolished. This was announced in the infamous white paper, that pedantic exercise in academic jargon which was read to us so badly on the first of December. Could the minister please tell us a little of the thinking, assuming that the decision is towards this, could he tell us a little of the thinking behind this and also I should also be interested to know, Sir, whether there have been any representations which he has received, you know, asking that

the board not be abolished?

MR. DAWE: I have received representations from various groups requesting that the board be not abolished. I have expounded on this earlier today and I do not see what I can add to it. I have already explained on three different occasions in this House how the board is presently functioning and that it is not being affected and at the present time it has not been abolished.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicates that at the present time it has not been abolished. Are we then to assume in the committee that the board is not to be abolished? Or is it proposed to carry on with it?

MR. DAWE: We have asked for representations from various groups, which we are now gathering. There are still one or two coming in occasionally. We have not made a firm decision on this thing. As soon as we feel that we have received representation from all the groups or as many groups that are interested in making representation, then we shall make a decision.

MR. ROBERTS: I see. Well now we are making some progress. It turns out the white paper was not accurate in that it did forecast the board would be - is the honourable Minister of Education waving to me or one of his friends in the gallery? Why does he not wave to the other one and get all of his friends, you know, at the same time?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Am I bothering the honourable gentleman?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I mean I do not mind if the honourable Minister of Education has some form of spastic, you know, if he insists on twitching.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is straying from head 501-01 -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister looks like he is in labour, Sir. If he is going to sit over there and wave maybe he needs medical aid. Maybe the honourable gentleman for Humber East should take him out and look at him, if he has his MCP card.

Now as I was saying, Mr. Chairman -

DR. FARRELL: On a point of order, I gave up my MCP card on the 1st. of January 1972 for the benefit of the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: It was a little premature.

DR. FARRELL: It was a little premature because it may be needed here eventually.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know what the minister's MCP card has to do with, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the honourable Minister of Education's MCP card. I assume when he goes off to seek medical aid he brings his MCP card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking to the point of order that the minister raised, Mr. Chairman. It does rather tax Your Honour at times, does it not?

Now as I was saying before the Minister of Education inserted himself into the debate, there he goes again. Hi! Gosh that just looks like Gerry Ottenheimer. If I were in Cambridge tonight I would say, "you know who that reminds me of."

The minister has said that the matter is under review which shows once again what the white paper is worth. Of course the white paper confidently predicted the demise of the Apprenticeship Board. But then again as I said at the time the white paper was - was it the Duke of York who had 10,000 men and he marched them up to the top of the hill and he marched them down again? The Minister of Industrial Development and I see eye to eye on the point. He should be worried because he is in the cabinet and I am most definitely not.

AN HON. MEMBER: A lot of people made sure of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Now the honourable gentleman should realize it is not getting elected but getting re-elected. Do they care to have an election today?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the honourable gentleman opposite care to have an election today?

AN HON. MEMBER: Me, I am ready anytime.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is two of us, if we could only convince what is his name, we would be in business.

Now if I may make another representation, or if I may pass on, which I assume the minister has, because it is in a letter addressed to him, I assume he has it. I assume he has received it. I assume he has read it. But I think this letter is worth reading, Mr. Chairman, because it reflects the feeling of a segment of the labour movement. The letter is from the Grand Falls and District Labour Council. A copy of it was sent to the honourable gentleman, the member for the District of Grand Falls. A copy was sent to the Premier. A copy has been sent to me. A copy has been sent to the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour. And the letter itself was addressed to the minister.

"Honourable Sir:

"In behalf of the sixteen unions and the 2341 members who composed this labour council we object to the government's move to abolish the Apprenticeship Board. We feel that to do this would be a retrograde step and would weaken our apprenticeship plan.

"To take away the authority from this board, which is composed of labour and management, we feel it would then place it in the hands of an advisory committee who are at best only a rubber stamp for management and in many cases are nonexistent or exist in name only.

"We feel also without this regulatory board the Apprenticeship Act would be open for political patronage and employer abuse. For Newfoundland to be the only province not to have such a board would be we feel admitting to a weakness in our whole act.

"We therefore urge you not only to retain this board but have the act changed to give the board wider power to enforce this act.

" Mr. Leo J. Fewer
Secretary of the
Grand Falls and
District Labour Council. "

Now one has received other representations along the same line and in view of the fact that the minister has indicated the matter is now under review and the decision which was announced by the Premier on the 1st. of December is no longer a firm decision, it may be changed or it may not be changed. The minister is nodding assent, and so we can concur on our understanding.

I do not really need to say very much expect to say that certainly on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, we feel that this case for retention of the Apprenticeship Board is a good one. The Apprenticeship Board is not a very public agency of the government. It rarely crops up in the newspapers and rarely is it mentioned in speeches but it does do extremely good work. There are what? Thirty-nine or forty separate agreements -

MR. DAWE: Thirty-nine.

MR. ROBERTS: Thirty-nine various trades and categories of skilled workmen. We all know that in this

MR. ROBERTS: province one of our great lacks in men finding work is skilled labour. We have all, as members or as ministers or as citizens, experienced the problem of men coming and saying, "Can you help me get a job, Sir?" "Yes, of course I shall do what I can for you." "Well, Sir, I have a skill, I can drive a truck," you sort of say, "Well that is going to make it a little tougher."

We have all experienced the problem which is caused when outside workmen are brought into this province because we do not have skilled tradesmen. I do not think there have ever been any documented instances of men from outside Newfoundland being brought in to do work when we have skilled tradesmen in the province. There have been many accusations made, they have been looked into time and time again and as far as I know, they have never been documented. The assertions have not been borne out on investigation.

Now this just shows the crying need for an apprenticeship board. It may very well be, Sir, that one needs changes in the act, it may very well be that the board (after having been in existence for what? I suppose twenty years) needs a thorough revamping. It may well be that it needs new legislation but the concept is sound, Sir, and I am pleased that the government have agreed to restructure, I guess would be the phrase, and have another look at it.

All I would ask of the minister is that he would perhaps indicate publicly - he has, I suppose we could say his speech here in the committee has done that but any interested citizen may now make representations because until tonight, Sir, I for one did not know the matter was open. Maybe everybody else in this province, except I, knew that the matter was open. But I did not know that it was open. Perhaps now, the minister having said so publicly, there will be more representations from interested citizens.

MR. ROBERTS: We shall look forward with some interest to the decision, but I do hope the decision is to admit that the white paper was wrong, at least on this point (I could go on to others but that would be straying a little far Your Honour.) and that the board will carry on perhaps with changes.

MR. DAWE: Just one point of clarification with regard to the apprenticeship board and the white paper: The white paper recommended the abolition of the apprenticeship board but it also said that it would be subject to strong representation from outside the various unions and groups who were interested and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman has paid more attention to the white paper than I have on the point. The white paper I paid the attention to was worth very little.

I wonder if the minister might tell me the names of the men who were on the advisory council that is to play an active role in creating closer liaison between employers and employees?

MR. DAWE: I do not know if I have that information available right now but if the honourable member cares, I could always table it. I have a refill of notes here.

MR. ROBERTS: Could you tell me when the advisory council was appointed? Recently? Again I have not seen it in the press and I do really read Information Newfoundland's outbursts.

MR. DAWE: No, I think I was misunderstanding what you were saying. I do not know if they have been appointed yet.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. I understand the administration have appointed an advisory council whose function is to play an active role in creating closer liaison between employers and employees, either individually or through their organization, with a view to overcoming many of the problems that lead to major labour management disputes. I was wondering if the minister could - I had not read the names of the people. I assume the

MR. ROBERTS: council is hard at work and I wonder if the minister could give me the names of the citizens who are serving on that.

MR. DAWE: Not at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I will suggest why he cannot do it, Sir, because of course this is one more of the promises that have not been kept. The document which I am reading of course is the infamous Throne Speech of March 1. I just thought I would - you know the thing has not been appointed, The minister could be a little more candid and admit it. It is just one more instance where the government promised something and have not yet lived up to it. As we said earlier, it is a do nothing government. It is getting that reputation and earning the reputation and deserving it.

The advisory council has not been appointed. It was promised on March 1, 1972. That was one year and a month ago. Nothing has been done on it, I submit, no terms of reference, no appointment, no approach, no nothing. I think it should just stand on the record that it is one more broken promise.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a couple of quickies for the minister before we get off his salary, would the minister give us the name of his executive assistant, listed under the estimates for \$12,000 a year, and would the minister also give us the name of the government employment officer, listed at \$11,000 a year, and would the minister also indicate to the House why provision is made in the estimates for two secretaries to the minister? One is listed under the minister's office, secretary to the minister - \$7,588 and down in Manpower Training, one secretary to minister - \$7,588. Is the minister going to have two private secretaries now in addition to -

MR. DAWE: What was that subhead?

MR. NEARY: The subhead is 513 - Manpower Training, one secretary to minister. Is the minister going to have two secretaries in addition to an executive assistant. Would the minister also

MR. NEARY: indicate to the House when we can expect an announcement on the appointment of one Assistant Deputy Minister of Industrial Relations - \$17,100 a year, and one Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower - \$16,300 a year?

Has the minister got all these question now?

MR. DAWE: The employment officer has not yet been appointed. The second secretary to which you refer is Miss Triffie Joyce who was secretary to the former Labour Minister in the previous administration.

MR. ROBERTS: Was that the gentleman from St. Barbe South? Who? Your secretary or Bill Keough's secretary.

MR. DAWE: I think it was Mr. Keough's secretary at the time.

MR. ROBERTS: Bill Keough's secretary.

MR. DAWE: There was one more. What was the other?

MR. NEARY: Executive assistant.

MR. DAWE: Oh, Les Barnes.

MR. NEARY: Les?

MR. DAWE: Barnes.

MR. NEARY: And what about the appointment of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower.

MR. DAWE: Not yet. We do not have one.

MR. NEARY: When can we expect an announcement?

MR. DAWE: Well within the next few weeks.

MR. NEARY: In the next three weeks.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I would like to bring to the attention of the minister: The time of the year is fast approaching, within another two and a-half months, we will have students coming out of our schools. While I do not accuse anyone of anything wrong, I have a suspicion, and right now it is only a suspicion because I cannot confirm it, that some employers within our province last year laid off married men around June 15, and between June 25 and June 30 they hired on students, not from university or trade schools but from our high schools,

MR. THOMS: students who were in the grade nine, ten and eleven grades and of course they got them at a very reasonable labour price.

Now, could the minister give some serious thought, if there is not legislation to that effect right now, could the minister consider bringing in legislation to stop this kind of labour exploitation?

Because I think some of our young people, in grades nine and ten particularly, who come out of school, are expected to do the job for the full-fledged labour man. So I wonder could the minister comment on that?

MR. DAWE: I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that is the first I have heard of it really. No representation has ever been made to me since I have been in the department to that effect. I do not know where it is going on. I do not say it is not going on. It is quite possible it is, but it is the first I have ever heard of it.

MR. NEARY: I would like to bring up this matter again - one government employment officer - \$11,000, and I think the minister said that that appointment has not been made yet.

Does that mean now, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to have two government employment officers? Because I understand that we already have one in the person of Mr. Ed McCann, who is the government employment officer. He has an office down here on the main floor, right inside the main entrance. So are we going to have two government employment officers now or is this Mr. McCann's salary here?

MR. DAWE: We might have a government employment officer at the present time but we do not have a Manpower Department employment officer.

MR. NEARY: But this is not Manpower, this is general administration, government employment officer.

MR. ROBERTS: Well perhaps a further question might help, Mr. Chairman, from whence is Mr. McCann's salary paid? I assume the gentleman

MR. ROBERTS: is being paid a salary. While we are at it, from whence is Mr. Eric Martin being paid? He is doing something for Come By Chance.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is replacing Mr. Drover.

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody could ever replace Sam Drover.

Nonsense, Sam Drover was re-elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: When?

MR. ROBERTS: 1951. The honourable member for Burgeo was defeated in 1951 and 1956 and 1962 and 1966.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, I will try and get an answer to my question

MR. DAWE: Mr. Martin is being paid from my department.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Martin is being paid from Labour.

What is he paid? What does he do?

MR. NEARY: It is not shown here anywhere.

MR. DAWE: He is being paid \$800 a month. He is liaison officer on the project at Come-by-Chance.

MR. NEARY: Where is it listed under the salary details?

MR. DAWE: Extra-assistance.

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. DAWE: Salary estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: It is very interesting now. What does he do (in polite terms) What sort of contract? Does he have a month to month contract? Is it a yearly contract? Is it for the duration of the project? I mean I can give lots of answers to the minister. The gentleman from St. John's East Extern is now providing the minister with another shaft. What does Mr. Martin do? I would like to know what his qualifications are, other than the obvious one of having failed to win Trinity North for a certain political body .

MR. DAWE: He has been appointed for the lifetime of that project.

MR. ROBERTS: Or the change of government, whichever comes first.

MR. DAWE: The completion of the project, of course.

His function is to keep government informed as to progress of the project. The number of people employed; the number of Newfoundlanders as opposed to the number of outside people and this sort of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Does he make regular reports, Sir?

MR. DAWE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister undertake to table them in the House? They are obviously of great interest. Would the minister undertake to table them?

MR. DAWE: No, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay! Well that is interesting.

MR. ROBERTS: Was this job advertised publicly or was Mr. Martin selected by a process other than (not tendering) public competition?

MR. DAWE: That was before I took over the department.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is fine. I am blamed for what happened in 1949, when I was eight years old.

MR. DAWE: I cannot answer it. I was not there at the time.

MR. ROBERTS: All right now, that is better. The honourable minister cannot answer it. That is fair enough. Let me suggest why Mr. Martin - let me help the minister. He is one more Tory hack whose only qualification is that he tried and failed to get elected. I can think of much kinder words than that but I could not think of more apt words than that. For all I know, Mr. Martin, may be honest and at least he seemed to have integrity. He may be all those things but he still got the job because he is a Tory hack. That is right. He is a Tory hack, as I said. I just want to note that \$9,600 a year is not bad for a government that does not believe - the hon. gentleman from St. John's East is shaking his head. He is part of it. He is responsible for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am not the least bit interested in knowing why the hon. gentleman from St. John's East - he may have any number of reasons, physical, mental, superficial, psychological, physiological, I have no concern. If he is ill, as I said, I will try to help to get him medical assistance. My father is now back. The honourable gentleman slandered him earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is probably better acquainted with the rules than I am. His speculations or otherwise of the Minister of Portfolio are certainly irrelevant to Head 501-01.

MR. ROBERTS: Now as I was saying, we are talking about Mr. Eric Martin. I just wanted to record the fact that here he is on the payroll and his only qualification is that he is a political friend of the gentleman in power.

MR. DAWE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: He may be all those things. Mr. Chairman, if I may, without the jovial jocularly of the hon. junior member for Harbour Main. He is merely helping his leader, his senior colleague, That is the only reason why Mr. Martin is on the payroll. I submit he he is not doing anything and that is why the minister will not table the report. I will say it. I believe it to be correct. I am not saying it is true, I am saying that I believe it to be true. The minister merely saying that it is not true does not make it untrue.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Martin has not submitted any reports of any sort. Tomorrow morning the minister's executive assistant will be on the phone to him saying, something along these lines: "For Heaven's sake, Eric, get some reports in here. That ----- Roberts was after you in the House, that terrible man." I submit that the only contribution which Mr. Martin has made to the public service of this province since his employment therein after a number of years - Mr. Smallwood's files would reveal some interesting details about Mr. Martin's application for employment. The honourable gentleman has them. What he did not have, the police took.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I doubt very much that the phrase of the hon. member for Bonavista North is parliamentary or grammatical. However, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has again digressed, for the third time at least, from Head 501-01.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the minister's salary and this is a general debate on his administration, his department. I was referring to a gentleman which the honourable gentleman has hired. I merely point out that the gentleman wore out the eighth floor of Confederation Building in the previous administration, looking for a job from them. He did not get it. Then he tried for a job from the people and he did not get that. Well now he has found his resting place, his Valhalla, and more power to him. I have also said that the only thing he has done for the public service in this province is cash a salary cheque twice a month.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are a lot more than that.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there certainly are. There are some who used to, but they are now out of the cabinet.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: With the hon. member for St. John's East it comes naturally.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman can fire anybody he wants. No he cannot. He got fired himself. The ministers can fire whomever they wish. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one in any way to derogate -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! If honourable members have a point to make, they are to raise it on a point of order. Senseless bickering across the floor draws the speaker away from the Head which he is discussing and the people who assist or provoke the man who has the floor into these irrelevant departures are guilty as the person who is speaking. Honourable members should keep this in mind.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour for coming to my defence. Provoked as I am, being unmercifully, by the gentlemen on the other side, I have

Mr. Roberts.

even driven the House Leader home out of it. I mean that is scandalous. I started by asking -

AN HON. MEMBER: Scandalous!

MR. ROBERTS: It is not scandalous. It is scandalous he is gone. He has deserted us. He has left us without his counsel.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not unparliamentary.

Mr. Chairman, I was asking the minister if he could indicate if Mr. McCann - I had a letter from a person in Cottrels Cove the other day about Mr. McCann. That is another story. If Mr. McCann is not on his vote, does he know from whence he is paid? He does not. I wonder could the Minister of Finance perhaps help us on this point?

MR. CROSBIE: When the honourable member finishes speaking, I want to address myself -

MR. ROBERTS: By all means. If he merely tells me from whence Mr. McCann 's salary is paid?

MR. CROSBIE: The public treasury.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine. From the pockets of the taxpayers, that is fine.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: But from what department? That is all I am asking.

MR. CROSBIE: I am looking it up now.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Then if the honourable minister wish to make a speech, of course, we should be delighted to have him make a speech. It is always a pleasure to hear him.

MR. CROSBIE: You will have to carry on because it might take a minute or two.

On motion 501-01, carried.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to find out about extra assistance that the minister spoke about earlier. He said that I think it was

\$800 a month being paid out to the honourable gentleman to which I referred. That is \$9,600 a year. In the estimates, Mr. Chairman, there is \$13,481. What is the extra amount for?

MR. DAWE: There is a Clerk-Stenographer (I) which we have in the department.

MR. NEARY: What is that?

MR. DAWE: Clerk-Stenographer, Grade I.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, why is the Clerk-Stenographer, I not listed. Would the minister elucidate. Normally, positions are listed out. A permanent position is not listed under -

MR. DAWE: It is not a permanent position..

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister merely tell us a little about - I assume it is a lady - who she is, for whom she works, what she does.

MR. DAWE: I understand that it is because of pressure of work, overtime, summer relief, this sort of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. DAWE: Mostly overtime.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister led us to believe and inadvertently I mean I am not saying he sat down and worked this out. His answer indicated that the money, \$9,600, from what was it?

MR. NEARY: \$13,481.

\$3,800 a year was being used to pay a specified person and if that is so I submit that that is probably questionable. It should be listed as a clerk stenographer (1) - \$3,800 a year. The minister is shaking his head. Well perhaps he can elucidate. Maybe what it is is this is a lot of overtime during the summer. Is that what it is?

MR. DAWE: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then why is he saying it is a clerk stenographer (1)?

MR. DAWE: Well, I did not understand myself what it was all about.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is obvious.

MR. DAWE: Why do you think I brought my friend in? That is extra assistance, overtime and sometimes there are two girls hired, sometimes there are three and it just goes on like this. It is to eliminate overwork, extra work. It is extra assistance.

MR. THOMS: It is part time work.

MR. DAWE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: I have only one brief question, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister indicate why he has ordered Mr. Coates (is he the human rights director?) not to participate in any public panels, seminars, discussions or anything else affecting the human rights business?

MR. DAWE: No such order, not to my knowledge.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister said no such order. He confirms that Mr. Coates has not been placed under any prohibition at all. I am not asking to his knowledge, I mean the minister is responsible for whatever has happened in that department.

MR. DAWE: I am responsible since December and I have not issued any orders to that effect.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the minister confirm then if Mr. Coates wish to go to a seminar, it is entirely up to himself.

MR. DAWE: I have no idea what Mr. Coates wishes to do.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I have no idea either. I would not know Mr. Coates

if he were sitting where the Sergeant-at-Arms is sitting. I do not think I have ever met the gentleman. But would the minister confirm that if Mr. Coates feel in his proper line of his duties he should go to a seminar or a meeting of some sort that he may go.

MR. DAWE: If he wish to come in and discuss it with me I -

MR. ROBERTS: I am told people cannot get to see the minister but that is another story. Anyway the point is the minister says he has not issued any such order. Okay, that is the minister's statement, is it?

MR. DAWE: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Fine. We shall see.

On motion, 501(01) through 501(02)(03), carried.

On motion, total subhead 501, carried.

On motion, 502(01) through 502(02)(02), carried.

502(02)(08):

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate please, last year the department seemed to have used a very minimum amount of computer time, \$600.00 worth, this year it is requesting \$5,000 worth. I do not know if that is much or little. I mean medicare looks -

MR. BARRY: That is prorated.

MR. ROBERTS: It is prorated. It is all very well to prorate between departments but that is a good cost accounting concept. The Minister of Mines and Energy says it is prorated but if they do not use it it is bad cost accounting to prorate it against the department who does not use it. What is manpower using computer time for? I guess that is what I am asking.

MR. DAWE: We will be using computer services much more in the future than we did in the past. It is a combination of manpower needs, job inventory and this sort of thing when we get into it under the manpower division.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister indicate the sort of computer programmes he has in mind?

MR. DAWE: Not exactly. These are in the formulation stages but I cannot elaborate anymore than that on it.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words the minister does not know.

On motion, 502(02)(08) and total subhead 502, carried.

On motion, 511(06)(01) through (06)(04), carried.

511(06)(05) - Industrial Enquiry:

MR. ROBERTS: Last year it was \$12,500 and the only one that I can think of was Mr. Morgan's enquiry in Labrador West into the iron ore and then Professor Hattenhauer's enquiry out there at the Long Harbour plant. Could the minister indicate please to the committee, Sir, how much was paid to Mr. Morgan, how much was paid to Mr. Hattenhauer, whether any bills are still to come in respect of either of those and whether he envisages any enquiries this year. Now I know he can say that he does not know what is going to happen six months from now but he is asking for a relatively large amount of money \$5,000. Does he have anything in mind at this stage?

MR. DAWE: The Hattenhauer Report cost approximately \$6,739.87 and the Morgan Report was in the vicinity of \$4,500.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, how are these things made up? I have no experience at all with this sort of enquiry and there is a fee for the commissioner I assume. Is there a standard? I think royal commissions are what? \$100.00 a day and expenses? No, I am looking at the Minister of Industrial Development as he knows pretty well everything there is to know and what he does not know he makes up. Professor Hattenhauer presumably was at it a very long time and perhaps the minister could give a little more information on it.

MR. DAWE: It is approximately \$100.00 a day for the commissioner

plus expenses and so on, legal fees I guess, reports from various other people, travelling expenses, office overload - the stenographical requirements.

MR. ROBERTS: What about this year? Anything in mind this year?

MR. DAWE: Well, not unless it should come up.

On motion, 511(06)(05), carried.

511(06)(06) - Labour College of Canada:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that is a continuing thing. It has been going on for two or three years anyway. I wonder, a number of years ago Professor Hattenhauer was retained to write a history of the labour movement in Newfoundland. He was retained when Mr. Clyde Wells was Minister of Labour, as I recall it. I wonder if the minister could indicate when we might expect to have the book published? How much has been paid to Professor Hattenhauer?

Also the Federation of Labour have asked the minister, I believe it was when they appeared before the cabinet they asked the cabinet to approve a scholarship for a person to go to the National Labour College which I believe is in Montreal. I assume that \$1,000 does not cover that. Could the minister perhaps indicate the ministry's position.

MR. DAWE: The scholarship, I think we will be able to provide that this year. We have had representation, of course, from the Federation of Labour and they have wanted that.

MR. ROBERTS: From whence will the scholarship be provided, please?

MR. DAWE: From 511(07).

MR. ROBERTS: Labour education.

MR. DAWE: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: How much is the scholarship?

MR. DAWE: \$1,500.

MR. ROBERTS: What about the Hattenhauer Report? How much has the man been paid?

MR. DAWE: He has been paid now all except \$100.00 of the original fee that he figured they could do it for.

MR. ROBERTS: The original fee was \$10,000?

MR. DAWE: \$12,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister have the manuscript?

MR. DAWE: No, we do not have anything on it yet. It is possible it will take another six to nine months.

MR. ROBERTS: The man has been paid all but \$100.00 and it may take another six to nine months, and I am quoting the minister, before one even gets the manuscript.

MR. DAWE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that (06) or may I refer to (07), Your Honour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on (06)(06) at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then I have nothing more on that at this stage.

On motion, 511(06)(06), carried.

511(06)(07) - Labour Education:

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister indicate what this is for? \$1,500 of it

he has just accounted for but that leaves \$8,500. What has he got in mind for this expenditure, please?

MR. DAWE: This is for an educational programme which will be worked out, Sir - we will be asking the Federation of Labour of course to give us their views on it - this is to, as I mentioned earlier today, to educate the students in high schools and vocational training schools. It might take the form of literature or it could be classes or whatever.

MR. ROBERTS: So, in other words it is just at this stage of thought. I mean, a commitment but no more than that.

MR. DAWE: Give us a chance to work on it.

MR. W. ROWE: Where does the figure of \$10,000 come into the picture? I mean, is this just a shot in the dark? Why did the minister not merely put in a token vote, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DAWE: This is really an arbitrary amount but we feel that we need at least that amount, \$8,500 to get this thing under way. This is a very important programme and one which is badly needed and we did not want to find ourselves -

MR. ROBERTS: One agrees that it is badly needed, Mr. Chairman. The point is that one is trying to find out whether the minister has done anything on it except look at the idea. The answer is that he obviously has not. Let us hope that he will.

MR. THOMS: Is the literature on this being prepared at the present time?

On motion total sub-head 511 carried:

On motion total sub-head 512 carried:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this is a new division. I do not know. I wonder if the minister can tell us - maybe these estimates are badly laid out. You have to flick back and forth to find out who is who - if the minister could give us the new division of his department. There may be some people already on staff. What is planned here? Who has he got in? What will they be doing and so on and so on? I say that because I assume most of this is new. It has the magic work "manpower" in it.

MR. DAWE: I suppose it is new of course but it will incorporate the present branch of the apprenticeship training and have the other personnel hired as time goes on out in the new premises. We have the room whereby we can hire other people.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, the old apprenticeship training branch by another name. One is authorized to hire nineteen people in this. Mr. Chairman, how many would be there now? The minister spoke of room to expand. What sort of expansion does one contemplate?

MR. DAWE: We have just all of the nineteen under the manpower training of 513. That is in your salary estimates. They will be coming under the manpower. At the present date we have not yet hired any new personnel for the manpower division.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us see if I can get this one straight, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry. I think that I am having an off night, I guess.

Under this 513-01 we are voting \$154,300. That is broken down on page 18 of the grey book into nineteen separate staff positions. Now, I understand the minister correctly, question mark, that these nineteen people are presently employed. Most of them I assume have been there for some time and have been taken over. That is okay. Now, where the confusion comes is the minister says that there is some room for expansions. We are not being asked to create any positions, apparently, that are not yet filled. That is what perplexes me because if we are going to have a vastly expanded manpower operation, one would think there would be five or ten or fifteen or twenty new positions in the estimates. They apparently are not in this section. They do not seem to be in any other section. What did the minister mean by his comment, "We have room to expand"? I have no doubt there is work that needs to be done but that is not the point.

MR. DAWE: There is one apprenticeship officer, who will be appointed in the near future, for Labrador City. We have an employment officer

a Director of Manpower and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower. These are the positions right now.

MR. ROBERTS: I see. Well, that makes some sense. I wonder if the minister could indicate on manpower training whether any thought is being given by him or by his officials and if so perhaps he could elucidate. Is any thought being given to manpower need forecasting? Because if we are going to have a manpower department that is worth a hoot, as opposed to a department that enforces labour standards and that sort of thing, which is what the department had done in the past, that and served as sort of an honest broker in labour management disputes. These have been the traditional functions in the Department of Labour - could he go on for a minute or two on what is envisaged because this is one of the key questions.

The committee, headed by Dr. Harris, that my friend the Education Minister has appointed, is presumably looking at this whole question and it is very much at the heart of not just the manpower but of the whole educational programme, for the whole social policy of the government, whoever they may be, of this province. I would like to hear the ministers thoughts.

MR. DAWE: I mentioned earlier in the subhead there for computer services that one of the functions of that computerizing would be the "Manpower Needs Programme Job Inventory" thing. It will be begun in close conjunction with the Canada Manpower people. They at the present time have a "Manpower Needs Committee" set up and they meet regularly. We had one meeting last week that I was involved in and the Minister of Education. So, basically we really do not have everything formulated at the present time because we do not have an Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower and we do not have a Director of Manpower and the other positions are just outlined, they are not filled. So, we can hardly go ahead and do any extensive planning without having these people there to let them know what is going on and to have them involved from the beginning.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Could the minister indicate what steps are being taken. I am very reasonable this evening. Am I not? What steps are being taken to employ an Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower? I have not seen notices in the - well, he said three weeks time but that is what prompts my curiosity because I have not seen notices in the newspaper. There have been notices asking for people for example in the Policy Planning Priorities and Programme Secretariat, whatever it is called, all sorts of people with wonderfully sounding titles and I may add wonderfully high salaries when we come to look at that. What steps is the minister taking? Has he somebody in mind? Is he in close and intimate negotiation with somebody? He says he is going to appoint somebody in three weeks. You know, what is it all about?

MR. DAWE: The member for Bell Island as usual did not get it straight. I did not say three weeks. I said a few week. That was back a little while ago. I do have somebody in mind for the Assistant Deputy Minister's position. I am hoping that we will be able to make an appointment soon. However, there is not much point filling these positions if we have no office space to put them in. So, when we get out into our new premises, we will have the available space and we will then be able to appoint the people.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister tell us to whence they are going to move and also with what they are going pay because I do not see any rent voted here for this?

MR. DAWE: As far as the rent is concerned, I think that comes under public works and we will be moving to the Gorman-Butler Building on O'Leary Avenue and the Day-Nite Neon.

MR. ROBERTS: The what and the what?

MR. DAWE: The Day-Nite Neon.

MR. ROBERTS: Who are the Day-Nite Neon.

MR. DAWE: It is the one right across the street from the Gorman-Butler Building.

April 3, 1973

Tape 1002 (night)

IB-5

MR. ROBERTS: Every other department I think has rent voted when they are outside but I will not press the point. I think every other department does. How does the minister propose to pay for this?

MR. ROBERTS: He has money voted, Mr. Chairman, and I am talking about the Manpower Division of course, there is no money in here for rent.

MR. DAWE: Initially Public Works would be looking after it as far as I know, for the first year anyhow.

MR. ROBERTS: In every department, Mr. Chairman, where there is space being rented, an amount is shown under the heading - expenses voted in other department and of course that is transferred through, postage goes through to Finance, aircraft operations go through to aircraft or whatever it is called, Public Works and Services, Printing and Photography goes forth to that department, rent goes through, I mean there is no money being voted. What is the minister up to? Who has negotiated this agreement? How much are they paying him? Who are Gorman Butler?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that the one the Tory Headquarters was in before it moved out?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh that is Mr. Wilson that prints, yes I had forgotten, I am sorry.

He may be a very competent engineer but I suspect he has other attributes as well.

MR. WM. ROWE: He is also a royal commissioner.

MR. ROBERTS: Par excellence, disposal of salvage - but who are Day-Nite Neon? Have tenders been called? I should be asking the Public Works Minister, he will get his when the estimates come. But have tenders been called for it? What are we up to?

MR. DAWE: I do not think tenders were called because space is at a premium here in St. John's and as far as I know these are the only two buildings available.

MR. ROBERTS: Those are directly contradictory statements, Mr. Chairman. He thinks tenders were called because space is

MR. ROBERTS: at a premium. Did I hear him correctly?

MR. DAWE: I did not say that, I said they were not called because space is at a premium.

MR. ROBERTS: I see. Okay tenders were not called because space is at a premium, interesting, very interesting, an administration that makes such a pious protestation about calling tenders. How does the minister know space is at a premium? How long are the leases? Five years? Ten years? Two years?

MR. BARRY: Perhaps he has been looking for space

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy had people looking for space,

AN HON. MEMBER: Could not find it.

MR. ROBERTS: Could not find it, Well they managed to find some, apparently. How much space has been taken? When does the department move? This is all relevant to Manpower, Mr. Chairman, because we are talking about where the Manpower people are going to live and work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, you could try.

MR. EARLE: I would like to inform the honourable member, Public Works searched the town for all spaced available. We took what we could get which was suitable and rents in most cases are for two years. The leases are for two years and the rents are competitive with the going rates.

MR. ROBERTS: Did the minister table any advertisement that has ever been placed by this administration?

MR. EARLE: There has been no advertisement placed. There was a diligent search throughout the whole town.

MR. ROBERTS: I see.

MR. THOMS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is okay. The point is they did not advertise. The crowd of hypocrites did not advertise. That is all I am trying to establish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Manpower told us that under the Manpower Training that they would be doing job inventory or job forecasting, inventory of jobs and so on. The Minister of Education is going to be doing the same thing.

I wonder if the minister could tell us if there is any thought being given to transferring the district vocational schools and the Technical College and the College of Fisheries, over to the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. It was the former Liberal Administration that set up this department but we did not get a chance to finish it before we got flung out.

But we had it in mind to transfer the vocational training from the Department of Education over to the Department of Manpower, is that still the plans of the department of the government?

MR. DAWE: No.

MR. NEARY: It is not. It is going to be left with Education?

MR. DAWE: Right.

MR. NEARY: So, we will have two ministers doing the same thing. The Minister of Education doing job forecasting and the Minister of Manpower doing job forecasting.

MR. THOMS: 513-02-05 Mr. Chairman, could the minister inform us as to these instruction costs and supplies. They are up substantially since last year. What do the supplies consist of and where do they come from?

MR. DAWE: Most of that, practically all of it, is to cover the instructional cost of the College of Trades and the vocational schools.

MR. THOMS: Where do these supplies come from? What sort of supplies are they?

MR. DAWE: The supplies are very negligible really.

MR. THOMS: It is not negligible. It is \$400,000.

MR. DAWE: It is not \$400,000 worth of supplies. It is probably \$1,000 or so.

MR. THOMS: \$1,000 worth of supplies.

MR. DAWE: Most of this is recoverable also from the Federal Government.

MR. ROBERTS: Why is it negligible? That mean \$400,000, less than negligible amounts for instruction costs. That is a lot of instruction. What is it? That is all we are asking.

MR. DAWE: These are supplies which are required for the various trades, like welding rods, steel and this sort of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister says the supplies are a negligible amount - what is the rest of the, let us say, \$380,000, let us give them five per cent of that amount for supplies. \$20,000 buys a lot of welding rods and stuff like that.

\$380,000 for instruction costs, all I want to know - well it may be burning a lot of blueberry grounds, that is all I want to know. I can think of some blueberry grounds worth burning. Ray Guy is going to have some square blueberries if he ever gets that grant he has been looking for from Ottawa.

The Minister of Industrial Development is applying for the job.

MR. DOODY: No, no he suggested it -

MR. ROBERTS: I believe that. What is the instruction? That is all.

MR. DAWE: In baby talk?

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable gentleman is capable of it, yes.

MR. DAWE: This is for instructors at the Trades School, administration and this sort of thing, the instructors' salaries and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: This is getting more and more confusing now. My friend, the gentleman from St. Mary's, the Minister of Education, will be in due course asking for "x" million dollars to pay the instructors in

MR. ROBERTS: the trades schools and the College of Trades and Technology. That is very fine, including the three new ones which we built. It is not new. I mean it is not as if the minister had a brainwave and came up with this. According to the revised figures, he spent \$313,000 on it last year. Nonetheless, he wants twenty-five per cent more this year or actually about twenty per cent more, closer to twenty.

It is worth a little information, if the minister does not know, why does he not stand up and say so?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, but it is still expenditures.

MR. DAWE: Supplies, expenses to run the school, instructors' salaries, teachers' salaries, administration salaries.

MR. ROBERTS: What school?

MR. DAWE: The College of Trades and Technology.

MR. ROBERTS: But I mean the honourable gentleman is going to be looking for \$3 million to run the college.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think that this refers to the apprenticeship training programme which is under the Department of Labour. I presume that is it.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, he is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is not my department. I am only trying to assist.

MR. ROBERTS: I said he was the most inept guy we have ever seen and I just want to prove it again. He is right. This is the apprenticeship training programme, of course. We knew that, we just wanted to prove that the new minister had no idea of what he is doing. All I wanted, once again, was to show that the minister had no idea of what he was doing. That is all.

On motion, total subhead 513 carried.

On motion total subhead 514 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall subhead 515-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: It will carry when the minister or if the minister, I am sure he will give us, last year there was \$12,400 spent, this year we are going up to \$85,000 for eight jobs. They appear to be conciliation officers, looking at page nineteen of the grey book. We have had a number of conciliation officers on in the past, more than one, I am quite sure. What is this about?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, we have transferred the conciliation staff from the general office over to the Labour and Industrial Relations Division.

MR. ROWE, W.N. The general office is not down very much.

MR. ROBERTS: The general office is up \$5,000. In other words, the minister's total salary increases are up by \$5,000 in general administration, which is straightforward. I referred in committee yesterday to the fact that these estimates are most unhelpful, the grey book, because they do not give last year's staff. So the general administration is up \$5,000 and this one is up - \$72,800. How many new positions are there then in the department as a whole?

MR. DAWE: The general administration is up because of the appropriation for assistant deputy minister of Manpower, director of Manpower, director of Industrial Relations, one clerk stenographer III, one clerk III and two clerks II.

MR. ROBERTS: Taking on any more or any addition -

MR. DAWE: They have not been taken on, no.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, this is the situation is it, Mr. Chairman, that the number of conciliation officers is the same, eight, including two clerk stenographers. It is the general office where we have seen the expansion in the positions, which the minister has just indicated. Most of these positions are still not filled, is that not right? Who is the director of administration down there?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Williams.

MR. ROBERTS: I know Mr. Williams, I just wanted to see what his job is. Okay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could the honourable minister tell us why there is a difference in the salaries of conciliation officers? They all do the same work. Should they not be all paid the same salary or is there provision in here for seniority? Is this why some of the salaries are - for instance I think two conciliation officers earn almost \$12,000 a year and three conciliation officers earn about \$9,000 a year. Why should there be such a difference? They are all doing the same work?

MR. DAWE: Did you ever hear tell of PAD?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I have heard of PAD.

MR. DAWE: That is the answer right there.

MR. NEARY: PAD or no PAD, Mr. Chairman, why should there be a difference in their salaries? They are not specializing in any particular industry. They act as conciliation officers in any dispute that comes up, that they are assigned to. I mean why the difference? Should not the minister appeal the classification to PAD, to try and get them all put into the same classification? Why is there a difference?

MR. DAWE: What was it like when you were there?

MR. NEARY: Well I do not know, I mean

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter that should be looked into. I think all conciliation officers should be paid the same rate of pay. They should be in the same classification. One is no different than the other, Sir, they are all the same. Mr. Chairman, because it was not done when I was there, does not necessarily mean that it should not be done. I was running two departments at that time, Sir. I never had any time to pay any attention to details. I had to run two busy departments of government. But now that I bring it to the honourable minister's attention, is there any reason why

they should not be paid the same salary?

MR. DAWE: The same reason as when you were there.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, that is no excuse. If someone had brought it to my attention when I was there, I would have had it rectified but now I am bringing it to the honourable minister's attention. So would the minister look into it?

MR. DAWE: You people brought in the PAD. You should understand it more than we do. We shall check it in the morning.

MR. NEARY: So what! I am trying to find out, Mr. Chairman, from the minister, if there is any reason why there should be a difference in the salaries of conciliation officers? Why we should have two conciliation officers II and three conciliation officers I, why? They are doing the same work. Why should not their salary be the same? Not because the previous administration did not do anything about it, Sir, that this crowd over there should not do something about it. While the Minister of Industrial Relations is not the Minister of Manpower, will the Minister of Manpower look into it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall total subhead 515 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the total carries I wonder if the minister would tell us if there is any political patronage in here for the Right Honourable George McLean? Is there anything at all in here for McLean?

MR. DAWE: Would you refer to a subhead?

MR. NEARY: No,

MR. DAWE: Any particular subhead?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not have to refer to a subhead.

MR. ROBERTS: The total, which is of a separate vote.

MR. DAWE: There is nothing there on advertising. Nothing there on films.

MR. NEARY: Nothing in here for George McLean?

MR. DAWE: I do not understand what prompts the question really.

MR. NEARY: This is a standard question we are going to ask on every department, Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister should know that. We want to find out how much graft George McLean is getting out of this government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable member is permitted to ask the question in the proper manner of course. The word "graft" connotes dishonesty. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his remark?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable minister if there is any payola, political patronage that the honourable Minister of Finance approves of. If there is any political patronage in here for George McLean? Or does the honourable minister anticipate that George McLean will be given any contracts or work by his department?

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That gentleman has a company and it is called, NACOM and we have heard all about it. The name should not enter into it. It is a company, refer to the company.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this is a point of order, Mr. McLean may surface under any one of a number of corporate manifestations. I mean the honourable gentleman who parks his car outside Elizabeth Towers where he is not suppose to, should know that.

MR. HICKEY: We have a legal -

MR. NEARY: Is the minister answering the question?

MR. DAWE: Did you read anything there? I did not read anything there which suggested it.

MR. NEARY: That is not an answer, Mr. Chairman, could he give us a "yes" or "no" answer, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Is there?

MR. DAWE: Is there what?

MR. NEARY: Is there anything in here for George McLean Public Relations?

MR. DAWE: I never had anything to do with George McLean.

MR. NEARY: That is not, Mr. Chairman, I want a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Is there anything in here for George McLean Public Relations or NACOM?

MR. DAWE: A simple "no." Okay. Very simple, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the total subhead 515 carry?

On motion total subhead 515 carried.

On motion subhead 571 Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan carried.

On motion subhead 572 Block Provision: Unemployment Insurance carried.

On motion Total : Current \$688,700 carried.

On motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed items of current expenditures under the following heading:

Heading V - Manpower and Industrial Relations - all items.
And ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, committee ordered to sit again presently, by leave.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider a bill, "An Act Respecting Tenancies Of Residential Premises," Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

A bill, "An Act Respecting Tenancies Of Residential Premises."

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, clause 9 is amended by - there is a new clause 9. It says: "No lease shall after the coming into force of this act provide for the delivery of any postdated cheque or other negotiable instrument to be used for payment of rent. But if it does so provide, such provision is void and of no effect." The present clause 9 becomes subsection (3) of clause 8.

On motion clause 8 as amended, carried.

On motion clause 9 as amended, carried.

On motion clause 10, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 11: Mr. Chairman, there is a new clause 11 which I moved last night. I will read it all again if the committee wish - 11(1): "A failure by (a) a landlord to fulfill any of the provisions of statutory condition (1) set out in section 7 or; (b) a tenant to fulfill any of the provisions of statutory condition (2) set out in section 7 shall be sufficient reason for the non-offending party to terminate the lease in accordance with section 15, provided however that where the failure is by a tenant in respect of his obligations under the said statutory condition (2), with respect to repair of damage, the landlord notwithstanding any other provision of this act may terminate the lease to take effect on the fifth day following the date on which the notice to terminate which was given to the tenant by the landlord." Subclause 2: "A landlord shall not disconnect or cause to be disconnected heat, water or electric power services being furnished by residential premises."

On motion clause 11 as amended, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 11 becomes 12(1) and clause 12 becomes clause 12(2).

On motion clause 12 as amended, carried.

On motion clauses 13 to clause 22, carried.

Motion that the committee report having passed the bill with some amendments, carried.

On motion that the committee report having passed Bill No. 21 with some amendments, and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

HEAD XI - MINES AND ENERGY

HON. L.D. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mines and Energy is a new department just recently created so perhaps it might be apt if I briefly went through the various divisions of the department and set out the functions of each division. The department is now composed of a Mineral Development Division, replacing the former Mineral Resources Division. The function is basically the same as the former division but now covers a somewhat broader area and the functions are designed to encourage and assist the further development of the province's mining industry. Some specific responsibilities of this division are: The accumulating of geoscientific data required for the optimum development and management of the province's mineral endowment. A large part of the current programme is being funded federally into the Canada/Newfoundland Mineral Exploration and Evaluation Agreement which is to continue until 1975. Another responsibility is the providing of the necessary expertise required for planning mineral resource development, recommending projects, liaising with federal government departments on the content of various projects and so on. Another responsibility is the providing of appropriate expertise required in the conservation of mineral resources, including aggregate material, quarry and beach deposits, etc.

Another division of the department, Mr. Chairman, is the Energy Resources Division, which is a new division. Its functions are to provide the necessary expertise required for the optimum development and control of the province's energy resources, particularly offshore oil and gas but also including onshore petroleum potential, nuclear fuel and other sources of energy. These responsibilities include the assembly and analysis of geoscientific data which are accumulating in growing volume as exploration activities are intensifying on the province's Continental Shelf; advising on the appropriateness of plans for development and transportation of petroleum resources; advising on the legal aspects of land tenure, jurisdiction, administration of activities; evaluating the economic aspects of current and future activities and providing expertise in information on the environmental implications of petroleum development activities.

The next division is the Mineral Lands Administration Division. Again it is partly a new division, although to a certain extent some of the functions were previously carried out by the position of chief engineer of the department. The functions are: To administer on a systematic basis and in an effective manner the mineral lands of the province; to provide expertise for planning in this area; included are responsibilities for mineral land tenure, dealing with exploration agreements, the staking of mineral lands, the inspection of exploration activities, the administration of the Crown Lands Mines and Quarries Act and other duties as required. With respect to mining activities, the inspection of mining development plans, to ensure the appropriateness of design and construction; the inspection of extraction procedures to ensure maximum tonnage as each commodity is extracted and to provide expertise on other conservation aspects and protection of the environment in mining operations.

April 3, 1973

Tape no. 1005

Page 4

The latter responsibilities have been carried out by the Mines Inspection Division and at the present time there is a review going on with respect to seeing what functions of this division the Mines Inspection Division

can or should be transferred to the Workmen's Compensation Board and what function should remain with the Department of Mines and Energy.

The white paper recommended that since there were certain safety functions involved in this division, that logically this could go with the Workmen's Compensation Board. However, some problems have arisen because of overlapping responsibilities, responsibilities which would tie certain functions of this division to the Department of Mines and Energy. It is at present not decided just how the work of this division will be allocated.

Finally, of course, there is the director of administration and staff required to perform the administrative functions of the department. Apart from the line department of Mines and Energy, as minister I also have responsibility for the power commission. For the present I will not go into any policy statement on the power commission, but I am happy to answer any questions which the honourable members on the other side might have.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we have had quite a good run at the Mines and Energy quantum of government policy in the Interim Supply debate, where the minister made one or two statements that my colleagues and I, particularly the honourable gentleman from White Bay South, considered injudicious and we took him to task as best we could at that time.

If the minister wants to reopen that debate, we shall be happy to have it reopened, if he does not, we shall be equally happy. I think we made our points and I think he probably feels he made his. The honourable gentleman from Trinity North chuckles.

There is really very little that I want to say in an overall way about this. The department has just been formed, it represents a consolidation of portions of the old Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and it also represents (the minister in between the technological jargon was telling us, as I understood him)

an initiative in the developing fields of energy and so forth. This is not anything unique to Newfoundland. I do not know how many provinces now have a minister who has in his ministerial title the word energy, but in Ontario for example, Mr. Darcy McKeough, who was one of the three or four wisemen in the Government of Ontario, was a senior minister with policy secretariat ,left - superminister if you wish - (The minister of Industrial Development is preening himself as only that gentleman can)

Mr. McKeough, estimable gentleman, sits for Chatham in Ontario, left the cabinet at the invitation of the Premier of Ontario, Mr. Davis, because Mr. McKeough, while Minister of Municipal Affairs, had approved a subdivision, I think quite innocently, but had approved it in the course of his ministerial duties and it turned out that he owned a portion of the company that was going to benefit from the subdivision. There was some consternation about it and Mr. McKeough left the ministry. He is obviously on his way back and now holds the appointment of parliamentary assistant or parliamentary aide to the Premier of Ontario, Mr. Davis, and his special duties are to energy. In other words, he does nothing but concern himself with energy questions. He has been very active recently in the fight between Ontario and Alberta over Mr. Lockheed's plan to raise significantly the price of oil. Even more interestingly, of course, for every six cents that is contributed in an increase price, Alberta gets to keep one percent.

It is not new. The administration are realizing they are moving with the times and that is a good thing and they put one of the bright stars in the department. That is fine. I think perhaps a detailed comment would have to wait for a year until we have some opportunity for the minister to display his undoubted talents, show us what he can do. I think he probably will look before he leaps having had one experience in the chamber. There are a number of

fairly small points, not the least of them, it may be the smallest, my constituents in St. Carols who are waiting for their lights, I wonder whether they will get them this year? The minister undertook to get some information, he may have had a chance to do it.

I wonder if the minister at the same time could outline his thinking, the administration's thinking with respect to this vexing question of offshore rights? Ottawa have now made the provinces an offer which I gather is not acceptable. It should not be acceptable, in my view. Could he indicate whether the government intend to proceed by negotiations or whether they intend to proceed by litigation? There is a school of thought which maintains that our case in Newfoundland in law is stronger. This is usually put forward by non-lawyers who believe, it is sort of an article of folklore. It has never been tested in the courts. There might be a case for testing it, there might be a case for not testing it but I would like to know the administration's view. I am particularly interested in this in view of the British Columbia reference with which I assume the minister is familiar, the Supreme Court of Canada decision on the reference by the Government of Canada, with reference to the ownership of offshore oil in British Columbia. That decision is as clearly a policy decision as I have ever read in my brief experience with the law.

There is no law in the field, really, Mr. Chairman, and so it is a matter of what the court wished. The significant thing in that decision, as I understand it and as it has been explained to me by lawyers of considerably greater stature than I shall ever be, is that it is a policy decision. The court said: "There is no law, we are of the opinion that these resources belong to the Government of Canada and therefore we declare, we find that they do belong to the Government of Canada."

I would like to know the administration's views on that. I would like to know their thinking with respect to royalties, Ottawa now charge royalties that are relatively small. The minister was in

Ottawa the other day unburdening himself of his views on it. I read of them in the "Globe and Mail"

MR. W.N. ROWE: Tilting at windmills.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he was tilting at windmills because Ottawa - these regulations, by the way, in Ottawa, speaking of previous administrations, were drawn up by Alvin Hamilton and the late Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, who is of course, very much alive. He celebrated his thirty-third anniversary in the Commons the other day, but it was his administration that drew up these regulations that the minister finds so objectionable.

Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues, I understand, are reviewing them. I do not know what will come of that review, of course, but they are reviewing them. They were reviewing them even before the minister delivered himself of his views. Nonetheless, the minister's views are of interest because he is the minister. Perhaps he could talk a little bit about what he thinks should be done here.

I would also like him, if he would, Mr. Chairman, please to say a word or two about what oil may mean to Newfoundland. We have had ministers, including the honourable gentleman himself, going about (the Premier is noted for this) making, the minister has not been making any wild statements, the Premier has, his usual half-cocked, half-thought, half-unthought statements about the great bonanza which may result from oil. The minister himself, at least any statements which I have seen of his have been remarkably more circumspect.

My understanding is that oil may bring a number of benefits to Newfoundland if in fact - I do not think if it is found, I think we can all assume there is a considerable supply or whatever the word is, reserve of oil on the Grand Banks. The exploration people may or may not have found enough to be commercially developable (if that is the word) but the minister may indicate what he could about this. By the way, I do not own any stock in oil companies nor am I booming any. Assuming the oil is there and assuming it is found in

commercial quantities, both of which I think are reasonable assumptions, Mr. Chairman, then the question becomes when it might be feasible and desirable to extract that oil. Because, the mere presence of oil in quantities sufficient to develop, it is not in itself a guarantee that it will be developed. We have the situation in Alberta where the tar sands, I think they are called the Athabaskan tar sands, have incredible volumes of oil. I think it is something in the order of

three billion barrels. I am lost for figures in this field, they are so absolutely immense. As I understand it, there is more oil potential in those Tar Sands than there is in all of the proven reserves in Canada today.

MR. W. ROWE: Two-thirds of their resources are not presently commercially developable.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. My colleague has just made the point to me that two-thirds of the resources are not presently developable on a commercial basis under present economics and under present techniques. Now, that is significant because there is oil on the Grand Banks. Let us call it our oil. The question of ownership, the question of royalties and so on will be settled one way or another in due course. It will be settled whatever happens. Have we any indications that it may be commercially desirable and commercially feasible to develop that oil? If so, how will it be developed? Will it be brought ashore here in Cape Race or on the Southern Shore or some geographically near point? I have heard suggestions that we might have pipe lines. I have heard suggestions that there would be great underwater submersibles. I have heard suggestions that there might be great tankers. The honourable junior member from Harbour Main does not know what a submersible is? A submersible I suppose by definition is like "indigenous native", I guess. I think the honourable member has a point well taken. Submersibles of course are not always under water. They are sometimes above water. I think that is a point well made. He is getting considerably better on his syntax. I did not say sin. I said syn.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: In the case of the honourable gentleman that may also be a syntax. We hear most interesting stories about the underwater contraptions in which great quantities of oil would be put. You know, these are all means or just tankers, ordinary tankers. I have heard suggestions that there would be storage tanks on the spot and the oil would come out of the sea bed and go into a big storage tank

that would be there. I mean, there are all sorts of things that I have heard. I would like the minister to tell us a little about it. This is important, very important. The Premier would have us believe that it is a new Jerusalem. Maybe it is but what will it mean for Newfoundland? We are now seeing of the order of \$50,000,000 a year spent on off-shore exploration. That is a lot of money. It is having some effect in St. John's. It has driven up the price of expensive houses even more expensively. It has driven up the services of these people who buy. We do have some industrial development or service industries, the Berry Brothers people and there are other people in the servicing industry but how much more can we expect. I do not know. I have heard figures.

The problem in this is that we all speak in generalities. There have been great flowing speeches but remarkably few reasonable developments or reasonable predictions. So, I am not accusing the minister of anything at this stage or at any stage for that matter unless he deserves it. If he would indicate what he can see for us in the off-shore oil, I would be very interested in his views on the control of development as opposed to ownership because I think he would agree with my view that the two are separate. Each has its importance.

The ownership obviously has importance in that we would presume to get royalties if we owned the stuff but the development is even more important, environmental considerations, employment considerations and so forth. I am told that there are very few Newfoundlanders now working on the rigs that are off our coast, "The Sedco H" and "The Sedco I" and the other ones that are out there. I am told that there are very few Newfoundlanders working on the boats that go back and forth. Very few Newfoundlanders work on the helicopters that supply men and carry men back and forth. You know, what can be done about this? Maybe nothing can be done. I do not know.

It is an interesting point about immigration, the provincial

right if any in immigration policy on this. There is the employment. There is the environment. There is the question of the fishery. There are fears of course that oil development might conflict with the fishery. We were told in the most recent Throne Speech with great solemnity that there would be a council appointed that has not been appointed as yet. The minister might indicate what he proposes to do about that, when we might expect some action.

I suppose in a general way we have not touched on the Power Commission. Is there anything that we need in there? They are not doing anything exciting this year. Maybe the minister could indicate what he envisages in power consumption. We have a certain amount in surplus capacity now at the Holyrood Generating Station, the thermo plant. I notice from the report of Mr. Hobbs, the chairman of the commission, that it is being used for peaking power but that is all. That is fine. It was built for that purpose among others. It will presumably do for a number of years. I think the minister had made some indications but he might tell us again whether he envisages anything more being done. Are we going to have more hydro development? Where is our future power to come from? Hydro development? Thermo development? If so, what kind of thermal? Oil fuel? Oil fired? Fossil fuel fired or nuclear thermal power? These are all possibilities.

Is he the one we asked about Churchill Falls? Is the honourable gentleman the man who has the buck on Churchill Falls or is it one of his colleagues?

MR. BARRY: It is the responsibility of my department but there is a cabinet committee of which the honourable member -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes but then I assume it is the Chairman, who is the Finance Minister or the Industrial Development Minister. Is that -

MR. BARRY: It is a revolving Chairmanship.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. They do not know if they are coming or going. That

is what Brinco tell me as well. I think it is becoming obvious to the people of the province but that is another story again.

I think that I have given the minister a few points he might elucidate on within the year, for another hour or five minutes. He should be able to cover a lot of ground in that.

There is only one other question at this stage, Mr. Chairman, that I have. The Power Commission membership includes in its ranks two gentlemen selected for their honesty, decency, integrity and general reliability. Namely Mr. Patrick J. Canning, formerly the member for Placentia West and Mr. William J. Saunders, formerly the member for Bay de Verde district. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether these gentlemen will be asked to continue. There are others but these are the only two - I assume Mr. Ballam is on but I do not really know. I am not so much concerned about Mr. Ballam because he was not recently a member. Mr. Ballam retired from the House of Assembly before the 1966 election.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he did. I am sorry but Mr. Ballam did not stand in 1966. He was Minister of Labour and he resigned in the summer of 1966 and Mr. Clyde Wells was made Minister of Labour and stood in the Humber East district.

MR. MURPHY: He was elected in the 1966 election.

MR. ROBERTS: Ballam? No, Sir. Mr. Ballam was not elected and he did not stand. Mr. Clyde Wells was elected in the Humber East in 1966. Mr. Smallwood was elected in Humber West which was Mr. Ballam's seat. He was on the Power Commission in the summer of 1966. As far as I know, he is still there. I am sure he attends daily at the offices of the commission.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course he was that summer. Sure. There were six or seven ministers came in, The Minister of Justice was sworn in. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was sworn in. I am trying to be nice

tonight with the honourable the member from Gander. I am trying to help. I am agreeing with him. I am being all sweetness and light over here. Are there not fourteen of them?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Just barely.

MR. ROBERTS: Just barely. Well, that is okay. One of them will feel a call to go out. The Whip is doubtless out trying to round them up.

Anyway, is it purposed to replace Mr. Saunders and Mr. Canning during this year? Also, how much are these gentlemen being paid? I am sure it is in the estimates somewhere. It is a fair question. I think it is five or six thousand dollars a year. I am not sure. It is of that order but I would like to know.

The other members for the commission are who? Mr. Sheppard who is a full time employee down there, Mr. Hobbs who is full time, Mr. Reid who is full time. I am not sure. The minister could perhaps tell us. I am concerned at this point - we have just gone through it - with Mr. Canning and Mr. Saunders both of whom were appointed to the commission while they were members of the House of Assembly and who to my knowledge as of today are still members. I would like to know the minister's thoughts. Will they be kept on for this year or not?

That gives him enough openings to make some spechs. I am quite sure he can deal with all of the points that I have raised.

MR. W. ROWE: Before the minister rises, Mr. Chairman. I am amazed by this supplement no. 3 contained in the Budget Speech, especially where the

Mr. Rowe(W.N.):

the supplement refers to projective activity on the province's shelf, page forty-three. It is mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, I would assume this is the Minister of Finance speaking for the government, "In attempting to project the probable level of offshore petroleum activity it must be recognized that the diversity of geogological settings and enormous acreage of the province's shelf will probably ensure that a certain level of exploration will continue for some time Before the true potential of the province's shelf is finally decided, we can expect to have the equivalent of two rig years," What is a rig year by the way? I have heard of man years -

MR. BARRY: A rig working for a year or two rigs working for half a year or two -

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Or half a rig working for two years and so on like that. A rig year, what are we going to hear next. We can expect -

MR. BARRY: Four rigs for example working three months -

MR. ROBERTS: Or twelve rigs for one month each.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Yes and it goes on like that. I mean you can fool around back and forth forever like. "We can expect to have the equivalent of two rig years work done annually for perhaps each of the next ten years. This would involve a work force of some 300 people." Why is that figure, Mr. Chairman, so -

MR. BARRY: They are involved directly on the rigs.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): I see but aside from any multiplier effect so-called that there might be, are there other people on the shore, on land who are directly involved in the offshore activity besides the 300 people? The minister might want to just make reference to that when I sit down. I am also amazed to see that upon the discovery of significant commercial fields the level of drilling both exploratory and developmental will accelerate rapidly. "In the event of moderate successes, it is expected that a level of ten rig years would be maintained over a ten year period following the

initial discovery. This would directly involved a work force of 1,500 people." The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that a number of people and particularly the Premier, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, are going around the province trying to make it look like the discovery of oil off our shore is going to be the salvation of this province, yet we are talking about 1,500 people working. If commercial finds are made while apparently they are gearing up to production, total commercial production, there would be 1,500 people working over a ten year period. I think Mr. Meeker, that time when we had that meeting with him, said that from the time that there was a commercial find, if they went to work the next day, from that point to the point where they would be in full production on such a find, six or seven or eight years would go by.

MR. BARRY: Three years off Scotland -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Why would he say seven I wonder because the Premier at the time, two years ago -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Well, Premier Smallwood at that time came out and said that Meeker was off his head and Meeker then lashed back (a fine gentleman as I recall) in one of the oil journals saying that the Premier was off his head. So it was a moot point.

MR. BARRY: And it turns out Mr. Smallwood was right, was he?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It turns out that Mr. Smallwood was right again. He said three or four years I think at the time and Mr. Meeker, the oil expert, kept saying seven or eight years and now the minister says three years.

MR. ROBERTS: You did not think Joe Smallwood was ahead of the oil people, did you?

MR. BARRY: Oh, he is ahead of everybody.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Well anyway, 1,500 people seems to me the most

that we can expect. If it is a moderate find that means that if there is a moderate find today then for the next ten years we can expect a maximum of 1,500 people to be working. Well, I can only go by what I see, Mr. Chairman, written down here. Any projections of the labour force involved in the development of a commercial field on most parts of the province's shelf would be largely speculative. So consequently it is difficult to anticipate the labour force which will be required for the manufacture and installation of these new technologies. So that is speculative. I mean is this budget out of date already or what? But 1,500 people seems to me to be a very small number of people, Mr. Chairman, when we are talking about this great bonanza off our shelf. That is point number one.

Point number two is this: I mentioned during the throne speech debate that we have two extreme examples in the United States, one is the State of Louisiana, with its offshore resources in the gulf, which according to "Business Week" and according to "Fortune Magazine" when they list the per capita incomes of these states and the rate of growth of these states puts Louisiana in with West Virginia and Georgia and three or four states like that as having the lowest per capita income, with this vast offshore resource which I believe control and ownership and royalties of which the federal government has turned over to the litoral states. So we have this case of a state with these vast offshore resources presumably doing as much as they can to take advantage of it still being the state with the lowest per capita income or one of the three or four with the lowest per capita income and still being a state with the lowest rate of growth or among the lowest rates of growth in the United States. Now that is one example.

Then we have the example of Alaska which undoubtedly is a specialized example because it is up North and perhaps people only go there when they are already employed in good jobs. But we

have the case of Alaska, another state with offshore resources, and they made several billion a couple of years ago. But here is a state which, according to "Fortune" and "Business Week" and these magazines, has among the highest per capita incomes and among the highest rates of growth. So I am just wondering if the minister can give us any indication as to what role oil has played in both these two states to see whether - you know, is it because one is not doing the right thing with regard to the development of oil or is it because the economies of these states are affected by other things completely divorced from oil or what is the problem? Because at first glance one sees that perhaps, forgetting about Alaska for a second, one sees that perhaps oil is not the bonanza that it has been touted as being? Certainly in respect of Louisiana it has not been. I am afraid that the minister himself, who has not been going around saying that oil is going to be our saviour or anything like that, but he has been making quite a number of public statements concerning our offshore resources and unfortunately people have a tendency to lose the substance for the form. In other words, by dint of these constant statements and repetition people are building themselves up to a, well not a feverish peak or anything like that, but their expectations concerning offshore oil are rising dramatically and I would hate to see the people of this province sorely disappointed in the short run, medium run or long run over what we can expect here from our oil resources.

Now the other point, Mr. Chairman, is why is there no mention in the minister's estimates concerning offshore resources?

MR. BARRY: Energy resources.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): I notice under energy resources, presumably the expertise which the minister said was lacking in the previous administration and which is going to be found in this present administration, the expertise is to be found under the salaries estimates for that department, \$84,000. I do not know how much

expertise you can get for \$84,000 these days. That would be three men I would say at the types of salaries the minister is talking about, probably two and a half men for those salaries, \$84,000. So I would ask him the question as to where is this great offshore oil expertise coming from, where it appears in his estimates? Finally, Sir, why is there an offshore petroleum industrial advisory council found in industrial development? Why would that not be found under the minister's department? You might say, well it is industrial development, but if that argument were to be followed industrial development should have a mineral development advisory board, it should have a fishery development advisory board and a forestry development advisory board. I am just curious as to why the long tentacles of the Minister of Industrial Development have once more reached out into the minister's department. Why can he not be left alone to -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): I see. We have seen one minister who has left the present administration because he was more or less or his duties were more or less emasculated by the hon. Minister of Industrial Development. This big \$40 million trawler fleet that we were going to have went to his department. I am not sure if the hon. Minister of Industrial Development took it away from the Minister of Fisheries or whether the Minister of Fisheries hoisted it over on top of him. I am not sure as to what happened there. It is a constant battle as to where these hot potatoes finally lodge, Mr. Chairman. But I am interested in why the offshore petroleum industrial advisory council, maybe it is because it is so hard to pronounce, is put in the industrial development estimates. It seems to me it should be in mines and energy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. minister is on his feet answering questions put to him by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for White Bay South I wonder if the minister would make

April 3, 1973

Tape 1008

JM - 6

a note to answer this question. Has the minister received any representation at all recently within the last few months from the St. Lawrence Workers' Protective Union? I am sure the member for Placentia West will be interested in this and the member for Burin will be interested in it,

because I have heard in front of me, Mr. Chairman, a proposal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, this is George M. Doyle, President of the St. Lawrence Workers Protective Union. The union is proposing here, Sir, that the government hire another radiation monitoring technician to monitor the mines at St. Lawrence. And also to put pressure on ALCAN in St. Lawrence to have two monitors on night shift as well as the two they already have on day shift.

I would like to find out if the minister has received any representation on this matter, and if so, what his department intends to do about this because this is classed as a very important item by the St. Lawrence Workers Protective Union. God only knows that we have had enough problems in St. Lawrence, Sir, and I would ask the minister if he would give me his reaction to this one while he is answering the question.

Also I am sure my honourable colleague there from White Bay South will not mind my asking the minister about the problem of asbestoes at Baie Verte. Is there anything new to report on this? Is there a close check being kept on this matter? Is the mine there being monitored regularly? If so, perhaps we could get a progress report on this.

I also have, Mr. Chairman, in front of me, from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 974, from Buchans, a request that we ask the government to take a look at the mess that the company has made in the countryside of Buchans. Apparently, Mr. Chairman, quite a bit of waste material from the mill at Buchans has already destroyed two very beautiful rivers in that area and apparently there is a possibility of a third being polluted. So I would like to get the minister's comments on this particular matter. This is considered as a very, very important item in the Town of Buchans, in the District of Grand Falls, and the workers out there would like to

know what the government are going to do about this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, would the minister also advise the committee of the name of the legal adviser, if he has been appointed, to the minister or to the department, \$16,000 a year.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. BARRY: Cabot Martin.

MR. NEARY: Cabot Martin is the name given by the minister. Well the minister has had more luck in getting a legal adviser than the Department of Justice, although I think the salary is a little bit less.

We have a Block Provision for a proposed new post, \$27,500. Perhaps the minister could give us a list of these posts and give us the name of the executive assistant, the minister's executive assistant, \$12,000 a year.

MR. BARRY: Miss Mary Spencer.

MR. NEARY: Miss Mary Spencer from?

MR. BARRY: Marystown, in Placentia West.

MR. NEARY: In the District of Placentia West. Would the minister also give us a rundown, a list of the Block Provision for proposed new posts under 1103 - \$42,500. The Director of Energy Resources, \$24,000 a year - Director of Energy Resources. Has that gentleman been appointed yet? What is the name of the gentleman? What are the classifications?

MR. BARRY: Stephen Millian.

MR. NEARY: Stephen Millian. What qualifications does the gentleman have?

MR. BARRY: Extremely good.

MR. NEARY: For \$24,000 a year he must be good.

MR. BARRY: We went out to get him. We had to pay that much to get him. He was the best of a large group who applied, and we are getting our monies worth.

MR. NEARY: But what are his qualifications? Would the honourable minister tell us what he is going to do - Director of Energy Resources. What qualifications the gentleman has and so forth. Then there is, under 1104 - Block Provision for a proposed new post, \$60,000. We would like to know what the classifications are. I think that is all I have for the time being, Mr. Chairman. But I am particularly interested in this matter concerning St. Lawrence because I have been asked their by the union to make sure that we bring that matter to the attention of the government to find out what they are going to do about it.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, I would also like the minister, when he replies to the various questions raised in dealing with the possible industries result from a fine or even from servicing the rigs that are presently drilling off the Coast of Newfoundland or indeed any further drills that may be implied. I have heard that the port of St. John's, as far as servicing these facilities, becomes quite crowded and I know that two oils rigs have already been serviced at Argentia, I would like the minister if he would when he deals with the various questions, in general introduction, to elaborate upon the port requirements and what the possibility is for further activities in Argentia itself? As the members of the House know, at Argentia there is probably one of the best harbours on the Coast of Newfoundland, ice free all year around. Also there are considerable docking facilities that have been built there, of course, by the Naval authorities. Berry Brothers have established there. I know that arrangements have been made. They have been negotiating and have obtained a DREE grant to expand their facilities there. They have already serviced one of these rigs. But I would like, when the minister replies, he inform the House what the position is with respect to the potential of the Port of Argentia to service these rigs.

MR. R. WELLS: In his general remarks also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister about the accidents which occurred on an oil rig off our coast where two divers were killed, about two and a-half months ago. I am wondering if the report has been made to the minister of an investigation which I believe was held or took place into that incident. And if there are regulations of any sort being contemplated by the department? Normally an area of 200 or 250 miles off the Coast of Newfoundland would be in international waters. I am wondering what jurisdiction the Province of Newfoundland has in that area. I am wondering if the minister has taken legal advice on the question of jurisdiction of this province. Whether the minister can impose regulations. Whether the jurisdiction of Newfoundland is recognized by the oil companies that are doing the drilling operations. I would appreciate the remarks of the minister on this whole subject of safety on these drill rigs.

MR. M. MARTIN: With regard to these discussions, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few of my own. I would like to know two specific areas of interest in which I believe the honourable minister's department is involved. Perhaps if I am not correct in my assumptions he would point me in the right direction on this. First of all, the matter in Labrador West with the mining company's operations which are dumping their tailings into the lakes, the lakes are being polluted. I understand not in the sense that they are being destroyed by chemicals but in the sense that the bottom of the lakes are being destroyed as a base or breeding habitat for fish, feeding habitat being polluted by these tailings. I would like to know what the minister's department is doing to correct this situation?

Secondly, I wonder- I would like to say too, first of all, that this state of affairs was brought about by relaxed regulations by the previous administration. I think it is criminal that this sort of thing should have been allowed to happen in the first place. I think it is equally criminal that it should be allowed to continue

to happen.

Secondly, with respect to the Bay d'Espoir project, in the highlands where as a result of the construction of dams for this project in the upper reaches the head waters: I had occasion to visit that area myself a couple of years ago and made representation to the government of the day, made representation to the Power Commission and was told to mind my own business and not bother because it was too much of a problem to clean up the mess that was created by the construction companies - the acquiescence of the government of the day.

I would like to know what this present administration is going to

MR. MARTIN: do to try to clean up the mess that was created by a crown agency in the construction of the Bay d'Espoir project at that time.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, if I could start in the order in which the questions were given: With respect to the honourable the Leader of the Opposition's question concerning whether there is anything in the estimates for the electrification of St. Carols, I do not believe there is, However I want to make certain I am not overlooking something, I want to check with my officials on that and if the honourable Leader of the Opposition could wait, I will have that for him tomorrow.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition raised a number of questions with respect to offshore developments. He inquired about the federal-provincial negotiations which are presently going on. One page 42 of The Budget Speech there is a statement there on the federal-provincial negotiations and also refers to the province's position as to the strength of our legal case.

Now as a lawyer, the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that there is no such thing as a perfect case and as a lawyer he should also know that it is hardly in the best interests of the province for me to stand up or for that matter probably any Newfoundlander, but for me particularly to stand up and attempt to find weaknesses in the province's case or pick loop holes in the case.

Basically the province's case is unique in that at the time of Confederation, 1949, prior to becoming a province of Canada, Newfoundland was a sovereign entity, a dominion, By 1949, unlike the situation in the British Columbia case where the doctrine had not developed, by 1949 it was recognized in international law that the adjacent sovereign state had particular rights over the continental shelf.

MR. BARRY: Under the terms of union, Newfoundland did not give up these rights and in fact there are clauses there which would expressly reserve these rights to the Province of Newfoundland.

The logical conclusion therefore is; Newfoundland had these rights prior to Confederation, Newfoundland did not give them up in the terms of union and therefore Newfoundland still has them. Now that purely and simply is the province's case.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to the Supreme Court of Canada's decision as being a policy decision. Unfortunately or fortunately, depending on your point of view, every decision of every court is a policy decision in my view and the principles of law that are applied at times do not make clear the policy that the courts are following but they do purport to have certain doctrines of precedent and so on which require the courts to observe previous policy laid down in previous cases where these principles were established.

With respect to the Newfoundland legal case and the offshore rights, we feel that the legal principles are there which will prevent the Supreme Court of Canada from flipping a coin or deciding purely on policy reasons in favour of the Federal Government or for that matter in our favour.

However, even if the Supreme Court of Canada does stress the policy factor in its decision, if policy play an important part in the Supreme Court of Canada's decision, the decision should still be in favour of the Province of Newfoundland because, as I will mention shortly, as has been mentioned many times in the past, the potential effect of any significant offshore development on the economies of the adjacent provinces will be so significant that for the federal government to have control over the management of these resources will be virtually for the federal government to have control of the economies of the provinces and this, we submit, was not contemplated by

MR. BARRY: Confederation. This is not federalism as we know it today, and therefore, on pure policy reasons alone, the Supreme Court of Canada should find in favour of the Province of Newfoundland.

Now with respect to the federal regulations, the honourable Leader of the Opposition asked certain questions concerning these, referred to certain criticisms that I had of these regulations at the recent meeting in Ottawa.

One of the reasons this public criticism was made was not in a political sense, it was not intended to start a raging debate. As a matter of fact, while the negotiations have been continuing, we have purposely stayed away from dispute with the federal government concerning their regulations or concerning the offshore generally. But there was concern on the part of the province that the federal government might bring in new, amended regulations, without consulting the provinces, without consulting parliament and basically without consulting anybody except the oil companies.

Now I say that, not exaggerating the matter, because initially, and I should stress that the federal attitude has been changing, before I get into this, but initially when we approached the federal government to request a copy of their proposed new amendments to the federal oil and gas regulations, we were told, "I am sorry," (this was by a civil servant, an official of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources) "I am sorry, these regulations are confidential. We have released them to the oil companies and we are discussing them with the oil companies but they are too confidential to release to the province."

Obviously that was not a position that could be supported and I am happy to say that upon reconsideration of their position, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources did submit a copy of

MR. BARRY: the proposed regulations to the province. However, the minister, Mr. MacDonald, did not make any commitment that these regulations would not be brought into force while the negotiations were continuing without agreement of the provinces. There was no commitment there. So we felt it necessary to focus attention on these regulations, on the existing regulations and the need for certain types of changes, and I am happy to say this is exactly what has happened.

As a direct result of this meeting which was what you might call an academic meeting, a meeting of the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, private group, as a result of papers presented at this meeting, as a result of discussions, I would like to think possibly as a result of some of my criticisms, although I may be putting myself into high regard there, but in any event as a result of this meeting, Mr. MacDonald stated in the House of Commons that these regulations would not be changed until they had gone before the parliamentary committee and while the federal-provincial negotiations were continuing. I am not quite clear on that point because the newspaper report was garbled.

In any event, we have focused public attention on these regulations, on the defects in these regulations. Now the honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that there was a previous Conservative Administration that brought the regulations in, that is correct. Mr. Alvin Hamilton had a lot to do with the initial

regulations. At the time they were brought in they may have been good regulations. There have been a lot of changes in this offshore area particularly. It is a new frontier and great technological developments have occurred just over the last couple of years.

In any event, it is not so much a criticism of the content of the regulations, although there are many things that can be criticized here. It is the way in which these regulations have been administered by the federal government that is of great concern. The regulations permit areas of crown reserves to be set up, they permit the federal government, if they wish, to reserve areas to the Crown and not issue permits on these areas. Unfortunately, very little acreage has been retained. Almost all of the continental shelf (off the East Coast specifically) has been subjected to these federal regulations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why would they want to retain—

MR. BARRY: Well, the point in wanting to retain is that you hold certain acreage where you may have geological information that there are structures or something. If there is a find adjacent to this, the value of the part you have retained becomes that much more apparent, it is much easier to assess the true value. You can then either go by auction or whatever manner you choose to dispose of the acreage, dispose of it at that time for presumably much greater royalties, much greater benefits.

MR. W.N. ROWE: May I ask the minister a question before he goes on further developing his remarks on this, Mr. Chairman? Exactly what do the federal permits or the federal regulations permit? Once they allow someone to explore, does this also give them production rights as far as the federal government is concerned or can the federal government, once the oil or some offshore resource is found, can the federal government then take back the acreage or a great proportion of it and put it up for auction? Exactly what happens?

MR. BARRY: If I could, possibly, to avoid any misunderstanding, I should

say that our entire discussion or comment on the federal regulations has always been based on the premise that; "Boys, you do not have any right to regulate anyhow but if you are going to regulate, do it properly." We are saying that it is the federal jurisdiction there, that only the federal regulations apply, but we are willing to comment on deficiencies in the federal regulations.

The federal regulations permit a person to apply for a permit initially. The practice has been (this is not necessarily required by the regulations) to have what they call a free entry system, first come first served, much the same as we do with Crown land. You apply for it, the first person to apply has the right then to get the permit. There is a very small deposit of \$250.00 or something, you have certain work commitments, you have to do so much work over so many years, which is very low, much lower than anywhere else in the world, and you have the right then to go to lease. You do not have to have made a commercial find but you have the right to go to lease at any time within six years. (I am sorry, the initial permit is for six years, it can be renewed for a further six years) You have the right to go to lease at any time within the first six years or the renewal period. You get a lease for twenty-one years and it can be renewed for a further twenty-one years, which is much too long a period.

When you go to lease, you have to surrender, under the existing regulations you have to surrender fifty percent of the acreage. At one stage the federal government had done away with the surrender provision and they had permitted the oil companies to retain the entire one hundred percent for an additional royalty on the fifty percent that they would otherwise have to surrender.

This completely defeats the whole purpose of the regulations. The idea of having to surrender is that the person, when he goes to lease, has to give up fifty percent of the acreage that he has explored in a sort of checkerboard pattern, not just cut it down the middle but in a checkerboard pattern, the idea being then

that way the Crown is likely to get back some attractive acreage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sell it by auction.

MR. BARRY: And sell it by auction or do whatever you want to do with it, knowing that the value is that much more apparent. We were afraid that the federal government were going to (because there is strong pressure to have this done) do away with

MR. BARRY: surrender provisions again and permit the oil companies to hold one hundred per cent for an additional royalty.

Now, if you set the additional royalty high enough, perhaps it would not matter. If you set it one hundred per cent, obviously it would not matter. But the point is that you are only guessing when you try to set a royalty prior to commercial find. You do not know the exact value of what you are giving away so it is just guess work.

MR. WM. ROWE: What is the royalty in Ottawa?

MR. BARRY: The royalty in Ottawa is the lowest in the world. It is five per cent for the first three years, I think it is, or first three years of production, and then going up to ten per cent. The next lowest is the United Kingdom which is twelve and a half per cent and there there is a big hue and cry right now since the Public Accounts Committee brought out its report March 1, shouting give away and sellout and so on.

Most places have a royalty of sixteen and two-thirds per cent. But again, of course, we have got to recognize - we cannot be unrealistic here, we are in a different position before a commercial find is made than we are after a commercial find is made and the terms that we negotiate with a company, before a commercial find is made off our shelf, may not necessarily be as beneficial or as good for the province as terms negotiated after. But what you have got to do, is you have got to keep your options open. You have got to keep some territory, some acreage, that you will be able to get better terms on afterwards. This is what the federal government, as we see it, has not done.

There are so many things you could talk about here you could go on all night but the House has other matters - unless

the honourable members have other questions, I will go on to something else.

MR. AYLWARD: I understood that you - did you say not public? are they now public, the federal regulations?

MR. BARRY: The existing ones are but -

MR. AYLWARD: The amendments.

MR. BARRY: Not the proposed amendments. No.

MR. AYLWARD: Have Nova Scotia or New Brunswick regulations yet and how do they compare with the existing federal regulations?

MR. BARRY: Nova Scotia has recently amended its act and it has brought in certain regulations there- but I do not think these are in force yet. They have not been proclaimed. They are somewhat similar to the federal regulations but have a higher royalty and there are some other differences - different lease period, shorter period and so on.

MR. AYLWARD: Is there any money required in addition to what is required under the federal permits? Are there any of the eastern provinces requiring deposits similar to that required by Ottawa or are the provinces accepting the deposits that were paid under Ottawa regulations?

MR. BARRY: Nova Scotia has something to the effect of five cents an acre. But I have to say here, without shaking up this reasonable co-operation approach bit, that we are not going to be too impressed by what Nova Scotia or New Brunswick are proposing because we feel that really Newfoundland is in as good a position to determine what the proper regulations are based on, looking at the Norwegian regulations, for example, looking at the United Kingdom regulations and the Australian regulations, as is Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and we have done as much work, I feel, in this area as these other provinces have.

We will not be too impressed by what the other provinces have done when we have a much larger hunk of the shelf.

April 3, 1973

Tape No. 1012

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: Are there two permits now and two fees, or two permits and one fee to Ottawa?

MR. BARRY: Two permits.

MR. NEARY:

You have to get a permit from Ottawa and from the province. Now they pay a fee to Ottawa. Do they also pay a fee to the Province?

MR. BARRY: We have not been issuing permits since we reviewed the situation. I do not think there has been one issued since the present administration came into office as a matter of policy because we have two choices, either to go along holus-bolus, follow at the heels of the federal government and coincide our permits exactly with the federal governments or else confuse the whole situation by issuing conflicting permits, overlapping permits which will make more difficult the eventual settling of this matter. There were some before we came in, four

MR. ROBERTS: There were no permits issued at all. Does that mean no exploration?

MR. BARRY: If there are no federal-provincial permits -

MR. ROBERTS: I have been listening with a deal of interest and I hope learning something. He said that no permits had been issued since the present administration assumed office in January 1972. Fine. There are some permits which were issued before which have been confirmed by the present government. I have been wondering if no permits, by which we mean provincial permits, were to be issued, in other words, if the Smallwood Administration had taken the position that no provincial permits should have been issued - our permits felt trapped with the federal permits, rightly or wrongly they did.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did this create a problem?

MR. ROBERTS: No. I understood that there were no rules, that our permits simply said that they will not be more onerous than the federal permits. That was a point the honourable gentleman made in -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They were conflicting -

MR. ROBERTS: They were because we took the jurisdictional point. Our feeling is the same as the honourable gentleman's that Newfoundland had the right to issue permits because Newfoundland owned the undersea resource. Now, one can quarrel with the company. That is another story. Some of them perhaps the honourable gentleman would not have

issued permits to. So be it. What is, is. What I am wondering is, if there were no permits issued where would that leave us. So, we now have four permits issued covering fairly large acreages but not everything. Certainly the real oil which is apparently off the coast of Labrador, off the Hamilton Inlet Bank - that is where the real oil is, I understand. The stuff on the Grand Banks relatively speaking once a lot of oil, is less than there is off Labrador. So they say. I mean, God knows how they know but apparently they do know these things. If no more permits are issued by the province for a number of years, what does that do to exploration? That is the question. Does it prevent exploration or does it go ahead on Ottawa's terms?

MR. BARRY: There are certain companies that are presently holding both federal and provincial permits in respect of the same area. There are other companies which have come to us and have said, "Give us a permit not just to explore but give us a provincial right to exploit as well because we only have the federal permit" and they either say, "When we came for the provincial permit before we were refused and they were later given to somebody else" or else they said, "We did not come for the provincial permit before although we should have." We do not have a lot of sympathy for them but as we see it, it is a delicate balance that you have to reach. On the one hand we do not want to impede exploration. We want to encourage exploration because the more exploration the more likelihood of a find, but at the present time and unfortunately this was done initially in the hope that the federal-provincial negotiations would not take as long - but the present policy we are operating on is that we cannot afford to issue permits or issue rights to exploit until we see what is going to happen with the federal-provincial negotiations which are going to have to, I feel personally, come to a head and I think they will, in the normal course of events, within the next few months. I would not want to -

Mr. ROBERTS: A company will not explore (Am I correct?) without a permit?

April 3, 1973

Tap 1013 (night)

IB-3

MR. BARRY: No. They come to us - it is a matter to a certain extent like a poker game - they come to us and they say, "We cannot. We will not. We are not able to. We are taking too big a risk to explore, to expend the money without a permit."

They cry in their beer and they say that you have to do this. But you see we have certain cards that we are holding as well, one of which is that the oil companies have work commitments, as slight as they are in some cases, but they have to expend so many dollars and they have to do so much work every year in order to keep the federal permits. So we feel that in most cases they will continue their normal programme and we have seen no evidence otherwise as of yet. They will continue their normal programme in order to keep and avoid losing the federal permits.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there any exploration now going ahead by companies who do not hold permits?

MR. BARRY: There is one which I am going to mention. Mobile holds a federal permit. It does not hold a provincial right to exploit. It came to us asking for one and we unfortunately had to say that we could not but we do not give comfort letters, we give comfort statements to the effect that -

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman is an especially good lawyer to know that it is only an evidential difference.

MR. BARRY: No, no, that is not quite so. We and - I think it is a matter of creating the proper attitude, the proper exploration environment, as it were, off Newfoundland. The position that we are taking is that we are going to be dealing responsibly. We are not going to do anything that is going to prejudice the interests of the people of Newfoundland. We are not going to take action at this stage that in the long run is going to impair the benefits that the province gets back. On the other hand we are going to have to recognize, when we start issuing our permits, we are going to have to sort the wheat from the chaff and look at companies that are responsible companies, companies that can afford to carry on certain exploration programmes and perhaps in cases have already carried on but making no commitments, not tying ourselves

into a box at this stage or tying our hands but doing what we can to encourage development on the one hand without giving away provincial rights.

Now I do not know if the hon. members appreciate the position we find ourselves in. It is not an easy one. I am not going to be prepared to say that every decision that is made is one that can be made safely and securely and lightly. It is a matter of getting the proper balance in just about every case and to date we seem to be doing all right.

MR. NEARY: Are there any outstanding applications from legitimate companies?

MR. BARRY: Oh, there is a list of them as long as my arm.

MR. NEARY: Legitimate, serious applications? No there are not a couple of hundred but there may be three or four.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice informed us on interim estimates, and he should observe how a real minister does it. I notice Stewart's salary is up another \$2,000 next year.

MR. BARRY: These are companies - now in the supplement we have listed the four companies that hold, as we see it, rights to produce or exploit the resource whereas a certain other number, I think it is five that hold rights to explore only and not to produce. There are eighteen other applications and there are a few more since then that have trickled in. In some cases these are companies that have made more than one application. There are at least twelve, I would say between twelve and fifteen or sixteen companies that have expressed an interest in getting

provincial permits.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they have federal permits?

MR. BARRY: In nine cases they hold federal permits and in three cases they hold partly, whatever that means, partly federal permits or federal permits on part of it, presumably. In other cases they have applied for or they have final agreements with other companies.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Are any of those companies which do not have permits of any kind, are they presently exploring -

MR. BARRY: There is Mobile, as I have just mentioned.

MR. NEARY: Do they have permits?

MR. BARRY: No, federal only.

MR. ROWE, W. N. Is this Coney Mobile of Canada or is that another Mobile?

MR. BARRY: This one is listed as Mobile Oil Canada, I do not recall it to the exact relations -

MR. THOMS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Yes. AMICO had and still does have two rigs for the drilling.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Before the minister gets away from the permit aspect of all of this, it is very interesting, would he permit a question?

MR. BARRY: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE, W.N. These Class A interim permits to PANAM Petroleum which have been farmed out presumably and then Canadian Home, Shell - Mobile Oil. What do these entitle the holder to, Mr. Chairman? For example, if they make a find and they go after a lease, presumably, then is there in this particular permit some obligation for them to give up anything? What is the situation Provincially speaking?

MR. BARRY: These are the last five, is it, you mentioned?

MR. ROWE, W.N. No, the first five, Class A interim permits.

MR. BARRY: The first four.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Which are permits not only to explore but to exploit as well I believe.

MR. BARRY: Well these permits, as far as we can determine it is a matter of legal interpretation of the document. As far as we can determine it gives them the option to obtain a lease.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Maybe the Minister of Justice can help you. He was the minister when these were given out. Presumably he would know what they are all about.

MR. BARRY: Here is the wording of the permit in that case. The wording of the permit in that case is "Pursuant to the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, 1965, Act No. 56 of 1965, hereinafter called the act. Permission is hereby given such and such a company, hereinafter called the interim permittee, to search prospect and explore for petroleum in an area located, and they describes the area. Then they say "This interim permit is issued subject to the following terms and conditions. The interim permit shall continue in force pending the making of regulations under the act authorizing the issuance of a permit in respect of the area described in the schedule and until the exploration of three months from the date that such regulations come into force."

Now as a matter of interest here the initial permit that was given out, say to AMICO, were given out when there was no right, nothing under the act permitting interim permits to be given out. There was a consequent amendment to the act to ratify what had already been done.

Then the interim permittee shall be entitled to have his permit issued to him under such regulations in forty-five days after the date on which the regulations come into force. This is the important one. The terms and conditions to be set forth in the permit issued under the regulations shall not be less than the federal to interim permittee, than the terms and conditions of permits previously issued to the interim permittee by the Government of Canada in respect to the same area.

So this is where they incorporate by reference the terms of the federal permit, the terms of the federal permits giving option

to go to lease, to produce. So it is going to be a matter of sitting down and just seeing how far we will apply it. We have not done that yet.

MR. ROWE, W.N. With presumably a fifty per cent amount of the area going back to the Crown, that would be under the present federal regulations. So we still could make a fairly substantial gain on one-half of the acreage even under these Class A permits.

MR. BARRY: I thought it was 11:00 P.M.

MR. ROBERTS: Move, if you want to call it 11:00 P.M., but it is not yet.

MR. BARRY: Well I could cover a couple of more points. I could finish maybe the honourable Leader of the Opposition's questions.

As far as the potential of the shelf is concerned, the oil companies say you have to talk potential until you bring the oil up in commercial quantities. There is oil out there. They have established that. You get then into the question of the ferocity of the rock, the firmability, whether the oil has collected to ensure a sufficient flow or sufficient daily flow or hourly flow to make it a commercial find.

Now the likelihood, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned, the likelihood of developing it if found depends of course on the cost in bringing it ashore and it depends in turn upon the quantity found. The larger the quantity found the more likely it can be brought ashore at an economic cost.

The development in the technological areas here will have a lot to do with whether it can be developed. How it is developed - off Norway they do it a number of different ways, pipeline is one, tanker direct from the well head, tanker coming to a -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I have to confess, I know they are insulated, I do not know if they are heated though. I do not think they are heated. I am not right up on this technology here.

MR. THOMS: They would have to have the pipe out here insulated to keep the oil -

MR. BARRY: It has to be insulated but whether it is heated I do not know.

MR. THOMS: Down South they do not have to do that, but up here they will.

MR. BARRY: There are a lot of things they will have to do up here

MR. BARRY: because of the ice and so on, that they do not do in other areas. Also the environmental factors, of course, will determine whether or not the oil can be brought ashore.

As far as the industrial potential which the honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned and also the honourable member for White Bay South, perhaps I can leave that until I get to the questions raised by the honourable member for White Bay South, but basically the reason that government has been talking about oil is not to paint pie in the sky, it is to permit the people of Newfoundland to become aware of any opportunities that arise at this stage from the exploration dollars that have been spent. There are significant jobs resulting right now from the money that is being spent on exploration.

The jobs referred to in The Budget Supplement, the 1500 jobs, these are jobs relating directly, either men on rigs or watchmen on the wharves and so on, caterers, helicopter people and so on, but they do not give the jobs that are created by companies that are doing machine shop work for the oil companies, doing welding work, doing work on these enormous quantities of pipe that they have and so on, and this is where the really large amount of employment has resulted in Scotland and Norway and so on. So that it is not a correct picture.

This E.I.U. report which was brought down about a year ago, the federal government report which was supposed to be negative, it was supposed not to show anything very attractive for Eastern Canada, that was based on predicting a small oil find and a small gas find and medium gas find and medium oil find and so on, the number of jobs they predicted ranged from 1500 to 23,000, if I remember the figures correctly. Now even 1500 alone, as far as I am concerned is a significant number of jobs. What is it - it is Come By Chance, Corner Brook, it is a lot of jobs. But when you talk from 1,500 to 23,000, the potential is great, and

MR. BARRY: there is no point in our denying it.

Again, it is pointless to speculate but at the same time we want to make people aware what opportunities are arising at the present time and also have people thinking of what can happen in the future, because if they are not ready, if they are not prepared, if they are not planning ahead, there are going to be people come in from outside and take advantage of the opportunities.

MR. THOMS: Could the minister provide us tomorrow or whenever he comes back with a plan, a map say of Newfoundland and the Grand Banks, and the location of these leases? There should be one in existence.

MR. BARRY: I can get one of those.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

MR. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, the committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 11:00 o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 o'clock tomorrow.