

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1977

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am pleased to welcome to the House of Assembly forty-eight grade seven students from Grant's Collegiate in Springdale. They are accompanied by three of their teachers - Mr. Harold Tremblett, Mr. Barry Jackman and Mr. Myles Blanchard. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these students to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Sir, it has been brought to my attention that recently a number of vehicle owners were involved in highway accidents and did not have insurance. Could the minister tell the House what the situation is now concerning compulsory vehicle insurance? Is it working? Are people getting away with getting their licence without the insurance and on? Could the minister give us an updating on that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter which the hon. gentleman refers to has been brought to my attention as well on a number of occasions over the past number of months in fact. Compulsory insurance came into being in this Province in January, 1976 and make it mandatory that all motorists using our roads and highways have insurance, third party liability insurance. However it seems what is happening is that the motorists are obtaining their insurance merely to obtain the registration of their vehicles and their drivers licence and shortly after that they may cancel their insurance or let their policies lapse and still continue to drive on the roads and highways and as a result some of them are being caught in accidents even with no insurance. So because of that we had an overall review of the situation and we are now making changes and these changes are along

MR. MORGAN: the lines that first of all my colleague, the Minister of Justice has been asked by myself, the minister responsible for motor vehicle registration and administration, has been asked to instruct the law enforcement agencies throughout the Province that whenever a vehicle is stopped on the highway or on any road in the Province for any reason that they will have to show three things whereas now they are only asked to show two. If a vehicle is stopped now they are asked to show the registration of the vehicle and their driver's licence. From here on in they are going to have to show not only the registration of their vehicle and their driver's licence but also they are going to have to show proof of their insurance. In other words, proof of their insurance is just as important because it is as mandatory to have it as the driver's licence and the registration of their vehicle. That will come into force almost immediately, in a matter of days, in fact.

Also, I plan to bring in amendments to the legislation, the Highway Traffic Act regulations, changing the penalties for people who are caught without insurance. And what we will be doing will be enabling the magistrates or the judges in making their decisions, enabling them to instruct the motorist to remove their licence plates, number one, or have the magistrate given the power to instruct the registrar of motor vehicles to take away the registration plates of the vehicles. So these two items will take place, these two procedures by the Department of Transportation in an effort to overcome the problem of vehicles using our highways without insurance. It is a law. It is compulsory. It is mandatory and we want to make sure that law is followed.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary - the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate just in the minister's opinion how widespread is this problem and can the minister, can the department wait until vehicles are stopped, you know, for some other reason before

MR. NEARY: checking into this matter? You know, would it not be better to set up road blocks or road checks, rather check points, and check all the vehicles to see if they are covered by insurance because if you have to wait, nine chances out of ten a lot of them will never be caught?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that part of the enforcement is a bit difficult based on the fact that - Of course there are a number people driving without even driver's licences throughout the Province, and unless

Mr. Morgan.

There is an overall, way-out campaign - a major effort, I should say, of the law enforcement agencies to track down the people who, number one, have not got even a driver's licence, and in this case, number two, have not got insurance. It is a very difficult thing to enforce. But I am hoping that when the law enforcement agencies receive these new instructions that they will go all out in an all out effort to track down those people who are driving - in fact driving illegally, because they have to have insurance before they drive. If they do not have insurance, and they are driving, they are driving illegally. So I am hoping the law enforcement agencies will go on an all out effort.

MP. NEARY: One more supplementary.

MP. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if the number of licences issued in the Province this year are up or down? And my understanding is that the number is down substantially. Could the minister confirm or deny this and tell us why it is down?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of the question, because I cannot give the exact figures on how many drivers' licences have been issued. I do know that the number of vehicles registered in the Province, motor vehicles, are up over last year this same time. So I am assuming that the number of drivers' licences are also up over last year.

MP. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary from the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans and then the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. FLIGHT: The problem seems to stem, according to the minister, from the fact that drivers will cancel their insurance after receiving their registration. This is happening.

MR. NEARY: Or let them run out.

MR. FLIGHT: Is it possible for the Province to make it mandatory for the insurance companies to notify Motor Registration when licenced drivers cancel their public liability insurance?

MR. J. CAPTEB: A little paranoia goes a long way.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is possible, but it is a nightmare when it comes to administering that kind of thing, because, for example, if I had insurance - well take, for example, with Munn's insurance or Johnson's insurance or any of them, X insurance company, and I let my policy lapse as of yesterday, and the company then would notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that Morgan's insurance has lapsed, and then the following day the law enforcement agency comes down to me, sent by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles saying, "Mr. Morgan, where is your proof of insurance?" I pull out my card, and say, "Well, I got my insurance changed over from Bowrings as of yesterday to somebody else today." X yesterday, B today. So that kind of thing is very difficult to administer, and that is really a nightmare. So we are hoping that by an overall major effort of the law enforcement agencies in tracking down these people who are driving illegally that will overcome the problem we now have.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is really directed to the Minister of Tourism, but I see he is not in his place, and possibly it should go to the Premier's office. I believe the Premier's office has been contacted on this particular thing. And the question is, big game applications for licences have to be picked up by one person, the person who wants that licence, he has to go to a certain place to pick it up, and in the case of the Eastern section, in the social service offices, Bay L'Argent is left out, and I am wondering whether the people of Bay L'Argent will have to go to Terrenceville or Grand Le Pierre, or if Grand Le Pierre and Terrenceville - where are they going to go? There is a bit of confusion in this. I have received some complaints from my constituents this morning. The Bay L' Argent office should be included in the temporary social

Mr. J. Winsor:

offices. There is a great hardship put on the fishermen who may be - I am sorry to have to go through this preamble, but it is important to get the point over. A lobster fisherman fishing up in Belle Bay or up in the bottom of Fortune Bay has to go to either Belleoram, appear in person, he could lose a fair amount of revenue from his lobster fishing just to get a big game licence. I am wondering if the minister would look at this? There are some anomalies in the different places to have to go. Part of the district is in Eastern Newfoundland, the other part is in Central Newfoundland. There is some confusion here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it - and the minister is not here this morning - but as I understand it, any employed person by the provincial government who will be visiting the area, whether it is the Social Services office or whether it is someone from the Department of Forestry, or some Fisheries officer, whatever the case may be, any of them people can accept these licences. But I will certainly take notice of it, and have the minister give a formal statement here to ensure the clarity of it, because the intention is wherever there is anyone from the provincial government, an official, visiting these people, they are in a position to accept these licences, but I will get that clarified for the hon. member.

MR. J. WINSOR: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has a supplementary.

MR. J. WINSOR: Another problem is the fact that it is a pre-arranged date and one date only. For a fisherman this could be very awkward, as most people who know fishermen will understand. It is one date and one date only for a particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this is to submit applications for licenses, I understand. Is that correct? I think the situation is, and it certainly is my understanding, that it is up to a certain date, any time up to a certain date. If that is the case, as the member says, I also agree that is wrong and certainly something that can be corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. J. WINSOR: A supplementary. For the Premier's information it says here, "Applications on a pre-arranged date to be announced in each area."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister give us any update on any cost-sharing relationship between this Province and Ottawa concerning the air strip programme for the Labrador Coast?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as earlier outlined to the House of Assembly, the air administration division of the Ministry of Transport carried out a major study in the need for airstrips in Labrador. And as a result of that study a report was made to the Ministry of Transport by the air administration division along the lines of what they call a master plan calling for the construction of twelve airstrips. The approval in principle of the Ministry of Transport has now been given for the construction of these twelve airstrips and they have asked the Atlantic region civil aviation division to implement the construction of these airstrips. But the last indication we received, a number of weeks ago, was along the lines that the civil aviation division of the Atlantic region could not implement this programme till possibly 1980. This means now we will be holding meetings in the very near future and discussions with

MR. MORGAN:

the Ministry of Transport, the hon. Otto Lang and other officials in Ottawa along the lines to get this programme commenced in the 1977 construction season.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us whether there is any talk of transferring some of the CN subsidy to airstrip building programme? I believe the talk is along the lines that the subsidy for CN coastal vessels, for instance, that if there were airstrips then some of this money could be transferred over to the construction of airstrips.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that discussion really came out of a meeting that was held by the Atlantic Provinces, or Maritime Premiers' Conference really at Charlottetown with the federal minister, the hon. Otto Lang. At that meeting this Province - I was there on behalf of this Province at that meeting. The conclusion of that meeting was that the Atlantic Provinces agreed with the Federal minister on his proposal to rearrange the subsidizations and subsidies paid for transportation in the Atlantic region, and therefore that there was a possibility of subsidies which were normally paid for coastal boat services or other services, in fact like rail passenger services was one as well, that these could be reallocated to other modes of transport, and other modes of transport referred to in fact were road, in the case of bus transportation and the Trans-Canada Highway upgrading, etc., and also air transport, in this case the construction of airstrips along the Labrador Coast.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Then I recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary. Could the minister outline whether there has been any consideration given to looking at only possibly

MR. STRACHAN:

four airstrips in the near future and looking at other - using twin engine aircraft and using a feeder service of bush plane aircraft into these larger centres rather than going for the whole twelve airstrips at this time at which I do not believe the money would be available?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all the master plan was calling for fifteen airstrips, and it was after discussions held with the Department of Transportation here in the Province that they reconsidered the master plan for fifteen. Now it is only down to twelve, based on the fact they felt there was no need for airstrips in some of the places, Fox Harbour was one and Cartwright a second, Fox Harbour being close to Marys Harbour and - not Cartwright, but Paradise River, I am sorry, Paradise River being in close proximity of Cartwright and possibly of a road construction there. So we are hoping that upcoming meetings with Ottawa will conclude in a decision made to commence the construction of these airstrips this year and we would like to see at least the commencement of three if not four. And these will combine, of course, with our ongoing provincial programme whereby we have now an airstrip in Cartwright which will be completed this year in 1977. And we are hoping to get, we mentioned earlier in Nain, Makkovik and Mary's Harbour, at least these three commenced in 1977 if the feds will go along with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. Could the minister be good enough to give us some indication when the promised bill relating to the denturists will be brought before this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything other than what I have indicated on three or four different occasions and that is that we hope to have the bill ready for this session.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Would the minister be good enough then to assure the House that he will sit down and consult with the denturists before bringing such a bill before the House?

MR. H. COLLINS: We have already done it.

MR. NOLAN: Will you do it again?

MR. H. COLLINS: Well -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. It arises out of the situation at Grand Falls where, as I understand it, the Chamber of Commerce and a number of other bodies have sent quite strong telegrams to the Premier, and I guess to a number of other officials and people in public life, including me: My question is this, Sir, can the Premier tell us whether there is any hope that work will begin this year on the expansion of the Central Newfoundland Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is, Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the Premier tell us whether the government will be

MR. ROBERTS: in a position to outline quickly and shortly whether they will be able to undertake to begin this work next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition well knows that next year is another year and another budget. There are quite a few demands for hospital extensions and new hospital construction in the Province. They are all needed. Some are more prepared to go ahead than others, but the fact is, Sir, that any hospital construction or extension in this Province will not be going ahead until such time as the Province can afford to pay for it.

MR. ROBERTS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier says next year is another budget year. Of course. But it is also - we have the much wanted planning effort and the planning effort certainly looks forward a year or two or three. The Premier said, now this is my question, that hospital construction cannot go ahead until we can afford it, which is a stunning insight into the obvious. Can he tell us whether the government have any plans or belief that the financial situation of the Province in the coming fiscal year will be such that the Province can undertake this expansion of the Central Newfoundland Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is that at this particular point in time I do not think it would be fair to make a guess. The Leader of the Opposition says it is a stunning insight into the obvious. It is also obvious that decisions made in the past were stunning without the proper planning for them.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, such is the promise to build a hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. member for _

PREMIER MOOPES: You turned more sods in 1971.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not turn any. I did not turn any.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly who I should direct this question to, whether it is the Minister of Manpower or the President of Treasury Board, but they can make up their minds when I have asked the question.

MR. DOODY: I cannot hear the question.

MR. LUSH: I started by saying I do not know whether I should ask the question to the hon. Minister of Manpower or to the Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board, but they can make up their minds. It relates to the Waterford dispute and I am wondering now whether or since both sides have agreed on a mediator whether the strike will remain in effect during the mediation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Both sides have indeed agreed on a mediator. The mediator has not agreed on both sides as yet and we are awaiting to hear from him whether or not he will accept the job.

MR. NEARY: Who is the mediator?

MR. DOODY: It would be inappropriate to announce the gentleman's name because there is a possibility that he may not accept although our indications were, in conversations with him yesterday, that he was quite enthusiastic about the -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Taylor?

MR. DOODY: That name strikes a bell. He appeared to be quite interested in the job and although he is involved in a negotiation process now he wanted twenty-four hours to see if he could clear his calendar and see how quickly he could get here and he will let

MR. DOODY: us know today being part of the twenty-four hours.

With respect to whether or not the people will go back to work while the mediation process proceeds, the answer to that unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, is no and this is why government was so reluctant to get involved in the mediation. We feel that it could very well be an unproductive exercise since the mediation -

MR. LUSH: It is not binding.

MR. DOODY: It is not binding on either side and the strike will continue. The people will still be on the street. The financial position will not improve for them but that is the course that the union wanted to take. We rejected mediation at the beginning and opted for arbitration. The union refused

MR. DOODY: arbitration, so in an attempt to get the strike settled we thought that this was the only opening that there was and when it was presented to us we grabbed at it.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: To the hon. minister. When the terms of reference were being drawn up, Mr. Speaker - now it was already indicated to us here yesterday in answer to the same type of question that one of the terms of reference was that the gentleman, the mediator, would travel, possibly outside the Province, to make comparisons of facilities and standards, and you have already indicated that the strikers would not go back to work while mediation was in progress - would not this type of terms of reference have the effect of prolonging the strike and is that type of terms of reference necessary? Would the minister explain to us why that particular term of reference was necessary when in itself it will have the effect of prolonging that strike?

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

MR. DOODY: Any mediation process or arbitration process for a strike such as that at Waterford would have to have some standard or norm for comparison purposes. The mediator or arbitrator, whichever of the two course were proceeded with, would of necessity have to compare conditions in other like institutions before he could decide whether or not the people at Waterford were indeed justified in their demands, their claims. Since there is no comparable institute in Newfoundland, it follows then we would have to look at these institutions which are in other Provinces.

MR. DOODY: This will take some time, there is no question about it, and the strike will continue while this goes on. This was pointed out very clearly to the union negotiators at the time as one of the reasons why we felt that the mediation process was not necessary. It was even suggested to them that perhaps they would consider going back to work while the process was ongoing, and if indeed they rejected the mediators proposals then they could exercise the strike weapon again and go back on the picket lines, but they opted to stay on the picket lines until the mediator reported. In order to get a meaningful report, as I say, it is going to be necessary to compare the conditions in other institutions.

It is unfortunate. If it could be done in two days it would be fine. If it can be done in two weeks it would be fine. The more quickly it can be done the better, obviously, but it is going to take some time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Lapoile followed by the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. With industries moving out of Quebec, or alleged to be moving out of Quebec, would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if there have been any enquiries to this Province in connection with industries that want to relocate and move out of the Province of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: We have not gone soliciting that sort of move, Mr. Speaker, because I think Quebec's situation is far too serious to fool around with that sort of thing. But we have been contacted by some companies, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier be in a position to identify these companies, or is it private and confidential information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very unfair to mention the names of the companies because they may or may not have made decisions as yet, and they may have to live in Quebec or they may, in fact, be moving. I think it would be, not only a breach of confidence, but I think it would be wrong in just about every respect to do it until - it is private business between those companies if we just happen to have them contact us to advise us.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir. Would the Hon. the Premier indicate if the government, the administration have set up any kind of a fact-finding committee, or a special committee to study the Quebec situation in the event that two or three years from now the Province of Quebec votes to opt out of Confederation and what the impact will be on this Province, and how we can cope with the situation at that time, if it should arise?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that every Province in Canada, collectively and individually, are doing everything possible to try to keep Quebec in Canada. At the same time, of course, part of the study that will come out of any of these sort of programmes, or planning, or negotiations, or discussions or what ever they happen to be, anything that came out of those would obviously lead to the information like the hon. member is talking about.

PREMIER MOORES: Unfortunately, Sir, I would
say there is a great deal of work being done in that
regard in every Province in Canada, as I say, collectively
and individually. I think the object

PREMIER MOORES:

of even that exercise is to do everything possible to keep Quebec in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In view of the fact that the night before last the residents of St. Thomas voted that they wanted to have their own council within their own community, in view of the fact that the people of Kilbride have indicated the same thing and to the best of my knowledge the people of Hogan's Pond are looking at the same situation, can the minister now show us as to whether he will give ministerial approval to honour the wishes duly recorded in the communities of the people concerned or will he refuse their request?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, with respect to Kilbride, I have talked to the committee and I will be talking to them again. They are not adamant about incorporation on their own. Their circulated petition was with respect to whether they would get their own incorporation or become part of an expanded city.

MR. NOLAN: Correct.

MR. DINN: They had no objection, or the committee did not, to becoming part of, say, a regional government. So we are still discussing that. With respect to St. Thomas and Hogan's Pond, I discussed with the committee but I have not heard from the people of Hogan's Pond.

MR. DOODY: Did you get any reference from Ottawa?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, their council speaks for them.

MR. DOODY: Ottawa will be in touch.

MR. DINN: So I would like to hear from the people of Hogan's Pond. And with respect to St. Thomas, there will be ongoing discussions with the committees from St. Thomas and St. Phillips.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural Development. About two weeks ago I asked the minister if he would give me some figures, or give the House some figures showing the number of repossessions by the Rural Development Authority for last year and how they compared with this year. I wonder could the minister tell me what time I may expect to get these figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Could the member tell me the answer I gave him?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, the answer was that you would produce them -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: - you would produce them.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: When?

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister said in answer to another question a couple of days ago that he would have them in a couple of days. Can the minister indicate when he will have these figures?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I told the member once that I would have them when the estimates are debated which should happen next week, the week after.

MR. FLIGHT: Why, why does it take so long?

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps this may not be supplementary, but it is on the same topic, it concerns rural development. Would the minister indicate whether or not he thinks that the reason that the Department of Rural Development is working so ineffectively is because it is very, very similar to a crown corporation and most crown corporations are noted for their inefficiencies?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Before the hon gentleman replies, apart from the reasons suggested by the hon. member himself for its being

MR. SPEAKER: out of order, it was also argumentative. Hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that we need more authority in Rural Development. The minister needs more authority and we have a bill before the House right now indicating exactly that and he should get together with his hon. Leader of the Opposition, who indicates that there is too much autonomy, authority and efficiency in decision making in the department. So if they can get on the one wave length perhaps we will get a little direction as to how they are going to handle the bill which is before the House at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot have a supplementary to an out of order question and an out of order answer! A question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can you answer it without getting into debate?

MR. ROBERTS: Well only the Minister of Rural Development could answer an out of order question because his answers are out of order anyway. Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. Could he tell us, please, the situation with respect to Flowers Cove and the proposals for the Public Health Center there? I have asked him during the estimates debate and he was not able to answer in the sense that he did not have enough time to deal with it. But are we going to go ahead and get some work done at Flowers Cove this year? We were told last year by the minister that Flowers Cove was number two on the priority list with Trepassey being number one. Trepassey has had the new facility provided, there is money in the estimates this year. Can we have an assurance that the start will be made at Flowers Cove this year?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a question during the debate on the estimates but he was not in the House. He got up and asked a question and took off somewhere. Exactly what the position is I am not sure, but I will get the information for the hon. member. But I know that some things will be done at Flower's Cove this year -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I did not get the answer in my notes either, or in the estimates either.

MR. COLLINS: - in terms of a new doctor's residence, which is one of the top priorities. We are dealing with the IGA. The planning is just about completed there, I believe, for the facility but we are in discussions with the IGA who after all operate that particular station.

MR. ROBERTS: They are willing to operate it but is the hon. minister going to build it? .

MR. COLLINS: I am sure the IGA are, and they will do a good job I am pretty sure as well. But I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: What they need is the money.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! 501(01). The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, just to finish a few points last night put forward by the member for Terra Nova, he asked about the teacher's negotiations - that is the NTA, I assume? That has been signed between the NTA and within the past week or two so that is a signed document now. And he also brought up the point of notice of negotiations, the hon. member for Terra Nova brought up about the fact whether there was any lee time in negotiations by law. Not more than sixty and not less than thirty days notice must be given by one side or the other, either labour or management, in order to initiate discussions on the

MR. ROUSSEAU: new collective agreement. So it cannot be more than sixty days or it cannot be less than thirty days, and normally if there are any problems the union or management will write the department and we certainly will look into it.

Last night, and I do not want to take up the time of the committee but I think it is important and I am prepared to table these, last night I referred to some correspondence we have had with Mr. Cullen in Ottawa in respect to unemployment insurance and the CNTP programme. I do not know whether hon. members want me to read in the province's position on unemployment that was forwarded but I am prepared to table it. I do not right now have Mr. Cullen's reply but it will be up sometime in the next hour or so and I am prepared to table that, too. Basically, if I may, just the four main points of this Province in respect to the new unemployment regulations were these: Number one, that they retain the present benefit qualification period of eight weeks in insurable employment; Two, provide for flexibility in defining the fishing season where the normal season is affected by ice or adverse weather; Three, improve the present inequitable provisions which prohibit wives who work as regular crew members on vessels operated by their husbands from availing of unemployment insurance benefits, and four, amend the provisions dealing with weekly income averaging for fishermen by removing or raising the \$200 weekly ceiling because of course with the short period the amounts may fluctuate. That letter was dated 1977-03-01 (March 1, 1977) but I do have a reply and it is on the way and I will table that. That purely is our position on unemployment insurance.

I have another letter here to Mr. Cullen dated March 16th and Mr. Cullen's reply of April 22nd in which we raise a number of points, some of which were included in the comments I made last night in respect to the CNTP programme. The fact that the training days had been decreased from 718,000 in 1975-76 to approximately 590,000 this year, we raised that point last night

MR. ROUSSEAU: and the letter is here. And also the point about the DMI - UIC programme where we suggested last night that people on unemployment insurance went to training school, were paid their unemployment and were topped up with Federal funds. They have recently, in the reply here Mr. Cullen suggests and it is indeed fact, that he will be forwarding about \$140,000 extra this year to clue up that programme by June 30th. We had hoped it was a pilot project, ^{we} had hoped it would continue, but apparently the Federal Government is not in a position to do so.

MR. LUSH: On that pilot project, was it just for the Province or just for -

MR. ROUSSEAU: It was

MR. ROUSSEAU: just for this province, but we understood that if it was successful that it possibly could be implemented across Canada, but apparently the Federal Government thought not and probably they have more important functions they find for the funds. I also of course make reference - it is a three page letter here and I will table that, and I will also table Mr. Cullen's reply. I only have one copy of these. Maybe the officers of the House could provide copies. A couple of points by the way on the, just if I may, points from the hon. member for LaPoile last night. I was very interested in his comments on workers as shareholders - I am trying to remember last night - I mentioned the West Germany one, which is the one I think he was referring to. It is a very interesting situation. Of course, it is not a government prerogative to order shareholders to become - or order companies to have members as shareholders, but I think there is no doubt about the question. These were points that were raised by the hon. member for LaPoile last night. It certainly is something that does make industry operate on a much more smooth basis. There is a reluctance to strike. There is a greater productivity because the workers themselves have some stake in the whole operation.

It is certainly a point that I would assume at some point in the future - maybe not in our lifetimes, maybe in our lifetimes - that the idea may spread more to North America, it is in selected places now in certain areas, and also to Canada and hopefully to Newfoundland. It has been successful, I think, where it has been, especially in West Germany and some day -

MR. NEARY: I do not think there is one company in Newfoundland involved in the profit sharing idea. I cannot think of one company in Newfoundland.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. But I think there are companies in Newfoundland - I think one example, and I should spell them out - I think one of the biggest problems I had in 1973-74 when I was Minister of Labour was ERCO. I think it is safe to say from all indications that we have that ERCO has turned itself around into one of the better labour relations situations in the province. I am very pleased with that. A number of companies of

MR. ROUSSEAU: course have good labour relations. A number of companies do not have good labour relations. The hon. member brought up another point maybe just a couple of comments on the tough talking and laying the law down. Of course, what goes on behind closed doors, whether with union or with management, as the hon. member for LaPoile knows who I think acted as minister of labour for years, is a lot different than what might be said publicly. Certainly you do not want to alienate the situation. But what has to be said in fact to either a union or to management, which is based on our advice and our feelings, is certainly said behind closed doors. But I do not think it is a place to wash your linen outside in the news media.

So that is done when it has to be done to both sides, and I think these pretty well answer the comments made last night and any other members who have any other comments we will certainly try and answer those too.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise a few comments as a result of the minister's comments. First of all, I mentioned last evening when talking to this I talked about the obligation of unions to educate people with respect to collective bargaining. I meant to mention the role of the N.T.A. and its bargaining. The N.T.A. is, I do not know whether it is, certainly among the most recent bargaining units to have achieved collective bargaining. I think in the particular union in the last negotiations with government that they certainly showed up as an example as to the kind of work that when we are bargaining for salary increases or wage increases and working conditions and the kind of communication that should go on. I would venture to say that if the N.T.A. had not been so effective that this could have been a very rough situation. I would further say that it would have been very difficult to avoid the strike situation.

But the N.T.A. was communicating with its teachers all the time, by way of communiques and letters and this

MR. LUSH: sort of thing, informing the organization, the teachers throughout the province, what was going on, calling special meetings to let them know again what and how the negotiations were going keeping the membership completely informed. I believe this is the sort of thing that unions have to do is to keep their people informed during the process of negotiations with those things that they can tell their people. I do believe that. And I think it was just a second time, really, for the N.T.A., collective bargaining, the second occasion. I believe that they showed up as a good example of what should be done during the collective bargaining process. But there are some questions I wanted to ask the minister. I mentioned last night - and this, I am certainly a bit academic on this because I do have to read what is said on it - and I remembered while reading the Royal Commission on work stoppages

MR. LUSH: they mentioned there that in several instances that many of the workers, and some of the union people, really did not know in certain situations whether the strike was legal or illegal. They did not know. And some of them, it would appear from the commission, that some of them innocently went on a strike, some of the workers in particular, thinking that it was a legal strike when in essence it was an illegal strike.

Now the commission recommended - I just forget exactly - but they recommended an officer or a one man situation to go around the Province and look into strikes and determine whether they were legal or illegal; Then of course if they were illegal to take the appropriate action, action that is provided in the legislation.

Now I am wondering whether or not in any of the bills, the two bills that the minister contemplates putting before the House, whether there is something of this nature, whether it would be something in the Labour Standards Board or whether there is one man to go around. All right, that is one question. The other one, I am a little bit mystified now with the Minimum Wage Board. In the Labour Standards Bill, I think it was, there was some reference there to the fact that the Labour Standards Board would be looking into the minimum wage situation. And then I recall reading another clause, and I do not know whether that was the Labour Standards or the other one, but I remember reading that the minimum wage - and I am just thinking now out loud, it was my impression that the Labour Standards Board would be given the assignment of looking into wages in the Province or working conditions.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The idea is to have the Labour Standards Board be all encompassing, more so than the Minimum Wage Board.

MR. LUSH: Well then you can deal with that question fully, all right?

So there is some misunderstanding about, let us say, what is the role of the Minimum Wage Board now as opposed to the Labour Relations Board and are they assuming that job and when the bill is passed whether the Minimum Wage Board will disappear. I wanted to ask a question about the UIC but the new UIC bill, the minister said that he was tabling some information with respect to the government's stand on this and the one question - if it is included in the letter that he has tabled, fine - but the question that I wanted to ask was whether or not the minister has made any efforts to find out exactly how this new proposed bill will effect people in Newfoundland. For example, increasing the qualifying period from eight weeks to ten weeks! Before we can condemn that situation outrightly certainly there is certain information we must know. For example, just as a point in question, how many people presently receiving UIC would disqualify under the new one, the ten week period? In other words, how many people are there in Newfoundland who find it difficult to get work for ten weeks?

So I am just wondering whether the minister got that kind of information, these kinds of statistics, that will tell us just how we are affected by this new proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am hoping we can get into an item by item analysis of the estimates, Sir, but before we do there are one or two more matters that I would like to raise while we are on the minister's salary. One has to do, Sir, with the situation in the Province today concerning job opportunities for our skilled people, for our tradesmen.

One time, Mr. Chairman, in Newfoundland, following the Depression years, people had to emigrate to New York and to Boston

MR. NEARY: to find jobs. And as a result of that there was a nucleus of steelworkers built up in New York City, and you will find quite a few Newfoundlanders down around Boston, the Watertown area and Boston, Everett and these places. Then the situation changed after Confederation, with Newfoundlanders looking towards Ontario for the job opportunities. And now today the situation has changed again.

Mr. Neary.

Newfoundlanders are looking towards Alberta for the job opportunities. The skilled tradesmen cannot find employment in this Province. And as I said yesterday, Sir, the tragic part of the unemployment situation in Newfoundland is that fifty per cent of the unemployed are young people between the age of seventeen and twenty-five. The young boys and girls in the galleries today may be interested in hearing that the big problem in Newfoundland today, as far as unemployment is concerned, is the fact that fifty per cent of the unemployed are between the age of seventeen and twenty-five years. And it will not be too long when the group of young people in the gallery today will be in that age bracket, seventeen to twenty-five. And I hope that their teachers, and their parents and the children themselves will look a few years ahead to see just what they are going to do when they do graduate from high school. What will they do? Will they go on to vocational schools? Will they go on to the College of Trades? Will they go on to universities? No doubt quite a few of them will want to further their education. Well, if they do, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that they take a good hard look at the kind of training that they want to get, the kind of training that will get them a job, will get them employment. Because I have been putting this point of view forward, Sir, in this House now, and outside of the House, for the last four or five years, and I can see some changes being brought about. It is a very slow process, but somehow or other, Sir, the people in authority cannot get it through their thick skull yet, that a lot of the training programmes that we are running are obsolete, that we are turning out too many of this, too many of that. We are piling up electricians, we are piling up welders, and there are no jobs, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUSH: And plumbers.

MR. NEARY: And plumbers. And there are no jobs. And pipefitters. And there are just no jobs for these kind of trades. We are stockpiling them, whereas in more sophisticated types of work there is a demand. So the young people should examine the situation very carefully before they decide the career upon which they wish to embark before

Mr. Neary.

the pick their vocation in life to make sure that it is a wise decision, that they are just not going to be stampeded or herded into university, because some academic said, "Well, if you get a piece of paper from the University, you got her made!" When in actual fact, as I said yesterday, we have in Canada, we have B.A.'s stockpiled. We have enough B.A.'s to last us for the next ten years if they never graduated another one. We have enough for the next ten years! And we have enough M.A.'s so we are told by the staticians, we are told by the experts - we have enough M.A.'s for the next fifteen years. And we have a backlog of Ph.D's. They are piled up.

MR. POUSSEAU: Do you know what Ph.D means? They are piled higher and deeper.

MR. NEARY: Piled high -

MR. POUSSEAU: Piled higher and deeper.

MR. NEARY: Piled higher and deeper. That is right. Piled higher and deeper. That is right, Sir. So we have a surplus.

So do not fall into the trap of having somebody talk you into something because they want to keep the enrollment up at the university, or they want to keep the enrollment up in this institution or that institution and you have the lobbying going on - to go into this type of training or that type of training. Be realistic and get involved in the type of training that will almost assure you of a bright future, and not be put on the shelf, not become disillusioned with our system, and with the educational system. Once you graduate and you go out in the world, work hard and get a certificate, get a training and go out in the world, and then only to find that you cannot find a job whereas right around you there are all kinds of job opportunities that nine chances out of ten we have to import people from the mainland to fill.

Mr. Neary.

I had a clipping on my desk here. I cannot find it right now. But it is here somewhere. I had a clipping yesterday, I was going to bring it to the minister's attention. Iron Ore Company of Canada advertising over in Nova Scotia for tradesmen, for electricians, for welders, for mechanics.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can only say to you that they are available in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: They are available in Newfoundland. That is exactly the point I am making.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If IOC happens to hire them from outside, they are going to be in for big trouble .

MR. NEARY: Well they are, Sir. They have an ad - I am sure I got it here somewhere if I can only -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I believe you. I believe you.

MR. NEARY: I will have it for the minister shortly. I had it here yesterday, whatever I did with it. Iron Ore Company of Canada advertising in mainland newspapers for tradesmen when

Mr. Neary:

we have record unemployment in this Province, when we have tradesmen who are unemployed. I do not know if our people will not go to work in Labrador City or what the problem is. I am sure the pay is pretty good. Maybe the attitudes again have to be changed. But I asked the minister a question some time ago about IOC recruiting skilled workers and tradesmen in Europe and the minister wrote me back and said "There is nothing in writing pertaining to the importation of European workers by the Iron Company of Canada, and there was no exchange of correspondence. However, officials of both departments have been in close consultation with each other on this matter." Well my advice to the minister in future is to put it in writing.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is now in writing.

MR. NEARY: Well I am glad to hear it is now in writing, Sir. Put the objections in writing and then they cannot weasel out of it.

And, Mr. Chairman, talking about the out-migration, I think somebody mentioned, I believe the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) was talking about the number of people leaving this Province. And as I mentioned a few moment ago, they are now looking to Alberta for employment, and I do not know if our people are just going out there on a temporary basis, that they will go out and work and then come back home in the Wintertime, or if they are moving their families out there. Perhaps the minister could get some statistics from Canada Manpower.

But the House may be interested in knowing the answer to a question, Question No. 112, that I put on the Order Paper back in February, I asked the minister, and I thank the minister for the answer, what is the estimated out-migration of Newfoundlanders to other provinces of Canada during the calendar year 1976? Answer: The following are preliminary figures from population estimates and the projection division, Statistics Canda, and on subject to change- 1975-1976, Immigration, that is 'i', Immigration, plus 995. Emigration 'e', minus 2,200. Net interprovincial 800. So the net migration was

Mr. Neary:

a minus 400. So in actual fact when people had moved into the Province, people had moved out of the Province, the next result of that at the end of the year was that Newfoundland was minus 400. That may be a very significant figure, because my understanding was that it was much heavier than that, much greater.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We had a zero net a couple of years ago.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I remember, I checked with somebody in Statistics Canada for the year before, and I believe we had a plus, by the way, it was not a minus, it was a plus.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think it was zero then, followed by the other one, I do not know.

MR. NEARY: But 1975-1976 there was only a loss of 400 people from this Province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: These would be by your province of residence as of 31st. of December.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would assume those figures would be based on your province of residence as of the 31st. December probably.

MR. NEARY: Well that is probably true. The figures indicate that between June 1, 1975 and May 31, 1976 the Province had a net loss of 400 persons. This figure is not exact since emigration and interprovincial have to be estimated. In other words, there are no statistics, It would be hard to keep statistics on that sort of thing.

So that is very interesting, Sir, that so far in that particular year we lost 400 people, which would indicate to me that the workers are leaving this Province and leaving their families behind. Because they cannot find employment in Newfoundland they are forced to go to other provinces, the Great Lakes, Alberta, the Tar Sands, Ontario, trawlers and so forth in Nova Scotia, So Newfoundlanders are just leaving and coming back again-I presume they are going back and forth, they come back on vacation, they come back when they get their holidays in the Wintertime, Christmas and so forth - and I would like for the minister to tell us if that is so or if the minister

May 6, 1977

Tape 2297

Pk - 3

Mr. Neary:

thinks that families are pulling up roots. And I think that would be a tragedy, Sir, if that was happening,

MR. NEARY: because we have to keep our tradesmen, our skilled men, we have to keep our good people in this Province. We need these people to help us develop the Province, especially the fishing industry.

I know, Mr. Chairman, I did a little research some time ago on the number of people unemployed in my hon. friend's district. Everybody looks upon Labrador West as being a prosperous area. I do not remember the figures but they were quite high. I was staggered at the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: 1,000 or 1,200.

MR. NEARY: Yes, over 1,200 people unemployed in Labrador West, right where you have this Iron Ore Company of Canada advertising on the Mainland for tradesmen. Why do they not run their own apprenticeship programme and train the young people right there in Labrador City and Wabush? I know they have a pretty good apprenticeship programme. I know what the Minister is going to say. Oh yes, they have a programme. Well it is not enough as far as I am concerned. It should be bigger and better than it is and they should not have to bring one worker in from outside of this Province to work in Labrador City, especially go to Europe recruiting.

Another example, Sir, is my own district of LaPoile, which is a fairly prosperous area of this Province as hon. gentlemen know. But in the Manpower Office in Port aux Basques there are 1,208, one thousand two hundred and eight men and women registered for employment. And a lot of these, Mr. Chairman, are in the category that I mentioned, young people between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five who cannot find employment in that particular area.

Now this would indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, that both levels of government are going to have to embark upon more

MR. NEARY: upgrading programmes, more training programmes and more re-training programmes for the young people in these areas that I am speaking about, and I do not think the minister will disagree with that. That either has to be done by the Province or Canada Manpower. Canada Manpower has the machinery, the resources to do it, and they should be doing more of this on a local level, especially to zero in on the young people. And as I said yesterday, the Province should have counsellors to go out around this Province. That is why I was disappointed that the Minister of Industrial Development took a negative attitude to my suggestion yesterday about getting the experience, getting the on the job training so that young people can get permanent employment, because the big problem they have is when they go to look for a job they say, "You do not have the experience." Well how do they get the experience if they do not get a job? And so what I am saying is the Government of Canada, Canada Manpower, the Provincial Government should work out a scheme whereby employers would be subsidized to give young people the initial experience they need to find employed.

Now that programme is already in place, as the minister indicated, to a certain degree, but it is not used enough to my liking. And the minister should set up - it would be very worthwhile, this is a positive idea - counsellors in the minister's department to go around this Province and indoctrinate employers into taking advantage of this programme. Because right now, Sir, I am afraid that from a lot of employers you get a negative reaction because of the red tape that is involved. Because they are afraid of it, they are afraid that Canada Manpower might come in and look at their books, that Canada Manpower will force them to become involved in all kinds of letter writing, filling out forms and this sort of thing. And so employers are discouraged to a certain degree, employers are somewhat discouraged from getting in

MR. NEARY: more and more into this programme.

But I think the Province should encourage employers around this Province to get in with both feet and get our young people on the job, because after all Canada Manpower will pay sixty per cent of the cost. Maybe the provincial government can throw in a few dollars. I do not know. But certainly, Sir, it would be a worthwhile project for the minister to undertake, to have counsellors going around helping employers make out the applications and by-pass the red tape and get cracking on this, because I checked on the number of applications and it is not enough as far as I am concerned. There are not enough people involved in this Province in on the job training. The money is there, sixty per cent from the Government of Canada, and it is not being utilized to the maximum degree as far as I am concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, with these few remarks I hope the minister, when the minister responds, that we can get into an item by item analysis of the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

Mr. Rousseau:

Mr. Chairman, first of all I will probably go to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I certainly agree with the very wise comments he made to pupils in the gallery, I think there is another side to the story too, you know, that education is not unnecessary, A few of us here have had to have the training necessary, I was a teacher and a school principal before I entered politics, and the training obviously - as was the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. W. House) and the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) and a few other members of the House - of course training is necessary. I do not look upon my degrees as superfluous, but I certainly know that within the bounds they are there they certainly do not make you all-knowing. But I certainly would agree with the member in suggesting to the students in the gallery that the university is not always the only answer, that there are other honourable jobs in society besides sitting behind a desk, Every job is an honourable job as long as you approach it in the right way and do an honest day's work.

A few of the points raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, the job opportunities for skilled tradesmen now are difficult to come by and people are moving, but I think it is fair to say that they are moving temporarily. Newfoundland is Newfoundland to Newfoundlanders, and they will always come home if the jobs are here. Certainly the statistics show that the majority of people unemployed and the problems we are having are with those in the age bracket of seventeen to twenty-five.

In speaking about the unemployment situation in my own district of Western Labrador, Labrador City and Wabush, where one is very surprised to find these numbers, that indeed the greater number of people unemployed of those numbers were people in the age bracket from seventeen to twenty-five. Now a few months ago I brought

Mr. Rousseau:

up a task force from Federal and Provincial Manpower in the hope to get involved with this industrial training programme, which is the other aspect of the institutional training programme we have with the Federal Government, the trade school, the College of Trades and so on, the institutional, but we have this year \$2.25 million - you know, we might be able to fight and get a few dollars more - but \$2.25 million is allocated for this sort of industrial training in the Province whereby employers can have people come to work in a job training opportunity, because we believe, as does the Federal Department of Manpower, that in order to have mobility, and we are not encouraging people to leave the Province, or leave their area in which they live, but we have to be realistic and if there are jobs in other areas we must give them some degree of skills in order to make them somewhat mobile. And this certainly is a programme by which they could acquire some mobility.

The hon. member - it was very interesting, by the way, that he brought up some questions about apprenticeship, and rightly so. And I have some figures here probably that may not be asked in the details, so I will just give them now. We have a number of Manpower Training Apprenticeship Officers across the Province .

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. NEARY: We have six Manpower Training Officers in St. John's and they cover the Avalon Peninsula, about 1,370 people involved in that, the Bonavista Peninsula about 60, and the Burin Peninsula about 70 people in which they are doing manpower training consultative work, There are two in Grand Falls, 370 from Gambo to Buchans including the Baie Verte Peninsula and Bay d'Espoir. We have three in Corner Brook, which includes 430 people that we are dealing with from Deer Lake West to Port aux Basques; and we have one in Labrador City who has ten people in Goose Bay, thirty in Churchill Falls and 650 in Labrador City and Wabush. And these are some numbers that

Mr. Rousseau:

may be of interest to the hon. member.

It is our intention in the Fall-by the way, we already have had funds approved for it; it is one contract that is going to go ahead,in case the hon. Leader of the Opposition is listening- but we have called a conference on Manpower Training and Certification. And it is this government's intention to begin to evolve a better programme of apprenticeship training and to make it very desirable for employers in this Province to participate in it because we think that some of the companies in this Province have not entered the spirit of apprenticeship training,as the hon. member for LaPoile suggested. So we are going to have a conference,as we did with Occupational Health and Safety last Fall,with Manpower Training and Certification in the Fall and that will look at consolidating and changing and modifying the existing

Mr. Pousseau.

legislation on apprenticeship training, because if we have to tell people that it is their responsibility and duty as corporate citizens of this Province to enter into the spirit of the programme, then we are going to have to do that. We would hope that it should not have to be done, but apparently from the figures given they are certainly not near the number. Some of the larger companies in the Province have very, very small apprenticeship programmes. And when you are considering sixty per cent of the cost of the salary being paid, up to seventy-five for handicapped people, then there can be very little excuse why more people are not taking advantage of the programme. I can assure the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I can assure the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and I can assure the people of this Province that if the Iron Ore Company of Canada hires one man outside this Province where there is somebody available in this Province for the job, then I think - I do not think the Iron Ore Company of Canada would do it. I can stand here and unequivocally say that I doubt very much they would do it, because we have had a number of discussions, and I think they know the views of this government.

I would like, if I may by the way, to read a letter just to give an indication of this government's position. There was a contract called on the Holyrood generating station. It was won by a company called Collavino which I do not mind mentioning. It was a new company to the Province. I wanted a local company, but obviously when the engineering company looked at the specifications and evaluated the tender, Collavino was the low tender. Collavino had registered in the Province. Besides getting a contract, Cabinet approved that before the contract was let there were certain conditions that would have to be met and attached to the contract. And these were the conditions as a result of a meeting that I had with the principals of the

Mr. Pousseau.

company. "I wish to confirm the understanding which we reached during a meeting in my office on the 10th. January, 1977 at which time you made a firm commitment in respect to employment and conditions of hiring to be followed by your company in carrying out a contract at the Holyrood generating station. You made the following commitments as a prerequisite to the granting of the contract to your company. Number one, with the possible exception of three managerial employees, that is the project manager, the superintendent and the general superintendent " - which is their senior management.- "your company will hire all Newfoundland labour. Number two, in the case of any subcontract for any part of the job, your company will make it a firm condition upon the subcontractor that only Newfoundland labour will be hired. Number three, your company agrees to recruit through the Building and Construction Trades Council of Unions ; and number four, there can be no exception to one and two above except by agreement with the Building and Construction Trades Council of Unions and on the clear understanding that local workmen are unavailable." That is our position simply put. And that position not only holds for that company, but as far as I am concerned, and as far as this government is concerned, that any company who works in this Province has a responsibility and a duty to hire , where available, Newfoundland labour. Certainly it appears to be available now on all fronts.

MR. LUSH: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, sure.

MR. LUSH: I am just wondering what the situation is with respect to federal projects. I know the hon. minister alluded to that some time ago. I am quite concerned about that with respect to the Terra Nova National Park. You know, it is a very dicey situation. The question I am asking is whether or not the minister has had any complaints about federal projects, whether they have done anything with respect to it, and if so to what extent?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member is worried. So is the hon. minister here worried, because this same company, I think, is the low tender on the Wabush Industrial Park, and we cannot make the same demands with respect to federal-provincial funds, because obviously the federal government argues, and rightfully so from their viewpoint, that the money that is going in is Canadian money, not Newfoundland money.

I remember when I was Minister of Forestry and Agriculture when we asked in our mapping programme and so on whether we could give ten per cent preference to local people and they said no. There was no question at all in the federal government's mind that this is Canadian money and it cannot be restricted. But we would hope that the same company which has this job in Holyrood from the provincial point of view and is now going to work on a federal-provincial job will not be inconsistent with this policy on a provincial basis. But I will tell you one person, and this government will not forget it the next time it comes around. That is the only sort of thing you can do. But that is the feeling of government. Now a few things mentioned by the hon. member - I think that covers the points raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Of course, the NTA's role in bargaining is quite recent, and I think quite a good role. There is a situation of course in it as

MR. ROUSSEAU: well, I mentioned this morning that the contract had been signed, I think the hon. member understands that there is a situation in Western Labrador which was excluded from the provincial bargaining in which the local bargaining takes place because of course the school board up there are augmented by company funds.

MR. LUSH: What is the particular reason for that? It is probably decey.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, it is a dicey reason. They made a request to me and I brought it to government and government considered it in this situation, a special set of circumstances because really the schools up there are funded to a great deal by the company.

MR. NOLAN: How about Churchill Falls? Are they under the Labrador West or under the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, they have their own. That was a private school board, but it is not now. It was in those days. Yes, they have played a role and I think it is an emerging situation. I know in the last year or two since the NTA Collective Bargaining Act came out there are certain anomilies in it and we have been working with the NTA in respect to changing the act, as you do with every new act, the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, any new act that is brought into the legislature, but especially one as comprehensive as an act dealing with labour or some other aspects of government, that there are shake-out periods and certain changes have to be made. We have been discussing that with the NTA.

The hon. member also asked, "When is a strike legal or illegal?" It is a very simple rule of thumb that where there is a collective agreement in effect that any strike that occurs between the effective date and the termination date is illegal. Now that decision, if there is any question, is made by the courts. Recently we had representation from the Labour Management Committee

MR. ROUSSEAU the provincial committee which is funded by the provincial government consisting of representatives of labour and management, in which they made some recommendations which government has accepted and will be reflected, as I told the hon. member in some of our private conversations, that there are some changes now to the Labour Relations Bill as it was printed last year. One of the changes will be an enlarged role for the Labour Relations Board, a much enlarged role.

But one of the requests made was that the Labour Relations Board have the right to declare a strike illegal or legal and that was one thing that we did not accept. We think that that should, at this point in time, remain with the courts. And the Labour Relations Board, although having broader powers in the new act, will not be responsible to declare whether a strike is legal or illegal and accordingly that will remain with the courts. As a rule of thumb, of course, a strike that occurs during the life of a collective agreement is an illegal strike.

The hon. member also mentioned the Minimum Wage Board and Labour Standards Board, and maybe it is confusing now but I am now referring to the Minimum Wage Board because until the Labour Standards Act is proclaimed it is still the Minimum Wage Board. What will in effect happen is that as soon as the act is proclaimed the Minimum Wage Board will go out of existence and the Labour Standards Board will immediately come into existence which is why we have it budgeted for. So probably my use of interchanging the use of Minimum Wage Board and the Labour Standards Board is different. They really are in power to look into all aspect of wages and working conditions and fringe benefits across the Province. And as I suggested last night, they are now in the process of preparing their review of the minimum wage across the Province and I would anticipate by late Spring or early Summer that the advertisements will go in the paper and they will have

MR. ROUSSEAU:

hearings right across the Province and make recommendations on the existing level of minimum wages.

The last point, I think brought up by the hon. member for Terra Nova was a point on Unemployment Insurance. He is wondering what position, of course, we should take, and I mean, we should take as a Province, not as an opposition party or as a government. But I think that we - the original suggestion was twelve weeks and we could not agree with that, and we cannot agree really with ten weeks, and only because, although it is a compromise, Newfoundland stands to gain the maximum under the way it is. But for ten weeks! It is pretty difficult in some instances to get eight weeks employment, especially in some of the seasonal situations and oftentimes, you know, you are asked if the minister, with the people working in the department, if they would put them on another week so that they can get enough stamps. So it is a stretch for eight weeks. That is why we cannot accept the ten week prerequisite. That is a pretty long time. Although a person who has been working - we will qualify for all the maximum extended benefits under the new act. We just feel that eight weeks

MR. ROUSSEAU: for the fishermen, for example, depending on the ice or the season, would be difficult. We feel that wives should be eligible for unemployment insurance. We feel that the \$200 limit is not sufficient because it may be \$1,000, I suppose, or \$1,200 one week and maybe \$200 the next week, because of the vagaries of the fishing industry.

But I think that Mr. Cullen at least has reacted to his own caucus and to the Opposition in the House of Commons and also to the various representations across Canada and has attempted to modify it, and while it is not what we want it is certainly at least a step in the right direction.

MR. NEARY: It could be worse.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, it could be worse. The ten weeks are not satisfactory. We still maintain that it should be eight weeks, that is as difficult as it can be. It will have an effect in this Province undoubtedly. But the other counterbalance is the fact that the money saved is supposed to go into the Province, so I am certainly hopeful that it will. The only question we have there in a point we would bring up to the federal government is this, that if the money goes into the Province then the Provincial Government would like to have some input into what the priorities are as well. Because we have down in Manpower, you know, a number of projects that we think as a priority basis would be good if the money was available.

We researched the projects that were involved in the Forestry, Tourism and Social Services project - and the Rural Development or the - the three of them anyway, the three resource departments and we have a list down there of priorities which we think would be job creation projects and if the money was available we would make those available. We have discussed them with the federal government and in the letter that I have tabled now, that is available, Mr. Cullen has indicated that he will certainly welcome interchange between the provincial and federal government because it becomes

MR. ROUSSEAU: very difficult when things are done not according to a priority and the provincial government thinks one thing, and the federal government thinks another. So maybe in the months and the years to come we could have a better co-operation in that matter in respect to the federal-provincial negotiations on this term of make-work projects.

MR. LUSH: Another factor too I think with it is the extent to which employers gauge their work around the qualifying period. You know, I think that is something that you cannot prejudge.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You cannot prejudge again. Yes, there are certain difficulties. I would think, as Mr. Cullen has now indicated to me, that Mr. Cullen could, sometime when the House closes, within two or three weeks after the House closes I think, we will probably sit down and discuss it. And I have to say again I found him to be co-operative. You know I am going to fight - or the government are going to fight to the best they can for this Province. Obviously he has his job to do too and I am not prepared at all to condemn him. I was disappointed that he could not have the meeting that we had here scheduled and that is referred to in the letter. But the new Director, by the way, of Manpower for the Province, Jerry Everard, has been most co-operative with us and we are very pleased with the co-operation he has extended to this Province and we feel a man who really understands this Province, and hopefully the officials of the Provincial Department of Manpower and the Federal Department of Manpower will continue that co-operation, and if they do I can only see bright things ahead in respect to the area of Manpower.

MR. LUSH: I do not want to put the minister on the spot, but with respect to the principle of the UIC, that is make it that we do see the qualifying periods for areas where the unemployment rate is highest - and I understand this is only a three year period too, is it not? If this

MR. LUSH: is the new proposal what would be the government's official position on that? Do they think that is the method by which it should be done, or did they press that it probably be the permanent arrangement that UIC benefits be extended, that qualifying period would vary according to the unemployment rate in a particular area?

MR. ROUSSEAU: This is the point we are making. At this point in time with as many unemployed people - we wish that we had zero unemployment, which is unrealistic - but when it comes down to a point sure, we will pay our way that way in Canada; but right now with so many people unemployed, and because of the type of industry we have in this Province you cannot judge Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia or Alberta as you would judge this Province. And that is where the problems come.

Now it is difficult for the Federal Manpower people, of course, and UIC people to have 1500 different sets of rules for all across Canada, and we have been sort of lumped in with the Atlantic Provinces, which is generally the same but there are particular and specific differences. We are not nearly as industrialized as Nova Scotia. Prince Edward Island is mostly a tourism and agricultural area. So there are differences

Mr. Rousseau:

within the region. But I accept the fact that, you know, you cannot have too many sets of rules, but during a period of high unemployment which we have in this Province we think that then special consideration should be given to a given area, region or a province or a number of provinces.

So I think that answers the questions put forward by the hon. members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I take it we are still on the minister's head and the reason I rise now is because I am not quite sure what head to speak to with respect to the two points that I wish to raise. And one is the difficulty of getting jobs in this Province, or being terminated with the Department of Transportation and Communications, and the other one is the difficulty of getting employment, period, because of the fact that you are not in a particular union. And I do not know whether this would come under Labrador Standards - or the head of Labour Standards, or the heading Labour and Industrial Relations, but I will raise the two points now in the Committee stage on the minister's vote.

Mr. Chairman, a great number of my constituents, and I know other members of the House or the Committee have this problem, individuals are being laid off or their work is being terminated in the Department of Transportation and Communications. Some of these individuals have had long years of service with the Department of Transportation and Communications, and in some cases individuals who have been with that department for only one or two years are kept on whereas people who have been with the department for, say, fifteen or sixteen or twenty years have been laid off. And I understand that the reason for it is because either The Employment (Notice of Termination Act) or the Collective Bargaining Act For The Public Service, this is the cause of it.

Let me give the Committee an example, Mr. Chairman. An individual who went with the Department of Highways, say twenty

Mr. Rowe:

years ago, as a labourer or the equivalent of labour, and who has worked himself up in the various stages and, say, has become a shop steward or a heavy equipment operator, has worked himself up but has only been say - let us take the example of the heavy equipment operator - for, say, the last two years; and another individual who came with the Department of Highways - now this individual I am talking about might have been with the Department of Highways for twenty years, and has slowly educated himself through experience or formal training and managed to become in a fairly high category, a foreman, a shop steward or a heavy equipment operator with the department, but only for say the past two years he has had that particular position: another individual comes into the department, or works, gains employment with the Department of Highways or Transportation and Communications and has been, say, a heavy equipment operator for the past five years. Now when the time comes for layoffs, apparently through the union agreement the individual who has more seniority, and has worked with the department for say twenty years but has only had this particular position of heavy equipment operator for two years, is laid off before the individual who has only been with the department for the past five years, say, but in that position as heavy equipment operator. Now I do not know whether it is fair or not, I honestly do not know, you know, where you draw the fairness line there, but I have had a tremendous amount of complaints from my own constituents and I understand other members have had the same types of complaint that people who have had long years of service with the department, or have seniority in the sense of years of service, are being laid off before the individuals who have only been with the department for a short number of years.

And I was wondering if the minister could relate to that particular problem, and if there is any way of rectifying that problem or if, in fact, that system is the fairer system as compared to, say, keeping on the individuals who had long years of service, even though he might have had that particular

Mr. Powe.

category of work with the department for a short number of years. I do not know if the minister is in listening distance now, but I hope that I have made my point clear, and if the minister could relate to it. The other problem, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to raise with the minister - and I hope that he can relate to it, address himself to it - is this whole business of individuals who are trying to get work in this Province, and this is partly a function of the fact that we do have a very high unemployment rate at the present time, but there are many individuals who are qualified carpenters, qualified electricians, qualified plumbers and, you know, qualified skilled workers in other words who are trying to get employment on various job sites. And the reason that they cannot get a job on a particular job site is that they are not a member of a particular union. Now that is reasonable enough, I suppose. Unions have done some good things for their members, and the natural thing that you would think would happen here is that it is just a matter of this individual joining the particular union that he has to join in order to get work as a plumber or an electrician or as another form of a skilled worker. But when that individual, who is not in the union, goes to join the union, he is turned away, I understand. He is turned away.

And I contacted a number of unions - I will not mention the names of the unions - but it is my understanding that unions really now are not - and I would like for the minister to suggest whether this is accurate or not accurate - that many unions in the Province now are just not accepting new members for the simple fact that the number of members that they have - they have a fair number of members in their unions now who they cannot find jobs for. So it would seem to be kind of unreal to accept more members when they have a great backlog of members who are without any employment. But we do have a great number of skilled workers in this Province, Mr. Chairman, who cannot get a job, you know, on the, say, Carbonear Mall or on any other

Mr. Rowe.

project that might be under construction, by virtue of the fact that they cannot get employment for the simple reason that they are not in the union.

Now I would think that a better procedure here would be for the union to accept all qualified, you know, plumbers, electricians and what have you into the unions so that when the opportunity arises or when jobs become available the union is in a position to select or recommend the best qualified people for these particular jobs. Because I am pretty sure, Mr. Chairman, that there are very well qualified people who are shut out of the unions because of that problem, that they got a backlog of unemployed people in the union already, but they may be even more qualified than some of the people who are in the unions at the present time. And it seems to me that the best qualified people should get the jobs when jobs become available - and they are being shut out.

Now I do not know if the minister got that point. I do not want to, you know, drag it out or make politics out of it or get in a rant and roaring mood about it. But these are two problems that I am faced with, and I am sure other hon. members are faced with, day after day after day, this business of - it seems to me that there is something wrong in the union agreement with respect to the Department of Transportation and Communications, that people with seniority who have struggled and worked themselves up to a good position, which they probably only held for two or three years, are laid off, although another person who has only had four years with the department altogether, but have held that position, they are kept on. I do not know whether it is fair or not, but it has come to my attention. I would like the minister to address himself to that first point, and then, of course, the second one, there seems to be a virtual shutout of people trying to join unions although they are in fact extremely well qualified in certain skilled trades.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member has brought up two very pertinent, very important points, and I would like to address myself to both. I will address myself to the first one in as much detail as I can, and maybe the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications may like to enlarge on it. It is indeed a question of seniority. But the important point that the hon. member should remember is this, that seniority prevails only when the two qualities of qualifications and ability are equal. That is theoretical. Whether that indeed happens or not - but that is supposed to happen. Where qualifications and ability are equal then seniority prevails.

MR. ROWE: That is the union's concern, is it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. Yes. But the problem is, as the hon. member suggests, a part of the union agreement. And what happens is this, that a person in each position, because each one is classified - or each classification probably would be a better word, that seniority exists in that classification. But the man who is less senior in that classification may be more senior in a lower classification. That is unfortunate, of course, if a man struggles through two years, five year, or ten years of his life to reach a certain plateau and then finds because of insufficient work or lack of funds on the part of the department that he has to revert to a lower classification in order to maintain his job and presumably a lower pay scale, then it certainly is a most difficult situation to cope with. But the unions who represent the people involved in government services have had that negotiated into the contract, it is part of the contract, and it is an extremely difficult thing once something is in the contract to have it negotiated out.

MR. F. ROWE: If the minister would permit a question, Mr. Chairman: you know, since this problem has arisen, did the union foresee this particular problem and now that the problem has arisen is the union satisfied with it and have they made any representations to change it or are they completely satisfied with the situation as it exists now even though that problem has cropped up?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know, unless the Minister of Transportation has had some particular representations on behalf of the workers of transportation. I have not received them as Minister of Labour, no. But again, you know, no matter what way you do it there is always going to be inequalities and I think the formula that was presumed to be able to take care of that was that the man who did not have seniority in a certain classification could revert to a lower classification, at least enabling him to continue work, albeit at a lower classification and with a lower rate of pay, I guess, in some instances.

MR. ROUSSEAU: So it is an unfortunate circumstance but that is the way the collective agreement reads. And as the hon. member knows once something is in a collective agreement it is very difficult to negotiate it out, and this is the way the - I think the question there is of course all these members, all the working people that the hon. member refers to, are members of the union and if they feel differently about that then the proper people to take it to would be to the union, and then if the union decides at the next set of negotiations that they want to modify that clause in the agreement then of course they will sit down with government and do so. But it is not - you know, a contract is made up with the concurrence of both sides, so it is not a matter for government. You know government could not say to the union, Here is what you are going to do for your workers. I mean, government does not represent the workers; NAPE, or CUPE or whatever union it is represents the workers and it is up to them to get to the union executive and to make their feelings known and if the union executive feels that this is a majority feeling then obviously some changes might be negotiated depending on the position of the union.

The second question is a very interesting one. I have a copy of the Labour Relations Act as it now exists and I will give the hon. member the copy. I have it underlined here if he wants to. Section 6, chapter 191, the Labour Relations Act, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other act when a person (a) is not a member of a union which is a party to a collective agreement but is otherwise qualified for employment by an employer who is party to the collective agreement - is not a member of the union which is party to a collective agreement

MR. ROUSSEAU: but is qualified for employment with a party that is party to the agreement-or (b) applies for membership in a union referred to in paragraph (a), the employer may employ that person notwithstanding any provision of any collective agreement if the union refuses to accept that person into its membership. In other words, the employer does not have to do so. Now the employer may, of course, because he has got good relations with the union, choose not to do so. But the law is there to protect the person who is not a member of the union and again the government cannot force the employer to act under this section of section 6 of the Labour Relations Act.

MR. ROWE: The operative word there is "may".

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh yes, well obviously then it is a - Shall, you know, pretty well makes it government's decision. This is of the employer now, the person still will have to pay union dues. Normally when a person feels very strongly, maybe for religious beliefs -

MR. NEARY: Where you have the Rand formula.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Rand formula, where it is. But obviously persons may have religious beliefs

MR. ROUSSEAU:

that they do not want to become a member of an union movement. I am sure the hon. member for LaPoile and other people employed in labour know that there are people like that across the Province.

MR. NEARY: For religious reasons? Possibly. You do not know.

MR. ROUSSEAU: These people, normally the union says okay but they still pay their dues if the Rand formula is in effect.

MR. ROWE: If the minister will permit, Mr. Chairman, the point that I was getting at is not the business of whether the employer can in fact employ a person who is not in the union. That is what I understand it to be. The employer can in fact -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. ROWE: - although he may decide not to do so, employ a person who is not in the union but is qualified for the job. The question I am getting at is that there are people trying to get into unions - that is my understanding now. I have had constituents come to me and say, "Look I have applied for this job, I am told I have to be in the union. I went to the union and they will not accept me." And the reason being given is that the union had said, "Well look, I am sorry, old man. We have a large number of members in our union who are unemployed and we do not want to add to that. They cannot find work, and we do not want to add to that backlog of unemployed members in our union." And what I am asking the minister is can the union in fact stop a person from joining the union? I guess they can.

MR. NEARY: That is only half correct what you are saying.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right.

MR. NEARY: It is done by mutual agreement between the union and the employers.

MR. ROWE: Oh! Yes, fine.

MR. NEARY: So the employer will not hire you either. You go to the employer and he says, "No, I cannot hire you because we have an

MR. NEARY: agreement with the union.

MR. ROWE: Right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But, you know, there is a number of ways of looking at it. See, unfortunately, the point now, although the point to be brought up at any time, but at this point in time with the economic situation across Canada and across North America like it is of course jobs are scarce. You know, the unemployment problem we have in Newfoundland is not restricted to Newfoundland. You know, it is across Canada and across North America as well, the United States. And at this point in time the union, of course, feels that it has an obligation to the membership that it has. But the hon. member should remember one thing; the union would love to have more dues and enlarge its membership. But it is a dilemma for the union, to protect the members they now have. But as soon as the jobs open I am sure that any union, and mostly we are talking now about the building and construction trades -

MR. ROWE: It is all a function of the unemployment rate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: And the union would love to have everybody on their list working, and take in new membership, because obviously there are higher fees and greater benefits to the union membership. I know the bricklayers and masons, for example, is a small union with a unit here in the Province, just seventeen or twenty members and not a large union, but they have come up themselves with a fantastic benefit programme for their members and also for the dependents of members should anything happen to a member. Because the more people obviously they have on their rolls, the more fees they get, well the more they are going to do from the financial view in support of their membership. So it is a dilemma for the unions. The unions would love to have more membership but they have the other problem, of course, of trying to protect the membership it now has on its rolls. And at this point in time one must remember another thing:

MR. ROUSSEAU: there was no question on that letter I wrote to that gentleman when I said that all hiring will be done through the Building and Construction Trades. And the reason we say that in that letter, and the reason we would hold with that, is that we know the gentlemen who are involved in the executive positions in the Building and Construction trades, and they are not going to stand for non-Newfoundlanders working. In other words, that is another way in which we can ensure that the first people to get jobs will be Newfoundlanders. Before anybody outside this Province comes in, everybody will be off the list in their union halls as to available workers. It is not meant to give them a monopoly. But they are a kind of a monitoring system that will insure that Newfoundland labour, of course, is the content for any job in the Province. So we say that to them. We gave them a closed shop, really, on this job but we know for certain that these people will insure that the content on any job will be wholly and solely from Newfoundland except in instances where an employer can prove to the union that, "Look, you do not have the qualified people," and if that be the case then obviously of course you cannot. If there is work being done in the Province you cannot say you do not hire. If there is nobody qualified and able to do the work here, sure bring somebody else in. But the first preference has to go normally to people in the local area and people in the Province, and that has to be the situation and that certainly is the situation. But it is a dilemma for the union. The union would like to have expanded membership, but it would do no good and I think it is a sense of responsibility on their part. What they are saying to John Smith or Jim Jones is, "Look. It is no good to take your money, I cannot get you a job. I have two or three hundred people unemployed now, so why should I take your union

Mr. Rousseau:

fees when I cannot get you a job?" That could be done as well. Really they would be on the end of again a seniority list, you know, of the term unemployed. So they would take this money and not find work for the people. That would serve no purpose either because the person would only be out of pocket as well as out of a job. So I presume that answers both questions.

If the hon. member would like to have this Act he certainly may have it,

MR. ROWE: What section of the Act was that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Section (6) of the Labour Relations Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Capt. Winsor): Shall 501 carry?

On motion 501 carried.

On motion 502-01 through 502-09-01 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Capt. Winsor): Shall 503- 03-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Capt. Winsor): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Labour Standards Board: Could the minister give us a little rundown now on the activities of this Board - \$11,500; last year there was \$1,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If I might read my notes, there are many questions arise out of that. Now the Minimum Wage Board, as I have explained, will become the Labour Standards Board, The Chairman is Mr. H. T. Renouf, recently appointed within the past three or four weeks, Mr. Andrew Rose, who was the Chairman, took employment with the Workmen's Compensation Board, and, of course, was indirectly an employee of government through the Workmen's Compensation Board, and resigned. The employer representative is Mr. H. W. Duffett, Harold Duffett, I believe, from St. John's, and the employee representative is Frank Taylor, I think, of the Retail Sales and Clerk's Union in the Province. The secretary is Frank McGrath, who is -

MR. NEARY: Labour Standards will do more now than just minimum wages.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, yes. This is what it is now, of course, but this will be expanded on. I will mention this when I get -

MR. NEARY: Will they be the new Labour -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not necessarily.

MR. NEARY: That is not the new Labour Standards procedure?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, no, no that is the Minimum Wage Board.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister have a list of the names of, you know?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

MR. NEARY: Some of these people could very easily go over to the Labour Standards Board -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - but it will be the new board completely?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, it will be a new board, yes.

MR. NEARY: And all the old boards will be incorporated and put under one umbrella?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right, right. Yes.

And obviously we are not, you know, presuming that the Act is going to pass, so I have no names.

MR. NEARY: No, right okay.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But what we normally would do, as we have already done in the past, is to go to employer organizations and employee organizations and ask for representation. So instead of three there will probably be five or seven members with alternate employee and employer representative. The secretary is Frank McGrath, who is a departmental officer. The remuneration is - the secretary has no additional remuneration beyond his voted salary as an employee of government. The term of office, of course, is during pleasure. The principal function is to investigate rates of pay, terms and conditions of employment in any trade, industry or business or occupation in any area of the Province, and to make recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council and to review minimum wage orders at least every two years. The rates of pay for the Chairman, for more than the normal working day, \$200; for a member it is \$140, for a normal working day it is \$150 and \$105; a half day is \$75 and \$50, and less than a half day is \$25, and obviously of course travel expenses

MR. ROUSSEAU:

when they go out from here and so on would also be picked up.

The proposed Labour Standards Act provides for the Labour Standards Board which would be comprised of three persons, a chairman and two members, one representing employees and one representing employers; in addition, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may appoint a vice-chairman and alternate members. The board members and chairman will be acting on a part-time basis and paid per diem wages. The Board is intended to replace the existing Minimum Wage Board but will have a considerably broadened scope which will include authority for recommending regulations on the full range of Minimum Labour Standards as well as reviewing and making recommendations on applications for exemptions from the aspects of the Labour Standards Act.

MR. NEARY: We really got the cart before the horse; we got the money, we do not have -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right. But we are anticipating -

MR. NEARY: - we do not have the authority yet.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We are anticipating sometime before the House closes, I hope this session to have this through.

Before the new Labour Standards Act can be implemented the Board will have to consider regulations under nine parts of the Act and that will be consolidated, of course, in the new Act when it is passed. If an employer supplies its employees with meals, board or lodging, the most he can reduce their wage is below the minimum wage is as follows: per single meals seventy-five cents each, for board and lodgings \$18 a week, for board only \$12.50 a week, and per lodging only \$5.50 a week. In other words, the minimum wage can be taken - the most recent minimum wage order effective the

MR. ROUSSEAU: 20th of February 1976, male and female \$2.50 an hour, overtime \$3.75 an hour after forty-four hours. With respect to shop assistants, that is retail clerks, the overtime rate is \$ 3.75 per hour after eight hours a day or forty hours in a week, and persons employed in domestic service in a private home the rate of wages shall be not less than \$30.00 per week.

MR. LUSH: There is obviously something that I misunderstand here under this head 503. I was just wondering where the vote comes for the salaries. For example, under every head the first one is usually the salaries. So under this 503 where is the vote for the salaries there exactly?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well these, of course, are not employees of government so that their salary will be paid on the rate that I have just suggested, the per diem rate. In other words, they would be part-time and per diem and the \$10,000 there would include - For example, they only do it once a year and now when they go into their review they will be travelling across the Province and they will get a per diem rate and their cost of expenses and everything.

MR. SIMMONS: The secretary is a civil servant anyway.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The secretary is . So that \$10,000 should cover the cost of this year's review of the minimum wage and would include the salaries - not the salaries, the compensation on a per diem rate, and the expenses, hotel room and whatever, and the hearing rooms and so on and also the travel expenses. So they are not paid directly out of government. That includes their salary that \$10,000.

On motion, 503-03-01, carried.

MR. NEARY: 503-03-02: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us if there have been any applications in the past year for decertifications of unions? How many?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It was tabled in the House of Assembly. I would have to look under this and check but I think there was one application with FM - no - down on O'Leary Avenue. That is the only one that I am -

MR. NEARY: That was not granted, was it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: - aware of. Were there any more? , There is only one to my knowledge and that was the one on O'Leary Avenue, that long strike. But it is all in the tabling of the Labour Relations Report that I tabled in the House. But to my knowledge there is only one.

MR. LUSH: A similar question, I am just wondering whether the minister has the information available about the number of applications for certification and how many were approved and how many are outstanding at this particular moment?

MR. ROUSSEAU: This -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 503-03-02 carry?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

MR. LUSH: That is the one I just asked a question on.

MR. ROUSSEAU: This information and I have to - It is in here. It is in the report, the annual report which was tabled. It is in there and it will take me a couple of minutes to find it. I could tell the honourable member privately, but it is in the report which has been tabled. See the report that I am referring to is the report of the matters transacted by the minister under the Labour Relations Act, the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, the Newfoundland Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board 1976. Now if I had a page on that I would be all right. If my officials are listening, it would be very helpful next year if they numbered the pages when they are passing me this report.

MR. LUSH: That is the difficulty about this. I found it very difficult to locate the information in there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, there should be - The decisions are all here.

MR. LUSH: At any rate, if the minister will just allow a further question. The reason for the question probably is not so much as how student unions applied and how many were rejected, I think the thing I have been getting on to is what is the time in getting certified, as this has been a complaint that it takes an awful long time and that was the reason for the question. whether there is anything under the Labour

MR. LUSH: Relations Board in a new legislation to speed up this process of certification?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well of course the main - the application comes in and normally the union, whatever union is involved in a non-organized area, would have cards signed and when it is presented to the Labour Relations Board an investigating officer, who is invariably a conciliation officer, goes out and checks the number to make sure that there is sufficient number, fifty per cent plus one of the people applying; then of course a hearing is then held by the Labour Relations Board. Now depending on the work load at a given time, and I think

MR. ROUSSEAU: the matter the hon. member referred to is a very simple one, I think the time has come for us to look at the possibility of a full time Labour Relations Board. I mean, the Board sits once a month, the third Monday, I think, of the month.

MR. LUSH: Is that the regular once a month meeting?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, and it is not enough. I think the time is coming now when we are giving consideration to the possibility of probably some young lawyer making him a permanent head.

MR. NEARY: What do you need a lawyer for?

MR. ROUSSEAU: You need a lawyer for interpretation. I know you want to keep them out.

MR. NEARY: Why not use Justice Department lawyers?

MR. ROUSSEAU: You need somebody who can interpret. You know legislation, the hon. member for LaPoile, which is difficult for some people. But the time is possibly come when we have to look at the possibility of a full time labour relation chairman. Obviously the chairman now has other things to do and it is once a month -

MR. NEARY: The chairman is going to resign anyway. He is going to Dalhousie to lecture in law.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The chairman has resigned effective June 30.

MR. NEARY: Have you got a replacement?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I have not even looked for one.

MR. NEARY: Leo Barry has resigned because he is moving over to Dalhousie -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well he stayed as long as he can. June 30 -

MR. LUSH: This one will be a non-partisan appointment, I take it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: Oh, absolutely! They always are.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think this was a non-partisan appointment. I think that labour and management -

MR. NEARY: Sure, an ex-cabinet minister, an ex-colleague of my hon. friend, of course it was. We are just green enough and naive

Mr. Neary.

enough to accept that. A Tory, a big Tory, and a former cabinet minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Is the hon. member suggesting, now after going across

MR. ROUSSEAU: the province as much as the hon. member goes across this province, and as many people as he talks to in the labour movement, that the labour movement were displeased with the appointment of -

MR. NEARY: No, but do not tell me it is non-partisan. I mean, that is not the argument. I happen to think that Leo Barry is a pretty fine fellow, a pretty intelligent fellow - But do not try to tell me that it is a non-political appointment.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does the hon. member want a part-time job?

MR. NEARY: Well, I would not mind. I have to subsidize my salary somehow.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What I am saying, it might appear to have been partisan but that was not the prerequisite on the appointment.

MR. LUSH: How does the legislation state that the chairman of the Labour Relations Board should be appointed, the new legislation?

MR. ROUSSEAU: By the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, obviously. The problem is that the membership includes two representatives of the employers of the Province and one alternative, and two members of the employees and one alternative. Now, obviously there has to be an independent person there. And government, being as independent and as non-partisan as it is, appoints a chairman.

MR. NEARY: One thing about Leo, he probably had his Liberal membership card in his pocket when he became a Cabinet Minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As I say, the specific question brought up by the hon. member for Terra Nova probably is brought about by the work load of meetings once a month and it is pretty difficult for these people to get together moreso. We have to give consideration to the possibility of a full time chairman. We have a full time secretary now which helps, but we certainly do need a full time chairman.

MR. LUSH: One other question. I do not know whether the minister

MR.LUSH: can answer this but just off the top of the head sort of thing, there is a large number of people, a large number of workers, not unionized in this province. Of course, I would expect that is one of the major reasons for the Labour Standard Board, because there is a large number. I am just wondering whether there are any statistics or whether there is any information available at all, to indicate the number of people, the number of workers who are not unionized. Is there a rough percentage ?

MR.ROUSSEAU: If I gave one I am not held to it. I think somewhere in the area of sixty to seventy per cent. I would guess in that area.

MR.LUSH: Not unionized?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I am sorry, unionized. I would say between twenty-five and forty per cent. I could not give you the specific number, I do not know if we have that statistic. Somewhere between twenty-five and forty per cent. I would think probably about one-third. Thirty-three per cent might be a good off-the-cuff figure. But somewhere between twenty-five and forty per cent.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Chairamn, I notice by an answer to a question that I put on the Order Paper for the hon. gentleman that there were no complaints about unfair labour practices, or no prosecutions, no action was taken as the result of unfair labour practices. Now as the minister knows, unfair labour practices usually occur on or about the time that the employees of a company are becoming unionized and make their application to the Labour Relations Board for certification. It is around that period that the employer then retaliates by doing all sorts of things that are contrary to the Labour Relations Act, creating unfair labour practices. Now labour has been complaining over the past several years that it is too difficult in this province to get permission from the minister to prosecute under the unfair labour practices section of the Act.

MR. NEARY: I would like to hear the minister's reaction to these comments because I have a feeling there may be some foundation to it. There may be an element of truth to it that the reason that part of the act is not used is because of the long-drawn-out legal wrangle and the obstructions that are thrown in the way of the individuals, and of groups, that they are discouraged from laying complaints and taking action under that part of the act. Is there any way that can be speeded up? Is there any way that can be beefed up to make it a little more streamlined? Because I know, Mr. Chairman, I know for a fact that there are all kinds of examples of unfair labour practices in this Province. The last complaint, I believe, where the minister authorized a group of employees to take action against the employer was the Battery Motel.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh no. No.

MR. NEARY: No? There has been one since then?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh yes, there has been a number since then.

MR. NEARY: A number since then. Well would the minister give us a rundown on the situation because it is something that has always concerned me, that employers are coming out and doing all sorts of things, throwing all sorts of obstructions, doing all sorts of illegal things, unethical things to stop their employees from getting unionized and the individuals and the groups cannot do a thing about it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Obviously we have reverted now to the previous subhead of Labour Standards, but that is okay.

MR. NEARY: No, we are on the Labour Relations Act. The Labour Relations Act we are on.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well this comes under Labour Standards, see? You are talking about prosecutions.

MR. NEARY: But Labour Standards is not passed yet.

MR. NEARY: We are still doing the Labour Relations Act.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But anyway, first of all the minister has never refused, nor have I ever refused where an investigating officer finds reason to lay complaint. The problem the unions have is getting it through the Courts. That is the reason why the hon. member has read or will read, and when we debate it in the House in respect of the new bill, that the powers of the Labour Standards Board will now include that ability, because the very point that the hon. member brings up is a point that concerns us - it is three months, six months, and then the frustration. The Magistrates Courts are not able to cope with the long docket of other cases that they have before them. So it is the intention of government as a result of the new Labour Standards Act to enable the Labour Standards Board and the Labour Standards Tribunal, which will be in effect a court and that will determine problems that arise under the Labour Standards, will be able to do it there and then very quickly rather than have to go to the court. which is a long process.

MR. NEARY: Will they have the same authority that the courts have?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, they will. It is a tribunal that has been used in other provinces and we are going to try it out. That will in effect help the point you raised, which is very valid. But the point is not valid that the minister has ever refused. The minister never refuses.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not what I said.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, okay. Now the investigating officer of course must go out and make sure the complaint is valid. But once that complaint is valid then consent to prosecute is given.

MR. NEARY: It is very difficult, the minister will appreciate, it is very difficult for an individual who has been fired or the

MR. NEARY: employer found some excuse to get rid of him and he is unemployed, fighting this battle and probably alone sometimes and having to be faced with legal fees and this sort of thing, you know, to get involved and to be encouraged to get involved and to carry on that kind of a case; it is a terrible thing and you get that lonely feeling. You get an awful feeling of frustration, you know, and I am sure that a lot of employees are getting shafted and just taking it lying down and not doing a thing about it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Section 63 of the new act will read, "There shall be a Labour Standards Tribunal consisting of three persons to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, one of whom shall be the Chairman" the member of the board, the Lieutenant Governor, and so on. Powers - "Subject to the appointment the tribunal may consider review here and decide upon such matters falling within the scope and intent of this act as may be referred to it by the director or any other complaints against the Labour Standards Act." So that will not, of course, permit the further stoppage of this through the courts or the problems which arise from it. So that should pretty well clear up that situation and I agree with the hon. member that the cost of going through courts is another question that the man or the person, male or female, would have to cope with in respect to termination or something under unfair labour practices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I want to raise a question, Mr. Chairman. I want to say a few words about arbitration, but I have looked down through here and I do not know where I should say it. So could somebody -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Industrial Relations, I think.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Conciliation Boards, I guess, 503-03-04.

MR. LUSH: Conciliation Boards, okay.

MR. SIMMONS: Where are you now? What one are you on now?

MR. ROUSSEAU: 503-03-02.

MR. LUSH: So it is under Conciliation Boards, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-02 carry? Carried.

Shall 03 carry?

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: I would just like to ask the minister the same question. I want to bring up a matter with regard to unions and the sort of open shop theory that they have put forth. What would that come under? What heading, what subhead?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Again Conciliation Board or the - I do not know. We have gone through the Industrial Relations. I will look at the subhead here for a second. Oh, heading 507, Labour and Industrial Relations would pretty well be all comprehensive with regard to the arbitration and this sort of thing.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you.

MR. LUSH: Is it 03, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. LUSH: 03?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 03, yes.

MR. LUSH: Okay, the Conciliation Board, yes. I wanted to just make a few observations regarding arbitrators, and I just wondered

Mr. Lush.

whether the minister can tell us how many arbitrators the government have available? Because again this seems to be a slow process when a dispute goes to arbitration that there does not seem to be enough arbitrators available, and there has got to be a waiting period. This is tremendously frustrating for the bargaining unit and for the workers, particularly when an arbitrator is not available. So I would like to get this information from the minister if I can. Just how many arbitrators the government have available? And the other thing is the importance of arbitrators, of course, being knowledgeable and having a high degree of expertise in the field, and I wonder to what extent the government has any programme or whether they have in mind any special programmes of training to specially train arbitrators?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Of course, first of all, we have about fifteen or eighteen arbitrators. It is actually called a panel of arbitrators.

MR. LUSH: By the way, my remarks were not meant to be derogatory to the arbitrators.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, all right.

These are arbitrators who are accepted by Labour and Management. They have a list of them. Now in some instances the list - normally three people would be the maximum number - would be included in a collective agreement between a union and a company in which they say, for any grievance procedure the following arbitrators have been accepted by both sides, and they will name the three of them. The government utilizes a list of fifteen to eighteen - I do not know how many are on the list now - that have been approved by Management and Labour where this is not included in their collective agreement so that they can go through the list of arbitrators that are

Mr. Rousseau.

accepted by Labour and Management. Normally now with regard to speed - Ouch! I hit my knee again, I am sorry.

MR. LUSH: Not your elbow.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I hit my elbow a few times, too. I think I am getting arthritis there. It is still not better yet.

MR. LUSH: Is that right?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, it is still not better.

The arbitrator, normally when a union and a company have a grievance, they will look for an arbitrator who is available and who can come as quickly as possible. Of course, they will probably go through the list of maybe five or six or seven, not that they do not want the previous four or five, but one that would be available immediately. Decisions are hard to come by. There is no question about that, and that is an unfortunate part of it. Sometimes it takes some arbitrators quite a while, but it does not take long for Labour and Management to find out two things: Number one, whether the person is pro-labour or pro-management in the other's eyes; and number two whether they are slow in the process of coming up with arbitration decisions. I might say one thing that we are doing, by the way, which is of extreme importance - and I just received the first copy in the department recently - is that one of our conciliation officers, the female, I believe, whom we are quite proud of, a conciliation officer, Miss Scott from Grand Falls, we are compiling a list of all the arbitration decisions across this Province that we have had, which will be most helpful to the arbitration process. There will be a couple of more volumes, I believe, coming along. Of course, we have a Labour and Management Consultative Committee across the Province, too, of which Lowell Paulson of

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Gander is the Chairman, equally divided between labour and management. We just made a contribution to them now. I have not told the President of Treasury Board yet. Of course, it is in the vote anyway. I am sure he would not mind the \$500 that they are going to get together. That is in the vote. But they will be coming together again. And they have at various periods schools for arbitrators or budding arbitrators in which they go over seminars in which they learn the arbitration process. But, as I say, who is for management or for labour and who is slow in decisions, it does not take very long for these two parties to come by that. And as I say, the review now, the condensation of all these various arbitration decisions over the past is going to be a great help to arbitrators and hopefully will speed up the arbitration procedure. But again, it is a difficult thing. There is often a back load. But if there was better understanding, to go back to education, maybe on the union's part and more of a sensitivity on the part of management, there would not be such need for so many grievances and there would not be the need for so many arbitrations. But in some companies, of course, they have quite a few arbitrations on the books.

Normally the ones you hear complaints from are the ones that have the problem because there is so many arbitrations they just cannot keep up with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the minister does not become too defensive because my question was predicated on the fact that I said last evening that I thought that the Department of Labour and Manpower should be assigned a higher priority with government because in view of the tremendous amount of work that is to be done, in view of the tremendous importance of establishing good labour relations in this Province, and I alluded to some things that I thought had to be done, the dissemination of information. And particularly, this certainly got to be a concern

MR. LUSH:

of the minister when the minister brings in these two bills because these have a tremendous amount in them, and even though a lot of it is insignificant, certainly it is important that our people, that our workers know what is in it, to know their rights. So my question was predicated on knowing the tremendous amount of work that has to be done to establish good labour relations in the Province. So when I asked about the arbitrators, the question I really wanted to get down to was whether or not the minister felt that the fifteen - I think he mentioned fifteen - whether he found that to be sufficient, whether he indeed would like to have more, whether this would expedite the process.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I might point out it is not defensive here. We do not have arbitrators employed by government. The hon. member obviously was referring to conciliation officers.

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh! That is a completely - arbitrators you are talking about, Dr. Leslie Harris, that type of individual, who are brought in to adjudicate a particular grievance.

MR. NEARY: The moonlighters over at Memorial University.

MR. LUSH: Yes, that is right, conciliation officers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have .No ,we never have enough . In a bad situation, no, we do not. The work loads normally are pretty tough. But in the past couple of years we have come along quite well. We have nine conciliation officers now. We have a couple in Corner Brook. We have St. John's and of course Grand Falls. And these are growing. I do not know the exact number. They are here somewhere.

MR. LUSH: There was , was there not - again I do not know what was the total disputes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Pardon?

MR. LUSH: For example, the total disputes referred to the minister's department last year, as I recall, was somewhere up around 127, was it not?

MR. ROUSSEAU: We cannot complain at this point in time in respect to the number of conciliation officers we have. The ones we have are extremely - oh, here they are - we have one director, Howard Noseworthy, who is now the A.D.M. of course of industrial relations. We have one director. We have two of the senior officers that I suggested last night, I said two by the way, there are three. They are Cyril Churchill and Dan Seymour who besides doing conciliation work also do consultative work with various industries and unions across the Province. We have six labour relations officers too. And we have two positions vacant in labour relations officers, one we are presently actively recruiting for that.

So at this point in time the hon. the Minister of Finance, the President of Treasury Board, has been very gracious with conciliation officers for the department. And if we need any more I am sure that that would not be a problem. Now if you get a situation during the Summer where you have a lot of strikes and a lot of agreements coming up then certainly there can be problems. And when that happens, of course, we do have the co-operation of Treasury Board. They know the sensitivity of it. So at this point in time the number of

MR. ROUSSEAU: conciliation officer positions is satisfactory. We have a few positions that we have not filled and we are actively trying to fill those now.

On motion, 503-03-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: 503-03-04: This head - Industrial Enquiries-perhaps the minister can guide me here, Is this the appropriate place to raise some matters I wish to raise concerning the hiring practices in Labrador City, for example?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It could be under that head.

MR. SIMMONS: All right. Okay. I am thinking of the, was it the Bartlett enquiry?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, yes. That is an enquiry under this subhead.

MR. SIMMONS: Under this subhead is it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: All right. Mr. Chairman, I do have a few comments that I would like to make here on this subject and perhaps we can get some response from the minister concerning my comments. The Labrador West area is an area that he is, I believe, and certainly ought to be and I believe is, more familiar with than I in that he has lived there ten or eleven years and is the member for the area. But it is an area that has a number of problems which have very Province-wide implications and consequently many of us in the House, I am sure, get correspondence and telephone calls and visits from people in that area. And one of the central reasons for the aggravation, for the grievance which these people feel, and I believe feel justifiably, is the matter in which- or the manner in which, I ought to say, the manner in which workers from Quebec have a pretty free hand in the employment opportunities of Labrador West, but there is no reciprocating. The workers from the Labrador side of the boundary are not able to avail of work opportunities in Quebec. The reason is simple, of course; the Quebec Government has taken definitive and legislative steps which protect the Quebec worker.

MR. SIMMONS: You cannot blame the Government of Quebec for doing that. I happen to think that the steps they took are discriminatory in the unkind sense of that term. I happen to think they border on racist.

But the fact of the matter is that whatever we feel about the morality of what the Quebec Government has done, or the advisability of what it has done in the Canadian context, the fact of the matter is that we have a situation there whereby the Quebec worker can fairly freely get involved in the Labrador construction project but our people cannot get involved in the Quebec project within the Province of Quebec. Again it is not a matter of laying blame except perhaps a bit of blame towards the Quebec -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Are you talking about a specific one?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no. No, I was not. I was not. no. I am thinking first of all generally of the fact of a work permit in Quebec and the absence of it here which creates the situation I am talking about. Now as such I am not an advocate of the work permit system. I think it is wrong and I think it smells of discrimination in its worst forms. That is the idealist in me talking. I think realistically we cannot stand by and allow Quebec to have a work permit. We cannot stop them from having a work permit but we cannot stand by in the presence of that work permit system and do nothing about our own workers, and that is what concerns me, Mr. Chairman, that our fellows in Labrador are being discriminated against.

Let me give you two or three examples. First of all, I know a businessman in Labrador City who was about to open a retail outlet in Fermont just across the border in Quebec, twelve, fifteen miles. He of course had to satisfy all the requirements of Quebec law, and that makes sense. One of the requirements is that he must hire all persons who are resident in Quebec for his Fermont operation. Now let us take an example; suppose the business

MR. SIMMONS:

were in operation today and suppose tomorrow morning his girl, his shopkeeper, his cashier in Fermont phones in and says, Mr. X, I am sorry, I cannot come to work, I am ill. He cannot take a person from his Labrador City operation, his other outlet there, and send across down the road twelve miles to fill in that particular day. He cannot even get a casual worker from Labrador City. He must hire a person who is resident in the Province of Quebec. Now let us turn that around. Let us suppose that it is the cashier in Labrador City who gets ill. All he has to do is pick up the phone, ask one of his employees in Fermont to come down and fill in for the day. Now that is a small example, but it does, I think, dramatize or highlight the kind of problem that these people are suffering under. And apart from being a real problem in the sense that people are prevented from getting job opportunities, it is a problem also in the psychological, emotional sense. It is creating unnecessary frictions, and people do not understand even to the degree that perhaps we do in this House the reasons for it. They see it only - they interpret it very often only in the sense that we here in this House and in government have not done the things we should do to protect our own workers.

So while I say that I am not an advocate of the work permit system, I think it is a matter, in this case, of practical tit for tat.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Unfortunate.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

And I believe what we ought to be thinking about doing - and perhaps the minister will indicate that this is already ongoing - what we ought to be thinking about doing is writing some kind of a regulation into our books which does not make the work permit universally applicable to whoever comes, but aims it directly at those who belong to a jurisdiction where the work permit is in force.

Mr. Simmons.

All right? In other words, if a guy comes from Ontario, no problem, because any Newfoundlander can go to Ontario as it has been proven over the years and get a job on the basis of his qualification.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Or Alberta.

MR. SIMMONS: Or Alberta where it is more up-to-date in fact. If he goes to Edmonton or any part of Alberta he is adjudicated on the basis of his qualifications and not whether he came from Newfoundland or Nova Scotia or Quebec. But if you go for a job in Fermont or Seven Islands or any part of Quebec or Gagnon or Schefferville - Schefferville is the most grating example, because Schefferville is on Quebec territory but the raw resources are coming directly out of Newfoundland, coming out of Labrador.

MR. HICKMAN: Half and half.

MR. SIMMONS: Most of the - well, the facility sits astride the border with the dormitory, if you like, the town in Schefferville, but the mine in Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: Is it not 50-50?

MR. SIMMONS: That is correct, 'Joe'?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, that is correct.

MR. HICKMAN: Is it not rumoured that if you take one ton off the Newfoundland side you have to take it off the Quebec side?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, they would have to pay royalties on the tonnage they take out of Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, but I do not think -

MR. ROUSSEAU: But if they open up their new area they are going to be taking a lot more out of Labrador.

MR. SIMMONS: My information to the Minister of Justice, my information is that the bulk of the extraction is from Labrador at this moment in time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: That is correct, is it not?

MR. HICKMAN: That would account for -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, no.

MR. SIMMONS: So as a result that example is particularly grating, but that example aside, I do not see the need for us to have a work permit which says to the fellow from Alberta, you know, if you want a job here you have got to satisfy these requirements. I think his only requirement should be his qualifications for the job. But if we are into a situation where we have the Province of Quebec with a work system, then I say tit for tat. I say, give them as good as they send in kind.

A couple of months ago, the middle of February, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and I had the opportunity to sit down with the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, and one of the questions I personally raised with him was this business of the work permit. And I gathered, if I can relate it as it happened, unless he is an awfully good bluff, and he may well be, but I gathered that he was most surprised - this is the net impression I got from him - he was most surprised that this thing was ongoing, not that there was a work permit, but most surprised about the aggravation, and I pointed out to him the relatively small numbers involved. There is no real population concentration in Labrador City, Fermont, and he at that particular time undertook to look into it. And I would suggest that at one point - and

MR. SIMMONS: perhaps the minister has some more up-to-date information - the Premier of Quebec was extremely surprised that there was this aggravation existing and went so far as to say that he saw no reason for it existing and thought something could be done about it.

MR. HICKMAN: All he had to do was pick up his phone and tell his Minister of Justice. That is the proper thing to do.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry?

MR. HICKMAN: All he had to do was pick up the phone and tell his Minister of Justice.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, okay. It has been now two months since we had that conversation and perhaps the time is right for somebody to ask him what he has done about it.

Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter - the names are not relevant to the point I want to make, so I will not divulge them - but it is a copy of a letter which was sent to me, the original went to somebody else. The signer of the letter is a resident of Labrador City and this gentleman capsules very well the problem that I just drew attention to once again.

He says in part, "It is interesting to note that when Labradorians and Newfoundlanders seek work in Schefferville or Mount Wright they are hauled to court and fined for working in Quebec." They are hauled to court and fined for working in Quebec! "This is called protecting the Quebec worker. When we seek to have Labradorians and Newfoundlanders find work in their own Province, that is called bigotry."

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, that is a good capsule.

MR. SIMMONS: Is it not?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: And it draws attention to the problem that we have

MR. SIMMONS: to wrestle with. And I believe there is a fairly simple, I do not believe simplistic, but a fairly simple solution and I say to the minister I think he would have the support of every man and woman in this House if he brought in some legislation, if legislation is required, or tabled regulations which would give effect to the suggestion, that I have advanced a few moments ago, that we reciprocate. In the case of Quebec where they have the work permit system, we write a regulation or we write a statute which would see to it that those people, in my expression, get as good as they send. Because that is a despicable situation, and not only despicable in a philosophic sense but it is despicable in terms of the practical realities that it is inflicting on a group of people. It is demeaning and it should not be in this day and age, and if the only way to counter the problem is to give them as good as they send, is to enact the same kind of work permit system to apply to those people, then by all means I will be the first advocate of it and I will be the most enthusiastic supporter of it because it is an affront. It is an affront in every sense of the term.

I could go on and talk about the implications of this policy when it gets into the involvement of construction companies, local construction companies, local to Labrador West, as opposed to the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Seven Islands.

MR. SIMMONS: Quebec construction companies. But that is all part of a very involved web and I hope that the Bartlett enquiry will uncover some of the complexities of it because it has to do with where the companies are headquartered, where their effective decision making takes place, a whole host of items.

One I want to mention. It is this. I had a telephone call just a few days ago from another resident of Labrador City and he expressed concern as to how effective the

MR. SIMMONS: enquiry would be, and he was not wanting to undermine it but he was concerned about how readily would people come forward to give evidence before the enquiry. And I thought this was an interesting twist on the subject. He advanced the theory or the concern that the enquiry into hiring practices would not be nearly as fruitful as it could be because the firms operating in the area just would not come before a public enquiry and give accurate, full evidence because of the implications it would have for future dealings with the Iron Ore Company and with the many large supply companies which are headquartered in Quebec.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can respond to that.

MR. SIMMONS: And I see that as a fairly realistic concern, and I am glad the minister has indicated he will respond to it, because if that is the case then we are going to need another enquiry or another mechanism, perhaps something not operating as openly for that matter, to take the evidence that needs to be taken. I mean, are we at the stage in Lab City where people are afraid, are intimidated from talking because of the economic implications for them, the implications for their own pocketbook, for their own balance

MR. SIMMONS:

sheets, for their own company financial position? If that is so we are at a frightful stage. Can the minister indicate when the inquiry, by the way, when should it clue up? What is the timing on it now?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would hope sometime by this Summer. In other words, to have the report.

MR. SIMMONS: I see.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. It may clue up in May, June. There will probably be some public hearings here in St. John's as well, I would assume. So if we say the middle of June, sometime in June - it may take a month, two months. But the question of constitutionality I have also asked Judge Bartlett to look into in respect to the work permit. That may take a little longer. It is a question whether it is constitutional or not -

MR. SIMMONS: Whether the Quebec permit is constitutional?

MR. ROUSSEAU: What Quebec is doing?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, yes, yes. Okay. Well I have, on this immediate subject, I have said the two or three things I wanted to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Does not the real problem lie in the construction industry?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. Only in construction.

MR. SIMMONS: It relates directly and only to the construction sector, that is true. But this is where the aggravation is. This is where the real aggravation is, in this particular sector, certainly in terms of volume, in terms of numbers of offences, numbers of aggravations, they apply in this sector. Perhaps part of the solution to the problem, although only a part of it, is a more active presence. I am suggesting that part of the solution might be a more active presence in Labrador West. Now we have heard the cliché about the lack of government presence, but I am being specific here. I am talking about whether or not government has contemplated the establishment of some kind of a Manpower office in the West.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have one. It is only apprenticeship now.

There is a Manpower and Industrial Relations office but it only deals with apprenticeship training now.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Some kind of an all embracing an umbrella type operation, which would police, to a degree, would oversee, would supervise the whole activity, the whole ambit. You see, I would suggest to the minister that during the period of the enquiry everybody concerned, particularly the offenders, are keeping their noses awfully clean at this particular time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is extremely difficult to hear yourself thinking, let alone hear the hon. member on the other side. I wonder if you would ask that the precincts be a little quieter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the constable if he would insure that those outside the Chamber are reasonably silent. And of course, the members within the Chamber will pay due heed, I am sure. The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: I was saying that it seems to me there may be a need for a more high profile Manpower presence in Labrador West. And I was suggesting that at this particular time with the Bartlett inquiry ongoing, perhaps - the offenders - if I may call them such - the people who tend to aggravate this employment situation, are keeping their noses especially clean at this moment in time, certainly a reasonable thesis. But once the inquiry is over, which will be in a month or two months or whatever, then the question is will things just get back to normal or indeed deteriorate even further. That could be avoided in part if we had a continuing presence there. If we had a Manpower office there with some clout. Again it may require new legislation. I do not know. One other thought on the subject which I feel is related; the Quebec government, again in the construction sector, has a requirement that its companies, or companies which do business in the province, be headquartered in Quebec. And that kind of law or regulation applied to the Newfoundland situation would not work in our favour as a whole. There are cases where we need companies from outside, where the companies here do not have the capability in a specialized area to provide the

MR. SIMMONS:

services that are required. But again I go back to my suggestion about reciprocating, and I believe it is time for this government to be thinking about a specific regulation in relation to the awarding of contracts or being eligible to apply for contracts which says that any company, any company which is headquartered in a Province -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Registered or headquartered? There is a difference.

MR. SIMMONS: Registered, well - no, no, I believe the Quebec regulation is headquartered, that the headquarters must be - and this is the emphasis I want to draw. And I would suggest a regulation which says that any company which is headquartered in a province which has that regulation, the regulation I mentioned requiring that it be headquartered in that province to do business there, that company not be permitted to do business here unless it headquarters here. Again it is a

MR. SIMONS: tit for tat situation, a straight tit for tat situation, and in effect we all know it would apply to one province only and that is the province of Quebec. Now I am not on an anti-Quebec kick this morning, not at all. I can make great speeches about the need for a continuing Canadian unity and that kind of thing, and I feel very strongly on that subject and the opportunity will come, I am sure, to say these things.

But I am on a kick, not an anti-Quebec kick but a pro-Newfoundland worker kick, and a couple of regulations of the Quebec Government. I do not think they were particularly aimed at Newfoundlanders, I am not suggesting that, but they have the effect, de facto they have the effect of militating against job opportunities here in two ways: The context of Labrador West where the worker cannot even go across the border and work unless he is a resident of Quebec and that kind of thing, and in the larger context where the Newfoundland company cannot even bid on jobs in Quebec because it is not headquartered in Quebec. And so again you have an unfair balance for the Quebec company, because of the absence of regulations, in coming to Labrador City and can bid any kinds of jobs and get them, all things being equal. The Labrador City contractor cannot go in Fermont for the simple reason that he is not headquartered in Quebec and even bid on the job, let alone get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member has brought up a number of interesting points. I would like to say a few words about a few of them. You know, I said it, and I am not afraid to say it; it is something that should have been done before and been looked at, this whole question. It was during what was jokingly called my 'reincarnation' as Minister of Manpower that it was done. It was better late than never. And I do think the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir was in the House on the

MR. ROUSSEAU: Wednesday afternoon when I spoke on Private Member's Day in respect of some of the points he raised today. If he might get the Hansard he might hear a lot more of the problems, I mentioned, when I poked my head in there and asked about Bud Messervey - Bud is a good friend obviously of the hon. member across, and a good friend of mine.

MR. SIMMONS: I am familiar with the issue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: And he has an electrical company and he had gone up to Fermont to bid on an electrical contract, electrical sub-contract -

AN HON. MEMBER: Any television set?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. Electrical sub-contract and he was told just to get out. You know, "You are not a Quebec company and we do not even want you bidding." He was thrown out of there. The five gentlemen - or the court cases, there were five of them, and my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, knows that I fought just about every minister that I have met in Quebec saying, "Look, let us play the game, fellows. Withdraw that." The guys had gone up to work, during the strike at Wabush, into Fermont and were issued summons by the Province of Quebec. I talked to everybody I could, and the hon. Minister of Justice and the deputy minister talked to the Quebec people and, you know, that is what is agitating. That is not playing the game.

You know, we have a community up there in the North between Seven Islands, Gagnon, Shefferville, Mount Wright, Fermont and Labrador City - Wabush in which if we cannot get along together there, supposing that we are from two different Provinces, there is not much left in this country and at least an accommodation could have been made up there. I must say that Mr. Cournoyer did make an accommodation for a while but it was withdrawn.

Now in respect to what the hon. member mentioned about Mr. Levesque's surprise - and I am sorry I do not have it now. I had it last night and I left it in my other coat pocket - I have an editorial from the Gazette, the Montreal Gazette in which Monsieur Laundret, who was the Minister of Economic Development, makes no qualms about the fact

MR. ROUSSEAU: that a job in Hull, Quebec, out of Federal funds--and I would like to know how in the name of Heaven he ever swung that - if there is not Quebec companies and not Quebec workers, forget it, we do not want to hear about anybody outside the border of Quebec applying for the job and we do not want anybody working on it outside the Province of Quebec.

MR. DOODY: How many seats does Quebec have in the Federal parliament.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Eighty-four, is it? And that is why. That is how they got to swing it. You know, if I recall, if I have it I will send a copy up to the hon. member, quite adamant and that is it, no Ontario firms. So much so that the Ontario Government is looking at now and saying, Look, that is not playing the game.

Now I said the other day, not to be wishy-washy, "Work permits if necessary but not necessarily work permits". And I can tell the hon member - first of all that Judge Bartlett has chosen, number one, because he was a good Newfoundlander. His ability was second, secondary to all the thoughts given to who the chairman would be, because he was a Newfoundlander and a good Newfoundlander and that is what the first prerequisite for that job was. I know Judge Bartlett will go in there and do the job. And I know something else, and I will say this quite frankly to show the seriousness with which this enquiry is being done. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Justice, thought it might better serve as a judicial enquiry, It would be broader. And I said I am the member for the district, the district that is involved is my district. I have an obligation and I will do it under an industrial enquiry because I want to take responsibility for it, full responsibility for it. If anybody questions that it does not have the powers, it will not take us too long to make it a judicial enquiry. But everybody will play the game and the companies who do not appear will be subpoenaed.

MR.ROUSSEAU: The one company that I referred to that I would like to see driven out of Labrador in my last speech here did not appear at the meeting so far. If he does not appear he will be subpoenaed. The man who flies in plane loads of people from Seven Islands every time there is a vote whether they want to unionize it or not, and defeats and then sends them back to Seven Islands; the man who pays \$6 to labourers in Labrador City working with him and \$7.50 and \$7.60 over in Ferront.

I will remember the name.

MR.NEARY: Is that the same fellow -

MR.ROUSSEAU: That is Real Ste Marie, that is who it is. The man is going to be subpoenaed. I do not think a greater service will be performed in this province if he was thrown out of it. No qualms in my mind about that, If he has one Newfoundlander on his payroll that is as many as he got.

There are other companies up there -

MR.NEARY: He kicked the Newfoundlanders out of the apartment buildings did he not?

MR.ROUSSEAU: That is the one who kicked them out of the apartment buildings a couple of years ago when the hon. Leader of the Opposition and we were discussing that. That is the gentleman who did that. There are companies up there though, but make no mistake, who have gone in and because of pressure applied to them they have turned around and hired all Newfoundlanders.

MR.NEARY: Brian Mulrooney is going to change all that now, I understand he is doing a half decent job down there.

MR.ROUSSEAU: Brian Mulrooney is reported to have said a relative of his who wanted a job at the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City, a relative phoned him and said, "Can you get a job for my son or my nephew?" who was a nephew or cousin to Mr. Mulrooney. Mr. Mulrooney said, "No, unless he is living in Newfoundland I cannot get him a job with the Iron Ore Company of Canada," which I thought was very pertinent point.

MR. NEARY: I have heard some good reports. I hope he continues to dig his heels in.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will say right now one of the main things to this is the Iron Ore Company of Canada because I am afraid - I want to find out - when they say 'Newfoundlanders' I want to know whether they are talking about native Newfoundlanders or people who were hired in Labrador City who are in effect not Newfoundlanders. I want to see the percentages of Newfoundlanders at the Iron Ore Company of Canada operation in Labrador City. They know my feelings, and they know it very strongly.

Apparently the figures that have come out as the result of this enquiry are good figures. When I get them I will know whether they are good or not. I am in constant liaison with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and with every other company up up there in respect of jobs. They know how I feel. I will say this to hon. members across and to the people of this province - this industrial enquiry is my baby. It is an obligation and a responsibility and a duty I have to the people whom I represent as a parting shot to try and make life a little easier for job opportunities up there.

I stake my political future on action; that is not going to be one that is going to be put down in the bottom drawer and dusted or I will not be around too long. But I will tell you right now that if the Quebec Government, and this is not a challenge, the Quebec Government cannot learn to accommodate us in the Labrador City-Wabush area in respect to employment opportunities, the local companies in the Labrador city-Wabush area cannot give preference to local people and to people of this province, then they are going to meet with one hell of a lot of trouble from me and from this government.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister responded very well to the matter of who could or who would appear before the enquiry. He mentioned the subpoena power but there is another half of it I am sure he recognized. How about this small local company which through

MR. SIMMONS: fear of reprisal or economic adversity might decide not to talk? Now you can subpoena people to come, you know you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make the guy talk and there may be some things which will be held in reserve because of the possible intimidation down the road. Can the minister respond to that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member brings up a very good point. First of all, it is obvious. I do not want this to be misconstrued. It is very important that it do not be misconstrued. Obviously I have had a private conversation with Judge Bartlett in which I pointed out the problem because I wanted them to have an overall grasp before he went down. I have lived there fifteen years, not eleven as the hon. member said, so I know the situation. I have asked specifically from Judge Bartlett that not only would there be public hearings, but there would be private hearings. When I suggest that there may be hearings in St. John's if somebody does not want to attend a hearing in Labrador City, then obviously there are ways that Judge Bartlett is prepared, and I can say this publicly,

MR. SIMMONS: So there is provision for -

MR. ROUSSEAU: - to hold private and public hearings.

MR. SIMMONS: - in camera hearings?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. So if anybody, and obviously there will be hearings on the Island somewhere, I presume, because there are a number of people involved, and all a person has to do is to phone the legal secretary when the ads come out or whatever and ask for a private hearing, and the private hearing

MR. ROUSSEAU: will be held. And I have one company there, maybe it is the same company the hon. member mentioned, who are concerned about the interpretation of the information they are going to give and they want a businessman or a purchasing person or so on with the suggestion that IOC are buying too many things outside of - not locally, and I have wired the person back and said, "Look, I am sending a copy to Judge Bartlett. It is his prerogative as commissioner to employ whom he wants to employ to interpret, but if he feels it is not then I would certainly have an independent study done." But I think once and for all this thing is going to be cleared up. You know, this is one that will not be swept under the carpet. The few examples that the hon. member gave, the number I gave on Private Members' Day if you would care to read, and many others - and this, by the way, may not be only applicable to Labrador West. That is where the problem is most visible because obviously the hon. member, as I know and as he knows, has had problems in Bay d'Espoir in the same light. We have had problems out here in various parts of the Island part of the Province in the same way, not to the same magnitude of course as Labrador West, but the same principle applies, especially at this point in time that we, as the House of Assembly, we, representing the people of this Province, have an obligation and a duty to ensure that first preference, where available - where available, and that has to be a fair one - should be given to our own people.

The point brought up by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), the fact that maybe we should only retaliate, if that is the term, or reciprocate probably would be a better word, with those Provinces that have that sort of thing. It may be a good idea. Certainly our people have been welcomed in other parts, and that is where the problem lies: How

MR. ROUSSEAU: do you shut out the people of Ontario and Alberta when they so openly welcome the people of this Province when we have hard times? Hopefully our force will move back in. But the one problem is the independence in this sort of global view of labour that the Quebec Government has taken and sometime in the next few days I hope when I remember to bring that up I will show you the editorial in which this question at Hull, just across the border of course from Ottawa, on which the Quebec Government makes this position quite clear.

It is my intention by the way to indeed meet with the Minister of Labour for Quebec. I would like to go armed with my finding of the judicial enquiry.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman bilingual, by the way?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I was partially but I am not now.

AN HON. MEMBER: In French?

MR. NEARY: You had better brush up on your French.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am by nature, birth and inclination a Newfoundlander. I was born here, by the way.

MR. NEARY: Yes I know.

MR. ROUSSEAU: "The name Rousseau frightens me," some people say. And when I go -

MR. NEARY: Monsieur Rousseau.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - when I go to Quebec if I cannot have the courtesy of the minister that I will be dealing with in Quebec speaking to me in English because I unfortunately do not speak in French and that is an unfortunate situation.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister take an interpreter with him in case he refuses to speak in English?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh I think as a courtesy yes. Well now I do not know. If the question became one of refusing to speak in English, that is a little different than somebody who could not speak in English.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would have to take that one under advisement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: If he refused that, it is another thing. If he could not speak English well that certainly is their prerogative. I cannot speak French and I, you know -

MR. NEARY: Well then who would provide the interpreter in that case? Would it be the Province of Quebec or Newfoundland?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, I do not know. We will work that out.

MR. SIMMONS: Better take one with you, boy.

MR. NEARY: You had better take one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: On this topic, I just want to express or give a little bit of information that I am sure that is not new to the minister, I should not think so, being in Labrador City for fourteen years, but it was a situation that I encountered while at Churchill, particularly at the time when people were saying that Newfoundlanders were not given preference there, and it was a matter which was of grave concern to me. But the point I wanted to make, I was wondering what kind of legislation, you know, and I think the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) was recommending some legislation of some type that forced companies, that obligated companies to hire Newfoundlanders, but I am just wondering, you know, how effective this thing can be because there is always the human element. Any legislation is only as effective as the parties concerned will carry it through and sometimes it is difficult to enforce it.

The point I want to make is I remember when this pressure came on Churchill Falls to hire Newfoundlanders that all workers were hired through Manpower and the company would send out a requisition for certain classifications of workers. And on numerous occasions I found out that companies were sending for a type of man that they did not want at all. Let us say a vacancy came and it might have been for an operator of a transport truck, these big Macks. What they would do is send out

Mr. Lush.

for a pick-up driver - I am sorry - they wanted a pick-up driver, I am sorry, and the requisition would be for a Mack driver, which is altogether different, and then a couple of days after come back and say, We cannot find a Mack driver, so they hire the man that they had in mind in Quebec or somewhere for the pick-up driver. The same thing with carpenters. When I moved into Churchill first, there was no demand for carpenters. All they were doing was just putting up trailers, levelling them up and putting ply board around them. Now there is not a Newfoundlander alive that could not do this, level up a trailer. And you would see all sorts of workers there from Quebec and New Brunswick, if you inquired. And eventually I found that, Well, we cannot get the carpenters. We sent out a requisition to Newfoundland the other day for eighteen carpenters but they sent for eighteen finished carpenters. Well, you know, this was not what they needed at all so now they go back to Quebec. So there is that sort of thing, you know, that makes it very, very difficult. Companies have a way of doing what appears to be the right thing but yet undercover hoodwinking the government and the people.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can assure the hon. member and the hon. House that these companies who are dedicated to the non-employment of local labour - and I speak local provincial - have the most devious methods of doing things. I, after many arguments first when I was elected in 1972, I was getting great figures out of Churchill Falls, as the hon. member knows. What I did not know at the time and what the people of this Province did not know, the figures I was getting was a percentage of hourly people.

MR. LUSH: Right, not the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: The eighty per cents and the seventy-five and the eighties were hourly people. If you took in the supervisory people the percentages - I doubt if the percentage ever went over sixty. If they did, not too far over it. And nobody knew that. They were

Mr. Rousseau.

giving out percentages of workers and their percentages were always in the eighties. And the argument came back from BRINCO at the time, Look, you know, we have got eighty per cent Newfoundlanders employed. Sure, they had eighty per cent, but eighty per cent of the labour force. But when it came to the jobs after the labour work was done and the more technical jobs, and the supervisory jobs, there were precious few Newfoundlanders there. And I doubt if it went over sixty that it went very far beyond sixty per cent. And these people have ways and means of doing it. One of the reasons I wanted -

MR. ROBERTS: You are opposed to it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, yes.

- and one of the reasons I wanted the Bartlett Commission report - look, I have friends in Labrador City who can go over and look at the 3,000 employees and tell you exactly which ones are from Newfoundland. I am talking about native born - I am not talking about a guy who comes in from Quebec, settles in Labrador City in an apartment or a basement and ends up with a job and he is put down on the books as a Newfoundlander. I can tell right away that a name like Rousseau - you know, I know we are the only family in the Province, There is a Rousseau working up in Labrador City or Wabush. He is not from this Province, because there is only one other male Rousseau in this Province and that is my brother. And the other names and the Portuguese names - you can go down through them. There are lots of people who can do that. That is the people I want to get at. Now they tell me that they have got eighty per cent, ninety per cent Newfoundlanders. I want to see that. They are advertising outside this Province. My God! If the Iron Ore Company of Canada is so stupid after knowing my views as to go out

Mr. Rousseau.

and hire somebody today outside this Province, they do not deserve to be in business, because they know that I am going to go right through the ceiling. They know that. They have been told it. And there is an old saying, If you hit an idiot over the head enough times he is finally going to figure where the pain is coming from. I am starting to wonder whether that applies to a number of companies that I am dealing with in Labrador West on this question of local preference. Like I say I have one now that is involved in a DREE project at the Industrial Park. I hope he does not break the rules of the game, as we have decided them, here on the job he has on the Island and occupy the same sort of accommodation up there as he did down here on a provincial project.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much time is left?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I have about - about ten or fifteen minutes after one o'clock, I think, is it? What do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOODY: How much time does the minister have left?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister began at 12:47 P.M., so he has got lots of time left.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But I mean how much time for the estimates, for the total?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-three minutes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Thirty-three.

MR. ROBERTS: We could close it off at one o'clock and add what is left to the unexpired time unless members have some other topics members want to raise.

MR. LUSH: I think there are some members who want to speak a little further along, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I thought the minister made a very interesting remark there. Of course, it is the wish of all Newfoundlanders, I am sure, and Newfoundland in general, that no one,

CAPT. WINSOR.

perhaps no one except Newfoundlanders should be employed in Labrador. But is the minister afraid of some retaliation from Quebec, because we have an awful lot of part-time workers going into the Province of Quebec working, especially during the navigational season.

CAPT. WINSOR: We have many, many seamen up there on the Lake boats, would there be any fear of any retaliation?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, there cannot be any more retaliation than they now have in respect - for example, we are talking about the construction industry, by the way, on these work permits, the hon. gentleman understands that, only those in the trades industry. For example, the big union up there is the Steelworker's Union. Well the Steelworker membership on a joint basis stretches indeed from Seven Islands to Schefferville and Gagnon. They are all part of the one Steelworker operation. I think, themselves they have agreed, and we have had support by the way from people in the Steelworker's executive from Mount Wright and Fermont who feel the way we feel, that does not exist in the Steelworker's Union. So they are doing it in the construction industry but again, you know, while in theory it sounds good you have to remember that you cannot start putting barriers in this country and that has to temper your decision.

MR. ROBERTS: After all, we are all Canadians.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We are all Canadians. An accommodation with the Quebec Government, the Minister of Labour to the Minister of Labour, or the Minister of Justice to the Minister of Justice, or Premier to Premier to say, Look, we live in Nouveau Quebec, their Northern part and our Labrador, let us have an accommodation up there, let us not bar the barriers across in that area. That might be some compromise.

MR. DOODY: It is more a union thing than a government thing. Construction, trade unions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is government.

MR. DOODY: Is it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. DOODY: No, boy, the union is -

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is called a government regulation, a government order in which they -

MR. SIMMONS: They are under union pressure.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. Oh yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: You cannot blame the union for the workers.

MR. NOLAN: Has the Newfoundland Federation taken a position on this?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Now the Labrador City - Wabush locals - I am sorry, the Joint Councils which include all the labour unions in the Labrador City - Wabush area did make a recommendation to the Newfoundland Federation of Labour meeting a couple of years ago and it was turned down on the principle that we are all Canadians, we are all moving back and forth across borders. And while they had sympathy for it, the Federation would not at that time endorse it. I do not know if any subsequent action has been taken.

MR. NOLAN: The purpose of my question was, not attempting to bar anyone from entering or crossing borders and so on, was that I was wondering if the minister is familiar with whether or not the Newfoundland Federation of Labour has taken it upon themselves to meet with, talk to, discuss, negotiate or whatever is involved with the unions that are involved in Quebec? That is my point.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, not to my knowledge. The only thing I can say is that they have been asked as a convention and have turned it down as a Federation.

MR. DOODY: The local unions have talked to the union in Quebec and gotten nowhere.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have a lot of sympathy, for example, in the Steelworker's Union.

MR. DOODY: The Boiler Makers and the Iron Workers, and so on.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have a lot of sympathy in the Steelworker's Union, I suggest, and some of their own unions, the local construction industries have talked back and forth.

On motion, 503-03-04 through 504-03, carried.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak to 505. This is Manpower Training, is it, that we are on? I just wanted to say a few words about this that has been said; I am sure, time and time again but it needs to be said, it needs to be -

MR. HICKMAN: If the hon. gentleman would permit me, by the time we rise the Committee it is going to be one o'clock. Maybe he could start -

MR. LUSH: Okay, I will do whatever has to be done.

MR. HICKMAN: He can save it for the next day.

MR. LUSH: I move the adjournment. Is that the proper -

MR. SIMMONS: You have to sit down.

MR. LUSH: Okay.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been instructed to report that the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have made some

MR. CHAIRMAN: progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow Monday, May 9, 1977, provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Monday, May 9, 1977 at 10:00 a.m. or earlier.