



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 65

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

Wednesday

12 December 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries, I am pleased today to announce that in its continuing role as a source of financing to the inshore fishery, the Fisheries Loan Board has had a successful first eight months in the 1984-85 fiscal year. The Fisheries Loan Board provides loans and bounties and grants to inshore fishermen for the purchase of vessels, engines and equipment. The board has two loan programmes, one being direct loans for amounts under \$50,000 and the other being a guaranteed loan programme from chartered banks when the amounts are over \$50,000. The board also administers three bounty or grant programmes for small boats up to 35 feet in length, and another one for large vessels between 35 feet and 65 feet, and a third one for rebuilding vessels which are over 35 feet in length and over eight years old.

During the first eight months of the 1984-85 fiscal year the board approved 360 loans amounting to \$2.7 million for the purchase of 25 vessels over 35 feet, 140 vessels up to 35 feet and 195 for engines and other fishing equipment. In the same period the board approved 129 bounty or grant

applications for a value of \$400,000 and these were for 125 smaller vessels between 17 feet and 35 feet, and for four vessels between 35 feet and 65 feet.

I am pleased to report that the current administrative structure and procedures in the board are such that fishermen's loan and bounty requests are being handled very promptly. Currently there are 68 loan applications on hand, the majority of which were received within the past few weeks and are now undergoing various assessments prior to formal consideration by the board. Also, there are very few construction bounty applications on hand, especially for the smaller boats, since these are considered very quickly. There has been a number of improvements in the administrative structure of the board allowing for quicker approvals.

Mr. Speaker, these figures on the loan and bounty approvals are a clear indication we believe in this government's continuing commitment to the inshore fishery and the Fisheries Loan Board continues to be the financing vehicle which under its new administrative structure over the last couple of years is keeping that commitment. I thought that the hon. House should like to know just where we are as it relates to the Fisheries Loan Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, again we have the usual discourtesy of no copy of

that statement being provided beforehand. Maybe this is an indication of the intent and an explanation as to why there is no full time Minister of Fisheries that in reality the Premier has decided to continue the practice of being the real Minister of Fisheries but doing it behind the scenes so as to avoid responsibility for the mess that the fishing industry has been getting into under his government's guidance.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is the issuing of further loans, we have the Loans Board doing the job it was created by this House to do. And, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we have a situation now in the Province where because of the lack of proper attention being given to the fishing industry by this government, because of the fact that the government is ignoring the needs of the fishing industry, we have many fishermen unable to repay the loans which they have already received from the Fisheries Loan Board, and more and more of them losing the vessels, Mr. Speaker, that they borrowed money to obtain. So I would recommend strongly to the Premier that he appoint a full-time Minister of Fisheries, that he give the fishing industry the importance which is its due, that he pay some attention to meeting the needs of the fishermen of this Province instead of standing up with this trivia that we have here today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce today the first appointments to the Board of the

Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador. This new initiative in the field of preservation of our unique heritage follows the passage by this House of the Heritage Foundation Act last session. I know I speak for all members when I say that despite the climate of financial restraint which we face, measures for heritage conservation can never be dismissed as "frills" to be easily trimmed from pressured budgets: They are the touch-stones by which we define our identity as a people and, hence, by which we develop a rationale upon which relevant and positive government programmes are serviced and based.

Hon. members will recall the Heritage Foundation Act was brought forward to address the question of protecting and preserving our Province's built heritage through action to support private owners of significant heritage-value properties. Government cannot possibly acquire and itself restore even a comprehensive range of heritage building types: Necessarily the private sector must be encouraged to conserve and recycle heritage property with judicious and relative incentives. The act provides for an independent board which will have the power to designate important heritage properties to an official registry of heritage structures and, additionally, to make direct grants to the owners of such properties for the structural repair and rehabilitation of those buildings in accordance with their original character. So it is an independent board, Mr. Speaker.

This policy of designation and financial assistance will result in the preservation of our fast

vanishing architectural heritage and we are confident that the board under the capable chairmanship of Dr. Leslie Harris of Memorial University, will supply the objectivity, the scholarship and the knowledge of local conditions required to promote this important public policy and to fulfill its mandate as laid down by this House.

The other members of the board are as follows: Mr. Shane O'Dea of St. John's, Mrs. Judy Foote, of St. John's; Mrs. Edwina Suley of Carbonear; Mr. Corwin Mills of Clarenville; Mr. Jessie Butler of Burin; Mr. Al Green of Gander; Mr. Joe Halfyard of La Scie; Mr. Gilbert Higgins of Stephenville; Mr. Philip Greenacre of Corner Brook; Mr. Wendell Hamel of Labrador; and Mr. David Mills, who will be the official representative of my department on the board.

I anticipate that the full board will hold its initial meeting early in the new year and I look forward to seeing this important programme implemented throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I first thank the minister for getting me an advance copy of his release. I am glad to see that at least the minister is trying to establish a Heritage Foundation in the Province and at least show some visible signs of

doing so. There are, though, Mr. Speaker, some questions that need to be asked, one of the main questions being, Does this mean that the owners and operators of the Murray Premises will be getting more moneys to maintain the premises?

MR. SIMMS
Not at all!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the minister.

Be quiet now! Just be quiet now!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

MR. WARREN:
I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, the former minister must realize that what I am getting at is the owners of the Murray Premises are probably some of the bagmen of his party.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed when the hon. the minister was announcing the members of the board he mentioned that some of the board members are from Clarenville, LaScie, Burin, and then all of a sudden, as this government has been treating Labrador all along, Mr. Hamel from Labrador. There are thirty-nine communities in Labrador. The minister could have been specific and stated what community the man is from.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the minister's statement and hopefully we will be able to preserve the Heritage buildings throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

In light of the fact that Mrs. Carney in Ottawa has now confirmed that the decision of the Prime Minister and of the Government of Canada is that the retroactive Crown share of offshore and frontier oil fields will be eliminated because it is confiscatory and un-Canadian, will the Premier confirm that this situation will apply with respect to Hibernia as well and thereby significantly decrease the revenue which will be available to this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the amount of revenue that is going to be available to this Province from offshore will be dependent upon the agreement that is signed between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, and the policy to withdraw from the 25 per cent back-in, which was a disincentive to exploration and development I think, is a positive step. How it translates itself into the revenues that will come to Newfoundland out of the development is another question entirely, so that in the formalization of the agreement and in the revenue-sharing formula that will be applied as it relates to offshore, is when we will see whether we will get less revenues or more revenues as a result of

the 25 per cent back-in being gone. Let it be clear, Mr. Speaker, that is when we will know the share of revenue the Province will be getting, it will be in the agreement. And, of course, as everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be able to levy taxes and royalties the same as if the oil was on land. So we have that kind of power to be able to do it, which the former Liberal government was not prepared to do for us. It is only since the Conservative Government has come into power that we are going to be able to achieve this very successful agreement. But the level of revenues, in total, to come from the development is part of the negotiations. Whether we are able to access revenues that because of the 25 per cent back-in would now be available to Petro Canada and available to the governments, and how much of that we are able to negotiate in the agreement is subject to those negotiations.

MR. NEARY:
There is an awful lot of money there.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, finally I think we have gotten confirmation from the Premier that the revenue represented by that 25 per cent back-in will not be available for dividing up between the Province and the Government of Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
(Inaudible) could happen.

MR. BARRY:

Does that mean the Premier has not confirmed that that back-in is eliminated?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I answered your question. That does not mean necessarily that the amount of money that the Province will be getting will be any less.

MR. BARRY:

Okay. We do have it confirmed, however, Mr. Speaker, that that 25 per cent is gone. Now, we will be very interested in seeing how the Premier, with a 25 per cent smaller pie, is going to get a bigger share for the Province. We will watch closely, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct another question on another matter. We have, Mr. Speaker, some further adverse effects of the Wilson budget. The unemployment insurance rule changes apparently now have meant the loss of thousands of dollars to workers who were persuaded to take early retirement and who expected that unemployment insurance, as part of the process of their taking early retirement, would apply. Specifically, there has been a reference to Corner Brook, where approximately 100 employees apparently have been persuaded to take early retirement. And the potential is there, as was pointed out in the House some time ago, to persuade even more people at Corner Brook to take early retirement and make jobs available for the younger employees who would otherwise have to leave.

I would ask the Premier whether any representation has been made to the Government of Canada with respect to this modification, and specifically as to how it will probably further hurt employees at

Corner Brook and will hurt the economy of the Corner Brook area?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are monitoring the situation very closely and are making representation to the government in Ottawa. In fact the understanding by the workers when they were taking early retirement was that this money was to be available to them.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works.

I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not he has rented a house on behalf of his department in Cedar Village, over near Mount Cashel orphanage?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will answer that one.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY:

No, I asked the Minister of Public Works.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I am going to answer for the Minister of Public Works -

MR. YOUNG:

He is my boss, you know.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- because I know what the hon.

member is getting at.

MR. YOUNG:

That is right, the member is trying to dig up dirt.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am in the process of moving, Mr. Speaker, from the apartment that I now have to a house next door, a couple of hundred feet away. It is not a house, but a duplex or whatever you call it, two or three joined together. I think that is what the hon. member is referring to. The rent is exactly the same, I think, as the rent now being paid on the apartment. There is a lease outstanding on the apartment up to next June and I will pay the outstanding amount owing on the lease from now until next June. If it is not rented before then, I have assumed personally the liability to pay the outstanding amount.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Seeing the hon. gentleman wishes to answer the question, could the hon. gentleman tell us the rental cost per month of the house and whether the taxpayers will be paying that rent?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact figure, but I will get it for the hon. member. It is, I think, almost identical to the rent being paid now at Tiffany Towers, which is somewhere around

\$900 or \$920 a month under the same arrangement as before.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Perhaps the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who is going to pay the rent, may know what the amount is. Is it \$900 or is it \$1,200 a month that will be paid for this house in Cedar Village? While the hon. gentleman is on his feet, could he tell us what services will be provided? For instance, will there be a satellite dish provided? A swimming pool, or a whirlpool in the House? Could the hon. gentleman tell us what services will be provided? Will they have a Jacuzzi there, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not being fair putting out that kind of insinuation, that impression.

MR. NEARY:

But we would like to know.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is a basic duplex house. It has a kitchen, it has a small dining room, and living room. It has two bedrooms and two bathrooms. They are common, ordinary bathrooms, common rooms that you find in any ordinary duplex. There are no whirlpools or Jacuzzis, there are no swimming pools or satellite dishes. There is a tiny little garden out back. It is a very common, ordinary accommodation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is very common. If the hon. member would like to come and visit, I would be glad to show it to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No! No!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
A supplementary. There was a time there a couple of weeks ago when I might have been tempted, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. gentleman is now starting to turn me off. Now could the hon. gentleman tell the House why he is moving from an apartment?

MR. BARRETT:
It is none of your bloody business.

MR. NEARY:
It is my business because the taxpayers are paying the bill, and the taxpayers have a right to know -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

MR. NEARY:
- why the hon. gentleman is moving from a \$900 a month apartment to -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is entering into the realm of debate. He should be asking a direct question since it is a supplementary question.

MR. NEARY:

It is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Could the hon. gentleman tell us why it is necessary to move from an \$900 a month apartment -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To a \$910 a month place.

MR. NEARY:
- to what I am told is a \$1,200 a month house. And would the hon. gentleman also tell the House if public tenders were called for this house?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Oh, boy! Is this not funny? I am moving because I need more space. That is the simple reason. I am in a small apartment and I am moving for almost the identical cost into a place which has more space.

MR. NEARY:
And it will cost more.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I think the price is almost the same. I will get the exact figures. The price is almost identical. But as I say, the lease for the apartment that I am moving out of was for a year, up to next June. And from the time that I move out up to next June, if that apartment is not rented, however much rent is owing on that I am going to personally pay, because I am the one who is breaking the lease.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Could the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) tell the House if public tenders were called. And if they were not called, would the hon. gentleman tell the House why the Public Tendering Act was not followed in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is foolish, Mr. Speaker. Obviously public tenders were not called. You know, there has to be some discretion. If a person wants this apartment or that house or whatever, there has to be some personal taste involved in this. And obviously no public tenders were called and would never be called for this kind of a transaction. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is trying to be a little bit silly here.

MR. NEARY:

I certainly am not. It is taxpayer money and public tenders should be called.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Look, the hon. member, as I say, can come over and take a look at it this afternoon, this evening or tomorrow if you want to take a look at it.

MR. NEARY:

I will drop down during Christmas.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure, drop down during Christmas. Come down and see it and I will show you just how common it is. I bet you it is more common accommodation than the hon. member got.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Premier. Approximately five years ago the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement was signed and the fishery agreement for Coastal Labrador. A couple of weeks after it was signed the provincial government asked for more money for the Red Bay Road, more money for water and sewerage, and for more money generally. The federal government of that day said no, pointing out that the agreement had only been signed a couple of weeks before, but that after five years were up there was a possibility that an open-ended agreement might be reached. The five years are now up. Would the Premier inform this House if negotiations are going on with Ottawa to add more money to the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement? If no more money is to be added to the present Labrador DREE agreement concerning the Red Bay Road, the bridge across Lodge Bay, water and sewerage, upgrading the fish plants belonging to the Province etc., if there is no more money being put into it, could the Premier inform us if a new agreement is being negotiated?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All of the existing agreements and the new agreement that are on the table are presently under discussion with the Government of Ottawa right now. We will have to wait and see just what we will be able to work out in the Spring on the existing one, which we would want extended or renewed, and the new ones that we want signed. But hopefully by the Spring we will have some clear indication as to how many we are going to be able

to sign in 1985.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

So the Premier is looking at the possibility of extending the present agreement, trying to get more money for the Red Bay Road, upgrading the fish plants etc. Is this the strategy the Premier is going to take, that there is going to be an open-ended agreement like the former government promised, and if there is not then he is going to opt for a new agreement altogether?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, that is exactly right.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in a news release made by the Minister of Careers Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), in other words the Minister of level 2, not the Kindergarten Minister, that he appointed a committee of three government MHAs to assist in formulating policies and options for government. This is a most unusual procedure. I am not saying there is anything wrong with it, but members of the Legislature are usually appointed to committees of the House and not committees under the ministry.

MR. SIMMS:

Sure they are.

MR. NEARY:

No, they are not unless they are parliamentary secretaries or something of that nature. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House if these members -

MR. SIMMS:

You are wrong.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not wrong. I am right.

MR. DINN:

You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. NEARY:

Go down and play with your telephones.

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if these MHAs will be paid extra for this? Will they be paid their per diem allowances if they meet when the House is not sitting? Is there any special arrangement for remuneration for these MHAs?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, on the Committee of Government MHAs that I have put together to assist me in formulating some policy options for government, I would just like to say that just because it has never been done before does not mean that we should shy away from it. This government has done many things that have not been done before in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

We as a government are going to continue to do things which have not been done before in this Province, and we are going to show leadership in many directions, including the area of post-secondary education. Members opposite continuously insist on making fun of in some kind of a strange way the fact that we as a government are trying to get a handle on the educational needs of the post-secondary people in this Province, the fact that we are trying some way to correlate the kind of educational programme we have and the job opportunities that will exist and which now do exist in this Province. If somehow or other the Opposition on one hand wants to make fun of what the government is trying to do, and on the other hand criticize us for the employment problems in this Province, then it is certainly not being very consistent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

As it relates to the Committee of MHAs whom I have asked to assist me, they are doing it, as they often do on behalf of the citizens of this Province, voluntarily, of their own free will, and they are on their own free time. It is a committee of very excellent gentlemen that I have asked to assist me because of the nature of the problem and because this problem has not been dealt with directly before. And I just hope that we, as a committee, will be successful in formulating some policy options for government which will then be accepted by government and will help the young students of this Province learn skills which allow them a better opportunity to get a job in this

Province.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

If we are going to develop a new procedure in this House, would the hon. gentleman inform the House, if they are going to use MHAs in an advisory capacity, why they are not chosen from both sides of the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I have asked some government MHAs who support the government and who are interested in some initiatives to improve the educational policies and the educational opportunities in this Province. Why should I then have Opposition members who continually insist on destroying all of the options for government, destroying all of the initiatives that we have, whose sole function seems to be, certainly in the last week or so, to create unemployment, to create troubles in this Province? Those are not the kind of members, obviously, that I wish to surround myself with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there are any benefits with this job? For instance, I notice the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is doing a Dale Carnegie course. Is that a prerequisite to getting on the hon. gentleman's advisory committee? Is the hon. minister's department paying for part or any of that Dale Carnegie course that is being done by the member for Carbonear, or is the hon. gentleman merely doing the course at his own expense with the hope that it is a prerequisite to get into the Cabinet?

MR. YOUNG:

He is looking for the aitches I drop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Leave it to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to summarize in some jovial way exactly what our feelings are towards those kinds of questions.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it is the business of the member for Carbonear if he chooses to do any kind of course for self-improvement, of which the Dale Carnegie course is one and a very excellent one, one which I did many years ago. It is a good course and could be recommended to many persons in the Opposition considering the nature of some questions today. It teaches some common courtesy and some common decency towards certain other persons which some people in the Opposition obviously could take advantage of. The Dale Carnegie

course and other courses that have been taken either or are presently being taken by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) have certainly improved him in many ways and enable him in many cases to contribute, as he did as an educator in this Province, to the education of our young people. If the Dale Carnegie course helps him in turn on this committee to assist the government to improve the educational opportunities in this Province, then I am delighted for Dale Carnegie and the Dale Carnegie course and I commend the member for Carbonear for his initiative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Newhook) and it is similar to the question I asked yesterday but I think it is perhaps more appropriate today. In view of the cuts made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and in view of the fact that they happen to be most acute in the minister's district and in my own district, has the department made any representations either to CBC or the federal government to see that those particular cuts hopefully are reversed or not made as severe as they are?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the

statements made yesterday and I am meeting with CBG in Gander over this weekend and I will probably have something more to report later next week.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance because the Liquor Corporation comes under the hon. gentleman -

MR. SIMMS:
Ask him if he took the Dale Carnegie course.

MR. NEARY:
No, the hon. gentleman did not but he should.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, in connection with South African wine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Premier on a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
If the hon. member comes to visit me at Christmas, will he bring along a bottle?

MR. SIMMS:
There cannot be too much in the paper today, is there?

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, the kind of a bottle I would bring along for the hon. gentleman would not be South

African wine. I would try to remind the hon. gentleman of his roots and where he came from, I might bring along a drop of hop beer or something like that, a drop of home brew to try to remind the hon. gentleman of where he came from, of his roots. He is coming up in the world now, he is in one of the most posh housing developments in the city, Cedar Village.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair recognized the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and he indicated that he was going to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and up to this point he has failed to do that.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, there is a move on in Newfoundland, spearheaded by the Social Action Committee of the RC Church, to have South African wine removed from the shelves of the liquor stores.

MR. PECKFORD:
Oxfam started that.

MR. NEARY:
Oxfam started it because I raised it here before.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They started it before you raised it.

MR. NEARY:
No, they did not. They started after I raised it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
And then they had a meeting with me, and then they had a meeting with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. NEARY:

Because of the apartheid policy in South Africa, the discrimination against the black people, because of that policy would the hon. gentleman tell the House if it is the intention of the administration there opposite to order all South African wine to be taken off the shelves of the liquor stores throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this is just the beginning of many questions, whether the hon. member is now going to go into whether we will take vodka off because we do not like the Russians or whether we will take saki off because we do not like the Japanese or the Chinese or whatever. Anyway this topic is hardly a matter that one expects in Question Period because there is a long history to that, it reaches back for months and months if not years, so why it should come up now as an urgent public question I fail to see.

As was indicated to the hon. member, members of Oxfam and certain other groups have met with government on this matter, put forward their point of view and we put forward our point of view to them, and I think that we came to a mutual understanding of each other's point of view.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are no further ahead now than we were two years

ago when this matter first came up.

I will switch over to the Premier there and ask him about the telephone workers strike.

The hon. gentleman sent off a Telex, did he get a reply? What was the reaction from the telephone company? Is there any hope that that strike will be settled before Christmas Eve?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) informs me that the conciliation officer is busy at work as a result of the initiative that we took last week, contacting both sides and comparing positions on the outstanding issues. We do not want to say too much but there are talks underway and we are hopeful that the matter now can be resolved to everybody's satisfaction and that the workers can get back to work. So it seems to be working and movement is underway.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The question I put to the hon. gentleman was did he hear back from the President of the telephone company or did the President of the telephone company treat him the same way as did the Iron Ore Company of Canada, Fishery Products International, Bowaters, when they sat on information and I had to bring the information out in this House?

Did the President of the company do the hon. gentleman the courtesy of responding to his Telex? If so, what did they convey in the message to the hon. the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the president did reply to me in writing - as a matter of fact I got it, I think, yesterday evening but I forget the date on it - in which he thanked me for my Telex and my initiative on trying to get the dispute resolved and said that the company was willing to continue to work with the conciliation officer - I forget the terminology now, I would have to get the letter again, I do not know if he used the word aggressive - on an eager basis to get the dispute resolved. They were eager to respond to the initiative that I made in a positive manner and with the help of the conciliation officer try to get a solution to it. The President of the Newfoundland Telephone Company responded in writing.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I think the hon. the Premier read the Telex that he sent to the president of the telephone company in the House. Would the hon. gentleman undertake to table in this House the reply to that Telex? I think that is fair enough. The hon. gentleman was quick enough to announce that he had Telexed the company and he read the Telex. Now would he read

or table the reply? And also, because time is running out, when the hon. gentleman is on his feet could the hon. gentleman tell the House what happens in the event that the conciliation officer cannot get the parties back to the table? Will the hon. gentleman's office then become directly involved to try persuade the telephone company to stop putting the iron heel, the iron boot in the face of the telephone company employees? Would the hon. gentleman use whatever power he has under the Public Utilities Board to bar any increases that they make ask for in rates for the next five years as punishment for not dealing in good faith with the telephone employees?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is unreal, is it not? The member for LaPoile is unreal.

I would have to check, I guess, with the President of the company to see whether he is agreeable that his response be tabled, because I did not indicate to him in my Telex that his response would become public. I do not know, but I do not imagine that he would have any problems.

I do not know if I heard back in writing from the union or whether they phoned. I do not think I have anything in writing from the union. But it might be due to the fact that they responded to my Telex by contacting the Minister of Labour and Manpower's (Mr. Dinn) office. But I did hear back directly from the president of the company, and I guess I will have to check with the president of the company. The member asks what happens if? - all hypothetical

situations. We are working with what is the situation and addressing it in a meaningful and positive way. We will wait and see what happens, and if something else happens then we will respond again in a positive and a meaningful way. But I am not going to try and predict or use a crystal ball as to whether this fails or this succeeds or whatever. We are working now through the system in a meaningful and positive way and we are hopeful that the dispute will be resolved through this mechanism.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I would if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will tell us whether he has received the Auditor General's report for this year and when will he be in a position to table it? Does he intend to do it before this session of the House ends?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe the report, if it is not completed, is in the final stages, but I have not received it as yet. When the report is received clearly it has to be given some study so we will know what is in it, so I am not able at this point to indicate how much study will be required before it is tabled. But I reiterate that I have not yet received the report.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier, on a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is like the hon. Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) said the other morning in the House, I am getting bored. I mean here is an Opposition here who will get on the radio every day or whatever, and they do not even have enough questions to keep us going for Question Period.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. Leader of the Opposition, to that point of order.

MR. BARRY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. If we were able to get a few answers out of the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
If we were able to get a few answers instead of these generalities, Mr. Speaker, we would be able to follow up. But what is the point of following up this stuff? All we are getting is 'that is under consultation,' Mr. Speaker, and 'yes, there is representation made, Mr. Speaker.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has a question and I think he should be entitled to put it without interruption, in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The point of order raised by the Premier obviously was not a point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The reason I am asking this question now is because it is a supplementary, and I asked my colleagues if I could have one more question to the Premier about the telephone workers strike.

MR. TOBIN:

'Steve', 'Leo' says you are ancient history.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is being awfully, awfully rude in keeping with his tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the workers in this Province want legislation brought into this House barring companies from hiring non-union workers during a strike; in other words, to bar companies from hiring scabs. Now does the hon. gentleman intend to accede to that request from the trade union movement, from the employees of this Province?

AN HON. MEMBER:

People have a right to work.

MR. NEARY:

They have a right to work, unions have their rights too and employees have their rights. But is the hon. gentleman proposing to bring in anti-scab legislation in this session of the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think at this time we, as a government, are prepared to change our present policies as it relates to that issue.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for the Question Period has expired.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to provide the hon. members with answers to certain questions raised during the introduction of Bill 18, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act," also, Bill 2, "An Act To Amend The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act." It will also address some of the criticisms and misunderstandings which hon. member in the Opposition have raised in order that the records are set straight, and, in particular, so that I may reiterate the high priority and importance which government places on the health and safety of workers in this Province.

Number 1: In responding to the criticism that government, as an employer, has a poor record of compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act, I would

like to comment on several points. With respect to the establishment of joint committees which are required under the act, I want to stress that the establishment of these committees in government workplaces can only be done on the basis of co-operation between the employer and the workers involved. It should be noted that an important principle in the act is that the persons representing workers on the committee are to be elected by their fellow workers or appointed in accordance with the constitution of the union of which the workers are members. In practice, the workers, usually through their union, will submit the names to their members for a given committee and government, as an employer, will also submit names to that committee and the committee then can be established.

This means that the pace at which committees are established in government workplaces or any workplace for that matter, is influenced by the selection of worker representatives. Since this is one of the important rights of workers under the act, it is one area in which I would be reluctant to intervene, particularly as it is my understanding that a high degree of co-operation has been experienced in this effort and both sides involved in this matter recognize that priority should be given to high risk work activities such as those in the Department of Transportation. Information available to me indicates that approximately 100 committees have been established in government workplaces and that this is a continuing, ongoing process.

On the broader question of the success of the Occupational Health

and Safety Division in establishing joint workplace committee in both private and public sector workplaces, I can inform hon. members that the latest report shows 823 active committees. When you consider the many seasonal operations throughout the Province, this figure is all the more impressive. As a matter fact, given an average of eight members on each committee this represents a virtual army of people involved in the monitoring and improvement of working conditions, and would not be duplicated by staff from the Division of Occupational Health and Safety by any stretch of the imagination. You could think of how many people you would have to have if these volunteer people were not in place.

Needless to say, the committee's programme is one of the pillars of the Occupational Health and Safety legislation and, I, of course, salute the workers and employers throughout this Province who co-operate in making these committees such a success.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that government has been keeping a watchful eye on health and safety activities within its own area of responsibility since the Occupational Health and Safety Act came into force in 1979. It was our belief at that time, and experience has reinforced this, that eventually government would need to appoint a Co-ordinator of Occupational Health and Safety to manage the many facets of this important work within the government sector.

We have examined the manner in which certain other government jurisdictions have dealt with this matter and I have also consulted

with my colleagues, the hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), with respect to the need to improve co-ordination of these activities. And I am pleased to advise hon. members that government is currently considering the appointment of a Health and Safety Co-ordinator.

It is my view that this move would be one of the most significant measures which government could take to ensure that health and safety of workers in the government sector is properly managed. I should stress to hon. members that the concerns of government as an employer over occupational health and safety matters go far beyond the important issue of establishing joint workplace committees. For example, a co-ordinator would be responsible for equipping and operating a modern first aid room in the new Confederation Building Extension Complex. As well, first aid facilities throughout government workplaces, first aid training, general health and safety education programmes, and follow-up inspections within government workplaces will all be co-ordinated by this person. This will greatly improve the capability of staff in the Division of Occupational Health and Safety to organize training and seminars for government employees and to follow up on problems in the workplace as identified by joint workplace committees. All in all I view the appointment of a government co-ordinator of Occupational Health and Safety as a very significant measure.

Number two: With respect to the Labrador West dust study, I stated in my remarks during the

introduction of Bill 18 that important consultations are ongoing and will continue between various parties, namely the companies, unions and government, to address a draft code of practice for the prevention of silicosis. I should emphasize that the code of practice brings together a number of recommendations of the dust study and once in place will represent government's full commitment and required action as a result of the recommendations. The code of practice will largely be a technical document which will establish threshold limit values for various zones or working areas at the mining operations and it will set out dust monitoring procedures and also establish worker exposure limits beyond which a worker must be moved to a lighter dust area. In addition, a revised medical surveillance procedure will be introduced which will have the important feature of requiring closer liaison between the local medical examiner, the Occupational Health and Safety Division and the Workers' Compensation Commission. This latter feature is necessary in order to ensure that the health in dust exposure occupations is closely monitored.

Number three: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on criticism that the staff responsible for Occupational Health and Safety in my department are guilty of empire building - once people said the division did not have enough staff and now they say the division is guilty of empire building - and would be more effective if the highly specialized staff, which is the majority of cases in the division, were provided with additional training so that they could inspect a broader range of

workplaces and equipment. If one considers the types of skills involved in this programme, such as elevator inspection, mining engineers, pressure vessel inspectors, one can readily conclude that little if any efficiency would be attained by having these people involved outside of the specialized area for which they are trained. This matter has been considered on more than one occasion and it is generally concluded that the move in the direction of generalized inspectors would have the affect of lowering their level of competence and consequently the standard of safety in the workplace. As a matter of fact, when the legislation had been drafted, concern was expressed by the mining industry that specialized staff, including mining engineers be retained in order that the inspection programme would not be watered down. One area where considerable progress has been made is with respect to occupational hygiene. Whereas prior to the creation of the Occupational Health and Safety Division in 1978 - 1979 occupational hygiene programmes were limited to mining properties only, the hygiene programme has been expanded to cover all work places throughout the Province. For example, when workers complained of problems in the laboratory in the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls, a hygienist from the department inspected the facility and made recommendations which essentially condemned the laboratory. Based on these recommendations government acted and provided the funding for a new laboratory.

Number four: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced Bill 18 I made

reference to an important provision of the Occupation Health and Safety Act, which is the right of a worker to refuse to do any work that he or she has reasonable grounds to believe is dangerous to his or her health and safety. In response to a question from an hon. member, I can inform hon. members that only nine instances - now that is since 1979 - nine instances have been reported to my department where a worker exercised that right. Bearing in mind that the act was brought in in 1979, over this five year period this is a testimony to the workers of this Province who have not abused this right but have exercised diligence and care over occupational health and safety matters. It suggests as well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that generally speaking workers in this Province are not exposed to unusually hazardous working conditions.

Number five: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the concern which has been raised over the size of the inspection staff of the Division of Occupational Health and Safety. I earlier provided information on the expansion of the division from 84 in 1979 to 102 at present. Most of this growth has been in the General Inspection Branch, the Health and Safety Education Unit and in Occupational Hygiene as these were the most efficient programme areas at that time. To a considerable extent the increased capability is directed at general workplaces such as construction, fishing, logging, commercial and institutional areas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to stress that the number of inspection staff is not the major point to consider. It is generally recognized that it is

impossible to visit all work places throughout the Province on a frequent basis, the logistics are simply against doing this. Accordingly the thrust of the Occupational Health and Safety Act is that workers and employers in a co-operative approach are the obvious and appropriate people to identify and correct unsafe and unhealthy working conditions. In so doing the need for intervention by government inspection staff is minimized. For this reason we have placed considerable emphasis on the joint work place committees.

MR. BARRY:

You are abusing the rules of the House.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member may not be concerned about occupation health and safety but I can assure you the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is, Mr. Speaker.

Notwithstanding this, my department keeps a close watch on the need for additional staff and will ensure that the capability to respond to complaints and requests for services is maintained. In this regard my department is currently recruiting to fill a new position of health and safety committee officer whose duties will be to concentrate on committee activities -

MR. SIMMS:

So that is a co-ordinator and a committee officer?

MR. DINN:

Yes, that is right.

- and will assist committees in solving problems and ensure that proper follow-up on programmes in the work-place occurs.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to a question which arose during the debate on Bill 2, An Act To Amend The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act, I can advise that the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Advisory Board does not have a woman appointed to it. However, I also draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act is very specific with respect to the membership of the advisory board and allows little discretion on the part of government. I believe this was asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Section 28 of the act in effect states that the membership would consist of a representative of persons engaged in the design, manufacture, assembly, erection or installation of equipment covered under the act; a representative of owners of pressure systems, two representatives of holders of first class certificates under the act, two representatives of provincial training agencies involved in training operators under the act, and a departmental representative. Naturally if any of the organizations chose to nominate a woman, I would be more than pleased to accept that nomination. However, it must be recognized that the majority of members on the advisory board would by nature have a technical competence in the field and obviously the various organizations nominating representatives are guided by this fact. This is not to say, however, that women with competence in the engineering field are not available and I hasten to inform hon. members that the Engineering and Technical Services Branch of my department, which is responsible for administering this legislation,

has on staff a woman who holds a degree in mechanical engineering and is responsible for approving diagrams submitted for the design of boiler and pressure systems. This is indicative, I believe, of the fact that not only is my department prepared to appoint women to an advisory board, but is also willing and pleased to employ them wherever the opportunity exists. The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked this question and apparently he is not interested in the answer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I could continue for some considerable time in briefing hon. members on many of the positive actions which government has taken with respect to occupational health and safety. I trust that I have addressed most of the questions and concerns raised by hon. members in the debate and will be pleased to provide any additional information.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Is the hon. the minister answering a question?

MR. HICKEY:
I have an answer to a question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Before recognizing the hon. minister, I have to remind all hon. members that this being Private Members' Day, the private members' business should commence under Standing Order 53 (4) not later than four o'clock. The only way the hon. minister can answer a question now is by leave.

Does the hon. minister have leave? Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Leave is not granted.

I call private member's resolution Number 6 on the Order Paper, to be moved by the hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:
The Dale Carnegie expert.

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that I am elated by the fact that the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) recognized that some of my extracurricular activities have been favourable. However, Mr. Speaker, to get into the resolution on the Order Paper today, I would first of all read the resolution for the record.

WHEREAS it is vital to the economic well-being of Newfoundland and Labrador that joint federal/provincial cost-sharing agreements be negotiated in such areas as rural development, secondary roads, and the Trans-Canada Highways upgrading, etc.; and

WHEREAS there has been a substantial decline in the amount of funding to the Province during the past few years as the result of the lack of such agreements; and

WHEREAS during the past few months there has been a renewed effort on the part of both governments to sign a number of vital development agreements;

MR. SIMMS:

The previous government you are talking about now.

MR. PEACH:

Previous government, yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Make that clear.

MR. PEACH:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges both governments to continue their efforts to reach new agreements in all areas that are presently outstanding as quickly as possible.

Now I have to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset that when this motion was put on the Order Paper a considerable number of months ago, and I do not look into a crystal ball very often or consult with my friend from Placentia on his ouija board, however it is very obvious that this resolution had a lot of motherhood in it and since then some of the parts of the resolution have been already addressed and agreed upon by both governments. I might add that a lot of it was done in the flurry of activity that took place during the early Summer when the federal election was called.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. PEACH:

At that time, and prior to it, we were accused of not being able to negotiate with our federal counterparts who were of the opposite political stripe.

MR. SIMMS:

Go ahead and say it, Liberals. Say they were Liberals.

MR. PEACH:

They were Liberals, yes, with a large "L", I guess that is the best way of putting it. At that particular time they were more than anxious to throw out some of their political propaganda and were quite willing to sit down with our government, which was quite willing and able and capable of negotiating.

MR. SIMMS:

The Premier said in two months he signed more agreements than he did in the previous four years.

MR. PEACH:

As a matter of fact, as my colleague from Grand Falls reminds me - yes, that had slipped my mind - in the couple of months after the election was called, and when the election was in the air, more agreements were signed than had been signed in the previous five or six years. That was a clear indication of Mr. Trudeau and his group clinging to power at the time, their attempt to cling to power by putting as much funding as possible into this Province in the hope and of regaining their five seats. However, I think the people of the Province spoke very clearly on September 4, and we were very successful in electing four Tory members to the House of Commons in Ottawa. For the second time in recorded history there was a Tory elected in Bonavista - Trinity - Conception. In recent days in particular he has shown a great deal of interest and has been very co-operative with members from both sides of this hon. House. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a clear indication

of the new atmosphere of federal/provincial co-operativism, I guess, is the word that has been used, rather than the era that we just went through of federal/provincial confrontation. Only a few days ago the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and I were in Ottawa and as a matter of fact had a meeting with the federal MP from Bonavista - Trinity - Conception (Mr. Johnson). I guess it must be the first time in recorded history that a Liberal and a Tory met with a Tory federal MP to discuss some of the concerns of the hon. member's district, as well as of mine.

MR. SIMMS:

There is no way of putting the member for Bellevue on the right course, is there?

MR. PEACH:

The member for Bellevue probably has decided that it might be time to get on the right track. However, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the resolution, I am sure that as the evening goes on, and next Wednesday when we come back to this resolution again, that the members opposite from the new coalition for socialism, both parties, will get up to make some comments on this. They will agree with the resolution and I am sure we will have unanimous agreement next Wednesday when we close out debate on this resolution because I cannot honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that there is anything in this resolution that members opposite would want to speak out against. We all realize the vital need for federal/provincial agreements in our Province with the economy such as it is, and I am sure that the areas mentioned, rural development, secondary roads, the Trans-Canada Highway upgrading, and dozens of other

agreements that are presently being negotiated and others that have been already negotiated and signed, nobody would say we do not need federal/provincial funding in our Province. Of course, as was referred to in the second part of that resolution, Mr. Speaker, we all realize, and I think the members opposite would be doing the people of this Province an injustice if they did not agree, that over the past few years such agreements were not signed, were not put in place. And it was not due to the fact, as they like to portray to the media, that it was our lack of willingness to negotiate, Mr. Speaker. It is very evident that on many occasions we tried to get agreements which, as I already indicated, have been signed and agreed to prior to the September 4 election. But at that time we always met with a blind eye and one ear to say the least from our counterparts in Ottawa. And, of course, I am sure we all realize and are appreciative of the fact that that type of attitude and atmosphere does prevail now and that is very evident in the way that our Opposition has been reacting the past few days, the past numbers of weeks, in really complaining because there is such a co-operative attitude now from both levels of government. They are really very scared, I guess, that we will negotiate agreements that will be good for this Province and will get us back on the road to economic well-being, and, of course, that is not politically good for those people opposite because I am sure when we go to the polls again that their numbers will be reduced substantially. As a matter of fact, we might even again eliminate the NDP from the House.

But to continue, Mr. Speaker, during the past few months there have been renewed efforts to sign some agreements and I have to draw hon. members attention to a brochure that has been prepared and passed out. During late Spring and early Summer, actually during the months of May and June, there were seven such agreements signed between the then Federal Liberal Government in their attempts to hang on to power, and, of course, our provincial government. Those seven agreements, Mr. Speaker, were vital agreements, were agreements that this Province needed and needed badly. We should note the agreement in planning, the agreement on mineral development, the Burin Peninsula agreement and the Rural Development Agreement, which was a bone of contention here in this House last Spring, Mr. Speaker, and took many hours of debate, discussion and questions, the ocean industries agreement, the tourism agreement, and the pulp and paper agreement, and it is only now, Mr. Speaker, that we are into the nuts and bolts of that. I am sure we all realize that a tourism agreement is an essential one for this Province. Quite often our tourist industry goes probably somewhat by the wayside and does not bring in the actual dollars it has the potential of realizing

MR. STAGG:

Tell us about the per capita income in Newfoundland from 1949 to 1984.

MR. PEACH:

Well, probably I will leave that to my hon. colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I am sure he is ready to address some comments to this very important motherhood resolution

that is before the House today. But those seven agreements that have already been negotiated and signed, Mr. Speaker, have created \$4 million worth of jobs, of course, and we have jobs for our future. I have to comment on some of those briefly, Mr. Speaker, because I think one of them was specifically mentioned in the resolution when I had it put on the Order Paper a number of months ago. One of the agreements dealing with planning, of course, was signed in May and, of course, long-range planning has been the objective and the goal of this government. I am sure we all realize that many of the short-term programmes and plans that we have gone through in the past are not necessarily the most desirable. We all, I suppose, appreciate programmes such as NEED programmes, Canada Works programmes and so on, but we must realize that they are only short-term, and I am sure that is what they were meant for in the beginning although I realize that many communities in our Province have become pretty well dependent on them. I hope and trust that in the years ahead, in fact in the next couple of years, with the new feeling for negotiation between our two governments, that we will put in some more long-term plans and long-term means of creating employment than we have had in the past.

The mineral's agreement has put \$22 million into this Province. It was signed, again, back in May. I am sure we all realize the mineral potential that we have in our Province. Some new resources mentioned by our minister responsible for mines (Mr. Dawe) on the West Coast of our Province and the reactivation of the fluorspar mine on our South Coast,

all of this, Mr. Speaker, along with more exploration for other mineral potential is essential if we are to capitalize on our mineral potential

The Burin Peninsula Development Fund: I am sure we all realized over the past number of months that the fishery and the restructuring programme have gone through periods of down time, and while I guess we would have to refer to the fishery in all parts of the Province, the situation applied particularly on the South Coast. This development fund, this agreement was absolutely essential for that part of the Province to continue to exist and to get some other things moving there to help out with the state of its depressed economy.

As I said earlier, and said directly in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Rural Development Agreement, a four year, \$18.2 million agreement, was signed in June and provides support for projects that development associations take on. I feel that the development associations are doing an excellent job in the Province. I probably should note that I must have one of the few rural districts in the Province that does not have a rural development association.

MR. WARREN

I do not have one.

MR. PEACH:

My hon. friend for Torngat (Mr. Warren) indicates that he does not have one, but I am sure he has other forms, other groups, Native people associations of all types that take the place of development associations.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Funded by government.

MR. PEACH:

They are all funded by government. I had the privilege last year of visiting some parts of the hon. member's area and realized from talking to some of the groups there that they do share some federal/provincial Native agreements and other federal agreements and a lot of dollars are poured into that area from both levels of government. But as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I have one of the few rural districts in the Province that does not have a development association. However, I realize the work they do and realize the importance of funding from both levels of government for development associations.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Is not your district covered by some nearby development association?

MR. PEACH:

There is no association.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I mean, is not your district included in some other development association.

MR. PEACH:

No, there is no funding from Rural Development at all. They have not capitalized on that type of funding in any part of my district. I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that in the next number of months some group takes the initiative to form a development association in that part of the Avalon.

The ocean industries agreement put another \$28 million into our Province.

MR. TULK:

Could we have a quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

There is a quorum call.

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to continue?

Agreed.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize, I guess, all of what I was saying was getting to some of the members opposite. They realize the motherhood issue that I am addressing here this afternoon and the manner in which I am doing it I think indicates the success I have had so far with my Dale Carnegie course. One of that parts of that is you are supposed to show enthusiasm in your speaking and I sure the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), when he called a quorum there, realized that I was doing just that. To continue, Mr. Speaker, the sixth agreement we had was the \$21 million tourism agreement signed in August of this year. By that time we were into the election and I guess that was one of the last efforts made by the Liberals in Ottawa to try to persuade the people of this Province to again return the Liberal Party to power but it did not succeed. We have our agreement and I am sure we are all supportive of expanding the tourism sector, which could add a lot to the economy of this

Province.

The pulp and paper modernization agreement, Mr. Speaker, is something I am sure my colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) put a lot of hard work into, being from a paper town. We all realize the potential of our pulp and paper industry.

MR. TOBIN:

Charlie Power did that.

MR. PEACH:

I am sure the former minister responsible for Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), along with the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), put a lot of work and effort into that. And it is only now, Mr. Speaker, that we see how essential it was to have such an agreement as that, to get two of our mills in this Province off on the right economic track. It was only a few days ago that the Premier indicated here in the House that the mill at Grand Falls was losing money.

MR. TOBIN:

Look at the coalition over there.

MR. PEACH:

Yes, the coalition for socialism is noticeable by the absence of its members today, my colleague reminds me.

The paper mill at Grand Falls needs modernization if it is to be competitive on the world paper markets, if it is to remain a viable operation creating the number of jobs that it has over the past number of years, as I am sure it will continue to do as long as this government here is in power, a government which wants to create jobs, which is the opposite theory being preached this last number of days by the parties

opposite.

MR. TOBIN:
To destroy.

MR. PEACH:
Well, I do not know. That is probably too harsh a word.

MR. TOBIN:
Not half harsh enough.

MR. PEACH:
I have also tried to offer constructive criticism, I do not want to offer negative criticism, but there seems to be a clear indication that the members opposite want many of our industries to close down so they can capitalize and say a Tory government closed those plants. But that will not be so, Mr. Speaker. We will continue to strive to keep our resource industries open and I am sure in the next few days -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. PEACH:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding me of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:
I will clue up in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an indication of what happened today

in Question Period when they had no questions to ask. Now, Mr. Speaker, the same thing has happened again and they do not have anyone to speak.

MR. TULK:
Leave is withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Leave has been withdrawn.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, I have permission to continue on?

MR. SPEAKER:
No, leave has been withdrawn.

MR. PEACH:
Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, put forward by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), to begin with I congratulate the member for taking the Dale Carnegie course. I highly recommend it to any gentlemen in the House because I believe that one can be enlightened on what a person can learn in fourteen weeks.

MR. SIMMS:
Did you finish the course?

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I hate to be interrupted by an ignorant gentleman from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard in

silence and the hon. minister can close his lip or go outside.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, on this resolution that the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has brought into the House, last week the hon. member for Grand Falls, the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) said that our resolution was redundant because some of the things that were in the resolution were already in process. I would likewise say the same thing about the hon. member's resolution. The hon. member's resolution I think is wasting the time of the House. Just as the minister said last week we were wasting the time of the House, today we are still wasting the time of the House because this resolution, as was the resolution last week, is redundant, Mr. Speaker. However, if we are obliged to debate the resolution, naturally we on this side will debate it as vigorously as possible.

The member for Carbonear said he was talking a bit positively. No doubt he was probably trying to talk a bit positively, but he was talking about the past and, Mr. Speaker, when one talks about the past I do not think one is very positive. I think the hon. member will learn in part eight of the Dale Carnegie course that when you are talking positively you talk about the future. You do not talk about the past when you are trying to speak in a positive manner. Unfortunately the hon. member for Carbonear has not gone far enough in his Dale Carnegie to know how you should use a positive approach.

Mr. Speaker, there is one

difference I noticed since September 4, particularly since this House began sessions in early November. In past sessions of the House when the Premier, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), or any other minister made a Ministerial Statement, he would be lambasting the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa and continuously giving it to them with both barrels. Mr. Speaker, in some cases ministers of that former administration received their just reward on September 4. However, I believe that since November 7 when this government here resumed the sittings of this House, for some reason the Premier, his colleagues and his followers, have been sitting on their laurels and expecting and waiting for the Tory Government in Ottawa to give them handouts. But this does not work, Mr. Speaker. We can see from Mr. Wilson's budget that if you do not fight whoever is in Ottawa you are not going to get your just reward. You have to keep fighting them in Ottawa. As a province you have to be strong, you have to stand up for your rights, but this government, since September 4, is not standing up for the rights of the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. What I cannot, Mr. Speaker, believe is for the Premier and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and other ministers to get up in this House and say they are having ongoing conversations with the federal government. That, Mr. Speaker, to me is one of two things: Either the individual person, either the Premier or a minister, is misleading the public, is informing the public in an incorrect manner; or they are not trying to get what is good for Newfoundland and Labrador. They are doing one of those two

things. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in responding to questions from this side of the House, the Premier is not telling the facts. Because we have asked several questions in past days of the Premier and he in response said there were ongoing negotiations, but when supplementary questions were put to the Premier, the Premier became dejected because he did not even know what was happening in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we want to get our just reward from the federal government in Ottawa, this Premier has to fight just as hard as he fought against Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien and Mr. Rompkey and the rest of them. Because, Mr. Speaker, they are the same -

MR. MARSHALL:

Now they negotiate.

MR. WARREN:

The only difference, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa now is the colours have changed but the policies remain the same. They will give Newfoundland just as little as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to do as the hon. member for Carbonear did, and go down through a couple of the whereases. He said:

'WHEREAS there has been a substantial decline in the amount of funding flowing to this Province during the past few years as a result of the lack of such agreements.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe if we go back and look at the number of dollars that came into this Province in the 1983/84 fiscal year, there was more money came into this Province from Ottawa in 1983/84 and 1982/83 than in the previous years. I believe

the member for Carbonear has not researched his facts and therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is another example of how a member opposite brought in a resolution thinking that the Liberal Government was still going to be in power when the time came to debate it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the Liberal Party were in power in Ottawa, the member for Carbonear would not have been such a calm and collected individual speaking in this House today. So therefore this resolution was an attempt to pressure the Liberal Government in Ottawa to try to get more agreements signed.

Mr. Speaker, on this side we are so concerned about this resolution I have brought in an amendment. I move, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), that all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted, "This House condemns the Government of the Province for its willingness to accept the crumbs off the present Tory table in Ottawa rather than negotiate firmly and vigorously to meet the needs of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador."

MR. RIDEOUT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this resolution I think is very clear as it stands on the Order Paper. That is, the resolution urges both governments to continue their efforts to reach new agreements in all areas that are presently

outstanding as quickly as possible.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the intent of the resolution, that is the guts of the resolution, that is what it is all about. And I would say to Your Honour that the particular amendment put down by the hon. gentleman for Torngat (Mr. Warren) totally negates the intent of that. It is totally contrary to the intent that is laid out in the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED clause and therefore according to parliamentary rules is certainly out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Where is the House Leader?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. BARRY:

Ring the bells.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me refer the hon. the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth to Beausheerne, page 431. I think what he was saying was the amendment proposed by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) negates the proposition as put forward by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

MR. BARRY:

It makes it stronger

MR. TULK:

That is right. Exactly what happens, Mr. Speaker, in this amendment put forward by the member for Torngat Mountains is that he is making the motion somewhat stronger. And let me

refer the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) to Section 431 in Beausheerne. "An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved." I also refer him to Section 425: "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question." Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that what the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has moved does exactly what those two sections refer to in Beausheerne. I submit to Your Honour that amendment is in perfect order. I would suggest to Your Honour, if I might, that perhaps you would like to take a few minutes to take a look at the amendment to see if indeed it is in order.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a further submission with respect to the point raised by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout). Really it is to offer Your Honour something substantive that you could use in determining whether or not this amendment is in order. First of all, if I recall the wording of the amendment itself, even though I do not have a copy of it, it certainly is not an acceptable

amendment when it talks about accepting the crumbs and that sort of a thing. I mean, that is hardly proper wording for an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN

It is Liberal crap.

MR. DOYLE:

It does not make it more acceptable.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, Beauséne clearly points out that an amendment which is equivalent of a negative, which negates the original intent of the resolution is not an acceptable amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) rightly pointed out, this resolution calls on both governments to continue their efforts in a reasonable manner to reach agreements. Now I cannot understand, in the first place, why the Opposition would want to propose an amendment to it, because surely they would want to support that. That is hardly something not supportable.

MR. BARRY:

We want to toughen it up, put some teeth in it.

MR. SIMM:

This does not put any teeth in it, Mr. Speaker. I submit the amendment clearly negates the intent of that resolution. The amendment is to condemn the Government of this Province. That is clearly negative to the resolution which is that the House urge both governments to continue in a positive manner to reach

agreements on federal/provincial cost sharing arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, they can submit all the evidence they want, but it is clear to anybody who is listening to this debate that that amendment is entirely out of order. It negates entirely the resolution, and therefore it cannot be accepted. I submit it is impossible to accept such an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, rarely have we seen a former Speaker of the House sink to such a low with respect to parliamentary procedure. Mr. Speaker, the picture is trembling on the wall there. And I would not be bit surprised to see every other hon. gentleman who is hung on this wall turn his face away. As a matter of fact they have. Now that I look at it, they all have their faces turned away except this gentleman here.

The four closest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member's picture has turned their faces away in shame because a former Speaker would get up and make such a flimsy argument.

Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to Beauséne, paragraph 425, which has already been referred to by my learned friend. "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original which

must, however, be relevant to the subject of the questions." So the only matter at issue here is whether that amendment is relevant to the question.

Now the question here has to do with the approach of government to federal/provincial agreements. The resolution is that 'This House urges both governments to continue their efforts to reach new agreements in all areas that are presently outstanding as quickly as possible.'

The intent of the amendment is to point out that this government should be condemned, Mr. Speaker, for the way in which they have totally failed in their approach to federal/provincial agreements, and the amendment proposes this condemnation because they should be approaching negotiations vigorously and firmly in order to meet the needs of this Province. Nothing could be more relevant, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the format, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of amendments that have gone through this House and have been accepted on that basis. It is a very dangerous game that the former Speaker of this House is playing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I can offer Your Honour something substantive. Again I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 154, Subsection 436, and I quote for Your Honour 436 (1): "An

amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order." Mr. Speaker, "is out of order". And to carry on, Mr. Speaker, Subsection (2) "An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion was simply negatived is out of order."

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is right.

MR. SIMMS:

Paragraph 437, Subsection (1): "An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved." Subsection (2), Mr. Speaker: "An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice" and is also out of order."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that all of those will now help you in making your decision. You will probably will not even need to retire to your chambers because those references are so clear that even the hon. members opposite should be able to understand that that resolution as amended would be totally out of order and unacceptable.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I will recess for a few moments and look into the matter.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have consulted with some authorities and it appears that this amendment is in order.

MR. SPEAKER:
According to rule 425 it is not a direct negative. The amendment, moved by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), seconded by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), was that all the words after 'that' be deleted and the following substituted, 'this House condemns the government for its willingness to accept the crumbs from the present Tory table in Ottawa rather than negotiate firmly and vigorously to meet the needs of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador,' is in order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:
I believe the hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY:
Your time has expired.

MR. SIMMS:
You are expired.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I have two minutes left.

MR. NEARY:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. STAGG:
I have the floor on a point of order.

MR. WARREN:
I only want to clue up, anyhow.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. member's time has not elapsed, he has two minutes left.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A good ruling. Mr. Speaker, maybe for the rest of this afternoon, and next Wednesday afternoon, we can have a lively debate in this House and, hopefully, members on both sides of the House will speak up for the people of this Province. The people of this Province know that since we have had a Tory government in Ottawa the Premier and the Cabinet ministers have not been fighting hard enough to get more agreements signed with this Province. Mr. Speaker, I urged the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who met Mr. Wilson prior to presentation of his budget that he get to Ottawa and fight the Minister of Finance as well as he fought the former Minister of Finance to try to get better deals for Newfoundland. It is not because we have a 'blue' machine in Ottawa now that we are going to get more if we do not fight for it. If the Premier is a 'fighting Newfoundlander' let him show it now as he showed it nine months ago.

MR. NEARY:
Right on!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, the member for

Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) and the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) last year spoke in debate condemning the former federal government for not helping Newfoundland and Labrador. Let them get up today and condemn the Premier for not fighting as hard as he fought last year. Let us see if they can you put the shoe on the other foot this time.

MR. SIMMS:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
I do not think members on this side who are prepared to speak in this debate have a copy of the amendment. Is it possible to get a copy of the amendment for members of the House to see so they can address themselves to it? Hon. members here are asking for it -

MR. NEARY:
Why did you not go to the table?

MR. SIMMS:
-because all the members here would like to have a copy.

MR. SIMMS:
I submit that as a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of order, copies of the amendment will be here presently.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:
Thank you very much.

MR. BAIRD:
Now they will know that 'Freddie' is backing down!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:
My friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) would draw attention to my temporary absence from the House. I understand things were reasonably dull while I was away but I decided to come back and liven up things to the best of my ability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution before the House today as put forward by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach). I believe it may have been put on the Order Paper last Spring when there may have been another situation extant in the country, that being the then regime of the late lamented Pierre Elliott Trudeau was running rampant throughout this country. Well, there is a different regime in this country at this time and it is probably apropos of the changed circumstances that the

member opposite would propose such an amendment. It is an amendment, we would think, from people who are used to slavishly adhering to the Liberal tradition, no matter how devastating it would be to the economy of this Province. It is a well-known Liberal tradition in the large L sense. It does not matter how destructive Liberal policies are, if they are put forward by a Liberal government in Ottawa it matters not. All that matters is that the Liberal Party says it, therefore they will fall in line with no difficulty whatsoever.

So it is now appropriate, I suppose, that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would propose this amendment, which really points out the main difficulties that the Liberal Party has been experiencing in this Province and it is now being transferred to the national scene.

The people of Canada have wised up to the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party has shrunk in number from 146 in 1980 in Canada down to 40. That is a drop of 106 members. In 1966 in Newfoundland, when the Liberal Party was at its zenith, it had 39 members in a forty-two seat House. It now has eight members in a fifty-two seat House and it has one erstwhile Liberal, a gentleman who was once an adherent to the Liberal faith, sitting ostensibly as a member of the NDP.

MR. YOUNG:

What about the NDP Leader? 'Peter' was not elected.

MR. STAGG:

And, of course, their leader was not elected.

MR. SIMMS:

When did he stand for the Liberal Party?

MR. STAGG:

Well, he was a member of the Liberal Party. Do you really want me to tell about that? Is that telling tales out of school?

MR. ANDREWS:

Tell us all you know.

MR. STAGG:

Well, in 1969, the now leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) was trying desperately to get elected to go to the Liberal leadership convention in those days.

MR. ANDREWS:

What? Go on!

MR. STAGG:

I was present at the time and I saw him trying to manoeuvre his way on to the ballot. The now member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and I were supporting Mr. Crosbie. I, of course, went with the real 'liberals' in this Province, the small 'l' liberals, and came across to the people who are ostensibly known as the P.C.s. But the real 'liberals', the small 'l' liberals in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are here on this side of the House, and the big 'T' Tories, the big government boys, are on the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

These are the people who stand for power and influence and unfair advantage. These are the 'Liberals' on the other side of the House. They are what has been traditionally known as the Tories in Canada. It is a strange, convoluted system we have here in

Newfoundland where this sort of thing can happen.

MR. SIMMS:

It is a coalition on the other side, more or less.

MR. STAGG:

A coalition on the other side, yes, and the now leader of the N.D.P. (Mr. Fenwick), well, I am not quite sure what his political philosophy is.

Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment to the resolution put forward by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) which indicates that this government is to be condemned because it will accept the crumbs of Confederation. Well, let us do a cursory examination of history to see who consumed the crumbs of Confederation from 1949. In 1949 when we joined Canada, or when Canada joined us - a very narrow vote, of course, but we did join Canada in 1949 - our per capita income in Newfoundland was 46 per cent of the national average; the national average was at 100 per cent, ours was at 46 per cent. Now the national average is at 100 per cent and what does Newfoundland average? Fifty-three per cent. So we have progressed from 48 per cent to 53 per cent, 5 per cent in - what is it? - 35 years.

An examination of the Government of Canada during those years would illustrate that the Liberal Party has been in power for all but six years, and for twenty-three years the Liberal Party was in power here in Newfoundland.

MR. HISCOCK:

And laid a great foundation.

MR. STAGG:

Yes, it laid a great foundation.

It laid a great foundation for toadies, the toadies who now adhere to the so-called Liberal faith here in this Province. That is the great foundation that was laid. They are a dying breed. They are like the dinosaur, Mr. Speaker, they are dying. They are like the mammoth, they are like the dodo bird, they are going, going, going - gone. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be gone in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

I predict that, Mr. Speaker, and my predictions have been far too accurate for the hon. gentlemen opposite to cast any aspersions on them. I have predicted it before and I will predict it again, that there will be four members maximum left in the Opposition after the next election. I do not know whether they will be Liberal or N.D.P.

I was elected on the 24th of March, 1972 when Frank Moores finally took over this government, when the now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) finally got into the House as a P.C. -

MR. SIMMS:

On the coattails of Frank Moores.

MR. STAGG:

- on the coattails of Frank Moores, yes, and got back in here in 1982 on the coattails of Brian Peckford. But anyway, on the 24th of March, 1972, I fearlessly predicted that the next government in Newfoundland other than a P.C. government would be an N.D.P. government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

The next government in Newfoundland other than a P.C. government would be an N.D.P. government, and I would say that is the case now. The present NDP are so far left they are to the left of Marx, if that is possible. So I predict, Mr. Speaker, that they have a long way to go. The NDP party may eventually get power in Newfoundland, I say they may be the party of the twenty-first century, but they have at least another sixteen years to spend in the political wilderness.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I do not think that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would intentionally mislead this House but I think he made the statement that his predictions have always been accurate. As I recall, the member for Stephenville predicted just before the last provincial election that he would be a member of the Tory Cabinet on the other side and that has not happened to him and I do not believe it is about to. So I would ask him to say that all of his predictions have not been correct.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

I plan to be around for a long time in political life. I wanted

to get onto the Stirling years. The Stirling years are years that I wanted to deal with.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, I rule there is merely a difference of opinion.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

I am planning to be here in the twenty-first century, Mr. Speaker. I will only be fifty-eight years old, but hon. members opposite would then be collecting their pensions. Let them calculate. I was elected in 1979, I slithered in in 1979. It takes five years to get a pension and I have six six years, six fives are thirty and this and that. They will get their 30 per cent and they will be back in the teaching profession and I will still be here. I may still be right here in this seat. Who knows.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the Sterling years because it is entirely relevant to -

MR. BARRY:

Is that with an 'e' or an 'i'?

MR. STAGG:

However his name is spelled, he is a footnote in history in this Province, the former, former Leader of the Opposition.

I would like to go into that, Mr. Speaker. We have in this House now the former Leader of the Opposition, we have also in the House the former, former, former, former Leader of the Opposition and we have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) who, after the next election, will be the

former Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, by the way, was destined to be Leader of the Opposition. I must say in 1979 I had the temerity - you do not always make accurate political judgements in your life - but I had the temerity in 1979 to support the now Leader of the Opposition for the leadership of the PC party. Yes, I admit it, it was one of my grave errors. I suppose it was because he was a fellow golfer at the time but his golf has not improved very much and neither has his quality. In any event, Mr. Speaker, had lightning struck in 1979 and the now Leader of the Opposition had become Premier - because that would have been inevitable; once he won the convention he would have become Premier - he would have been Leader of the Opposition an awful lot quicker than he has become Leader of the Opposition. He would have become Leader of the Opposition after that election.

MR. SIMMS:

And Steve would have been Premier.

MR. STAGG:

Who knows? Steve might have been Premier.

Whether or not it is clear to you perhaps the universe is unfolding as it should.

MR. TULK:

'Fred', come on over boy. That is what you want to do.

MR. STAGG:

We are talking about the crumbs of Confederation, Mr. Speaker. The Stirling years. I recall Mr. Stirling in the Arts and Culture Center when he was elected Leader of the Liberal party, that great gathering of 450 people, all of whom were brought in here courtesy

of certain -

MR. SIMMS.

By bus.

MR. STAGG:

Well, I thought they were brought in here by certain insurance companies but whether they were or not they were is a moot point. Anyway they were trucked in and Mr. Stirling won the convention and his words were that he was going to fight separatism in Newfoundland, he was going to fight that separatist Premier who could only fight, fight, fight against Ottawa. Now, we have won the battles, we have won the battle on the offshore, and what do hon. gentleman opposite want us to do? They want us to fight. They spent four or five years saying we fought too much. Well, we fought and we fought valiantly, we fought against daunting odds and subversion by hon. members opposite, who welcomed into the Province people like Jean Chretien who came down here to undermine the government, who flew in on government jets, welcomed by Liberals opposite, welcomed with open arms, was given the red carpet treatment as he came down here and told lies to the people of Newfoundland about their dealings with Newfoundland on the offshore.

MR. TULK:

Withdraw that.

MR. STAGG:

That is a fact, that is the way it went. They welcomed him down here and he definitely lied.

MR. TULK:

Withdraw that now. Mr. Speaker, ask him to be a gentleman.

MR. STAGG:

I will be no gentleman when it comes to Jean Chretien and how he treated this Province, even if it means that I have to shoot from the hip or from the lip.

Who did the Newfoundland Liberals support when the Liberal party had their leadership convention nationally? They went up to Ottawa and they support Jean Chretien of all people, the man who tried to deny Newfoundland its place in the sun, who tried to deny Newfoundland this offshore agreement, the man who wanted Newfoundland to have crumbs from the table of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

On A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution concerning federal/provincial cost-sharing arrangements and as that amendment says now the government is accepting crumbs.

It also has to be pointed out that the member is taking the name of a person who is not in this House to defend himself.

One of the things Mr. Chretien and the Liberals did was give 25 per cent of the offshore to all Canadians and Mr. Mulroney and Mrs. Carney are giving it to the Americans. That is what is happening.

MR. HEARN:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), are totally in order. He is talking about negotiations, which is what the main resolution is about, and he is talking about how we were treated during the negotiating period with the previous federal government and especially Mr. Chretien. The amendment refers to condemning. Consequently we are talking about the attitude of the gentlemen opposite and how they looked upon us when we were condemning the previous government and now they ask us to do the same thing. So everything my hon. colleague from Stephenville is talking about is in order because both sides of it are in the resolution and the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, I was on a roll. I do not know if I can get myself up to that emotional peak again, I do not know if I can get there again or not, but I will make every attempt to. I was on a roll and what the hon. member opposite did was use the parliamentary device of raising a point of order, which always gets precedence over the

speaker, to interfere with my right to speak, in the same way, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition now is trying to scuttle Corner Brook by being prolix in their debate. They are trying to scuttle this Province. They would take this Province down, down, down with them but we are not going to let it happen.

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

Is this another spurious point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made a statement that is completely false and untrue and unparliamentary inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as it impugns motives. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is the most politically bigoted and partisan member of this House. If the hon. gentleman wants to make wild, irresponsible statements, that is his business, but when he makes statements that are unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, then I believe Your Honour has no choice but to interrupt the hon. gentleman and direct him to withdraw the unparliamentary statements that he made.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the Chair was paying close attention to what the hon. member was saying. The Chair did not hear any unparliamentary language; therefore it is a difference of opinion between hon. members.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I commend to hon. members this article in today's Evening Telegram, that everything was ready and then the news came. There is a quote here from Mr. Anstey of the union in Corner Brook. Mr. Anstey said "We thought it was time something was settled. If Leo Barry is opposing legislation on our behalf, the least he could have done was called and discussed it with us." This is what Mr. Anstey, the head of the union in Corner Brook, is saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Now what else does he say here?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are you talking about?.

MR. STAGG:

I am talking about the Liberals scuttling Corner Brook.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) had been around in the last few days, he would know that we have been in constant communication with labour leaders and with concerned citizens all over the Province and that almost unanimously they condemn the games that the member's government are playing

with the lives of the people of Corner Brook, they see through the charade and the pretence, and they have expressed complete support for this Opposition continuing to fight Bill 37.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:
Mr. Speaker, I want to read this into the record again because it is entirely relevant. Mr. Anstey, the president of the union said, "We thought it was time something was settled. If Leo Barry is opposing legislation on our behalf, the least he could have done was called and discussed it with us." I do not know if Mr. Anstey has been talking with the Leader of the Opposition, he says he has not been talking with him. "Anstey said, "It is so close to Christmas the families here are anxious to know what the future holds for them." He said, "All the dealings the union has had with Kruger show that the company officials are thorough and they are not the type to sign something they are not sure of.""

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is another indication of what the Liberal Party stands for in this Province. I have been through it before, Mr. Speaker. We have had to sit all night in earlier years to get the budget through, when they thought that by occasionally getting certain expressions of emotion from the PC side, and occasionally we are exasperated,

and occasionally we might say things or even behave in a manner which is intolerant of that kind of thing, they think that the general public is out there lapping that up. Well, the general public only has contempt for Liberals, Mr. Speaker. The general public of Canada only has contempt for Liberals, and the general public of Newfoundland is going to demonstrate again when the times comes and in the parliamentary system the time does come - the mills of these gods grind slowly and they will grind exceedingly fine or thin when election time comes - and we will find where the people of this Province stand on the question of who was responsible for Newfoundland getting the crumbs of Confederation. They will never say that Brian Peckford stood for crumbs in Confederation; they will say that Brian Peckford stood for the whole loaf. We want the whole loaf, we do not want the crumbs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:
That is where he stands. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been caught with their political pants down so many times that they would like to confuse the issue. It is not going to work. It did not work in '79, it does not work in '82 and it is not going to work in '85 or '86.

MR. NEARY:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:
If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to abide by the House he should leave the House or get

thrown out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would remind both hon. members that when the Speaker stands both are to sit.

MR. STAGG:

I am sitting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

You were probably closer the first time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to Your Honour's attention that in my estimation the time for the hon. gentleman has run out and I would like for Your Honour to check that. I know the hon. members over there would like to take the House on their backs, but, Mr. Speaker, they have to observe the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman is only allowed a limited period of time, his time is up and he should not be allowed now to continue with his ranting and raving and shouting and roaring over there on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say and I think the last point that I made was the most relevant point of all.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order?

MR. NEARY:

Your time has run out.

MR. STAGG:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think I have several minutes left to speak. I am not watching the clock. I am not a clock watcher. I am here to speak and until the Speaker tells me to stop speaking I will continue to speak.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, his time has run out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! To that point of order raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), while he was speaking the hon. member's time did elapse.

MR. STAGG:

By leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY:

Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the resolution, "WHEREAS it is vital to the economic well-being of Newfoundland and Labrador that joint Federal/Provincial cost-sharing agreements be negotiated in such areas as rural development, secondary roads and the Trans-Canada Highway upgrading," I asked the Premier, in Question Period in actual fact, whether the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement, which was signed five years ago and now needs to be extended, whether they would be extending the present agreement or coming up with a new one. The Premier said during the federal

election that if the federal Liberals did not sign a roads agreement with the provincial government - even though they were in the midst of an election and the Province wanted something over \$450 million for roads - then the end result would be very little road construction next year because you need time for planning to go into that. Well, we have known, Mr. Speaker, since September that the Liberal Government did not get re-elected, that a Conservative Government has ruled in Ottawa since then, but we are still waiting for a roads agreement. The Province has its work done but we are still waiting on the federal government. One would assume that the Province, which asked for \$450 million from the former Liberal Government, still needs \$450 million, but because of cutbacks obviously the end result is that the national government is not going to be giving that amount of money even though it is badly needed and it is a realistic figure. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was quite right in saying we should vigorously tell Ottawa we need the \$450 million to upgrade our roads, that the Premier said we have the worst roads in Canada and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has said the same thing. If we needed them then, we still need them, but because of the belt tightening in Ottawa the end result is, of course, we have to settle for crumbs, we have to settle for whatever they give us. I have received a journal called, A Sea Of Men by Father Alphonses M. Tessier, who belonged to the Oblate Order and served for years in Labrador and set up the Parish of our Lady of Labrador. He is now dead, in Heaven I would assume, but he set up Our Lady of Labrador Parish in Labrador and

his journal was sent to me, as well as to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), by the school board of the Diocese of Labrador/Schefferville. In it I found some interesting reading and I think it is pertinent, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution because it calls for secondary roads. Back in 1960 the provincial government built roads linking up such small places as L'Anse-au-Clair, Forteau, L'Anse Amour, English Point, L'Anse-a-l'Loup, Pinware and finally Red Bay. Father Tessier wrote, "Soon the Newfoundland Government opened up a regional highway to join the villages of the Strait of Belle Isle. Making use of such a good opportunity, Monsignor Scheffer placed the example of a small province before the Highways minister of the large province of Quebec. From this there first resulted a connection between Blanc Sablon and Labrador South, and even later, the beginnings of roads between some Quebec villages. Monsignor Sheffer was able himself to make his two last visits to Our Lady of Labrador by road, in 1960 and 1962, satisfied by the example the progress done for the fishermen. Obviously there was no question of an episcopal limousine: the missionary bishop contented himself willingly with a van, except when the Newfoundlanders, alerted in advance and proud of the honour, came to fetch him at Blanc Sablon in their newly burnished cars.

The point I am getting at is because the Newfoundland Government at the time connected up the small villages on the Labrador Coast, the monsignor could go to the Province of Quebec and say that if little Newfoundland can do that for its

people, then what can Quebec do for Blanc Sablon? Hence Lourdes to Blanc Sablon, Bradore, St. Paul's, and Old Fort were linked up by secondary roads. When I asked that the road be connected up to Red Bay, it ended up being paved. I also asked that the same thing be done for Charlottetown, Port Hope Simpson and areas of the Northern Peninsula, and Harbour Deep wanted to be hooked up.

The question that comes into people's minds in St. John's and the Avalon and other large areas, and also in the government, is why should we do this? There are only a few people involved, so why do it? The battles are the same as they were twenty years ago when they had to convince the ministers of the day of their needs. Fishermen, it was shouted to the Newfoundland ministers, need roads. But the attitude of those in power was boats were good enough for them, that is all they have ever known in Labrador. Why not pave the roads around St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula instead of opening roads for dog teams in the wild country. What is the point of supplying electricity in the little villages up there when it has never been known and the people do not need it. Do you need electrical power to go fishing, to cut up cod? Why build so many schools? Worse yet, was there ever such a stupid idea as building a central school and sending school buses to them? It is wasteful. Will they ever appreciate it? Are all those radio-telephones in such villages really necessary? Two or three Marconi stations on the coast will be enough for those people. They have their dog teams to carry them and what news they have. In the last few years, what are the Bell Canada people thinking of? They

have no common sense. They are wasting their time and their money spoiling the fishermen of Labrador. Do they have such a great need for telephones? These and similar idiotic observations were put forth by people who in all seriousness consider themselves to be respectable segments of the population in conversations and public meetings and on radio in St. John's, and in the House of Assembly.

That was the attitude, Mr. Speaker, back in 1960. The question was why have central schools? Since then, Mr. Speaker, a central school for the Anglican population was built in Forteau.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

Could I be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

The end result, Mr. Speaker, was a central school was built in Forteau, Labrador, and children are bused in from L'Anse-au-Clair, Capstan Island, L'Anse-au-Loup and English Point. There is also a central high school, Our Lady of Labrador, in West St. Modeste.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

Could I be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, there is also a central school in West St. Modeste. Because the secondary roads brought those smaller villages together and made a central school possible, it also made possible the provision of electricity and telephone service. At that time there was only one telephone in each community, the same situation that prevails today in Pinsent's Arm and Williams Harbour. When I bring extension of electrical and telephone services in Labrador to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), he says, 'Well, why do these families need individual telephones when they have one in their community? Why do they need electricity, when they have their own private generators?' So the things that we fought for twenty years ago we still have to fight for today, Mr. Speaker.

Extension of this secondary road system brought the communities together and there was more intermarriage, more trade, more business going on, which produced a better way of life altogether.

Mr. Speaker, the government basically still questions extending the road system and building central schools. For example, Fogo is trying to get a central school, but the attitude of government is, well, they have six schools now, so why do they need a central one? Bloomfield and Musgravetown want a central school but government questions the need for it.

Mr. Speaker, I found it rather interesting to receive this journal earlier this week with

this Private Member's resolution before us. The need for secondary roads is not met by building a road from the Trans-Canada to Manuels where I grew up, or doubling the highway from St. John's out to Holyrood, or upgrading the Trans-Canada from Grand Falls to Gander, or upgrading the road from Corner Brook to Stephenville. We need secondary roads, Mr. Speaker, for the very reasons this former priest mentioned, to pull together smaller communities and make it possible for them to have facilities that we take for granted. It is in that regard that the road needs to be upgraded and paved to Red Bay, and eventually the road pushed from Red Bay to Marys Harbour and down to Fox Harbour, Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown, Cartwright and Paradise River, and then on into Goose Bay.

This Province is now settling for crumbs, Mr. Speaker, and has to take what is given in silence. Because if this government does not take it in silence, they will probably end up getting less. This government, moreso than any other, was elected to stand up and fight for Newfoundland and Labrador. But now that they have a party of the same political stripe in power in Ottawa, they are going to be silent, because a few of them do want to go to the Senate, a few want to be appointed to the Supreme Court here in Newfoundland, a few want to be appointed to the Federal Transportation Commission. A lot of them, Mr. Speaker, are a lot older than I am, a lot of them are losing a lot more hair than I am, and the end result, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, a lot of them will probably not be around in the next election, if they can get half

decent, cushy jobs, with the federal government. That is what is happening, Mr. Speaker; the government is not standing up for the rights of the people.

I remember, when we brought in a similar resolution and debated it in this House, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) contended that the ferry service between North Sydney and Port aux Basques should be regarded as part of the Trans-Canada Highway and the fares should take this into account. Now that they have a Conservative Government in Ottawa, do we, Mr. Speaker, hear the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) advocating this? Mr. Speaker, what we hear with this new turn of events is, 'What does it cost?' That is the new turn of events that has taken place now: Mr. Wilson asks, 'What does it cost?' It did not matter how much it cost before, but now the question is 'How much does it cost?' - not whether it is needed, but what does it cost, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

What does it cost?

MR. HISCOCK:

I would assume it was the responsibility of the Minister of Transportation, who advocated this, to get up and state that in his speeches.

MR. DAWE:

Did you support that resolution?

MR. HISCOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Also, with respect to the Trans-Canada, I say the Trans-Canada should be

twinned, but now the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) are saying, 'Well, that is not really necessary except in certain places.'

The final word, Mr. Speaker, is that the Trans-Canada needs upgrading, as does the Trans-Labrador highway. Time and again I hear people in St. John's and Grand Falls and Corner Brook asking, 'Why do you need a Trans-Labrador highway? Why do the people in Labrador West need to drive to Goose Bay? Why do the people in Goose Bay need to drive to the Straits, or why do they need to drive to Cartwright?' I say for the same reason the people in Bonavista need to go to Clarendville and the people in Lamaline need to come to St. John's and the people in St. Anthony or in Burgeo need to go to Deer Lake. But the question now is always, 'How much does it cost?'

When we built the Trans-Canada highway, Mr. Speaker, we did not ask how much it cost. Agreed, at the beginning it was up to par, as were the roads to the Burin Peninsula and the Bonavista Peninsula and the Northern Peninsula. All the roads that were done at that time were in half decent condition. Some of them were financed by the Liberals. Many of the bigger jobs were financed with federal Liberal money on the basis of 90/10. I would ask, are we going to be financed 90/10 now for road construction? Are we going to get the \$450 million needed for our roads programme?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, when members get up and tell us that they are settling for crumbs, that the few crumbs we are going to get will

cover places like Fogo and Croque and St. Julien's and Main Brook. Let us hope they will remember places like Red Bay and Lodge Bay. The provincial Department of Transportation has built a six mile road, from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour, ending in a cul de sac; 90 per cent of the community is across on the other side and not linked up, and the people have to get back and forth on foot.

The government built an airstrip at Paradise River and the people of the community have to walk to reach it. The same problem applies to Charlottetown, and I can go on and on.

MR. SIMMS:

Aside from all that, what do you think of the resolution?

MR. HISCOCK:

Basically, I think it is a good resolution. I think the amendment is even better because I really do believe in my heart and soul that if we need \$450 million, we should fight to the last breath to get it from this government; but it is obvious from the attitude of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that he is not going to fight for it. He is saying it will cost too much, we cannot afford it, and we cannot upset Mr. Wilson or Mr. Mulroney or Mr. Crosbie. And what does Mr. Crosbie care about the people of Labrador? We will see what happens in future.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is fine with respect to its purpose in asking for joint federal/provincial cost-sharing for rural areas and upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway. But that agreement should have been signed before the federal election in order to start work on the roads next year. They have been

in office now since September and, of course, we need the agreement now. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when the agreement is signed, it will not be for \$450 million, it will be what the Conservative Government in Ottawa wish to give.

In conclusion, with respect to the offshore, I would say this: The offshore was going to be the boom that would do everything for us. As it was originally, the 25 per cent from all oil fields off the coast of Canada would have gone into federal revenue and could have helped us with the \$450 million that we need for transportation and additional moneys for rural development. Instead, what does Mr. Mulroney do when he visits Washington? He tells the Americans, 'We do not need that 25 per cent when it stands in the way of development, Mobil can have that.' So, Mr. Speaker, now, when we need that money, it is not there.

We have heard the Premier say time and time again that the resource is ours.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would

like to congratulate my colleague, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) for putting this resolution. It is strictly a non-partisan resolution; in fact, it even goes as far as to give credit and praise to the former Liberal government which was in office when the resolution was put on the Order Paper. Certainly, I must say that I thought both speakers for our side did a tremendous job. The words of the Opposition members speak for themselves because they had the effect of driving the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) across the floor. I hope he does not stay over here but I presume he will stay long enough to hear what I have to say.

The resolution that was put forward by my colleague suggests that both governments continue their efforts to reach new agreements.

Now, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who proposed the amendment, suggests that we not continue to negotiate in an amiable way but that we start to fight. He says we are not fighting enough, that we have to keep fighting. As was mentioned before, we have been criticized in the past for fighting when we had to fight. We had no other choice but to fight when we were dealing with the former government. But he says, 'You are not fighting enough. Keep fighting.'

I am reminded of a movie I once saw about a couple of soldiers who were discovered on a remote island several years after the end of World War II. Not knowing the war was over, the two boys were still ready to do battle. To me the eight members opposite are very,

very similar to those soldiers, they still do not know the war is over. The war is over with Ottawa, it is now peace, harmony and love and we can negotiate in that spirit, especially with Christmas coming up.

In the dying days of the former administration, when the message was written on the wall, Mr. Speaker, we saw a flurry of activity towards Newfoundland, and we ended up signing seven major agreements; the planning agreement, the \$4 million agreement, the \$22 million agreement on minerals, the Burin Peninsula Development Fund, \$28 million, the Rural Development agreement, \$18.2 million, Ocean Industries, \$28 million, a \$21 million tourism agreement, pulp and paper modernization, \$33 million, related to Grand Falls, and we can go on and on. But it appears to me that when we want to do something positive the Opposition has to be against it, to the point they are satisfied to scuttle the whole West Coast. That is how paranoid they have become.

MR. TOBIN:

What is that? Say that again.

MR. HEARN:

They are so afraid that we will get a little bit of credit, they are satisfied to scuttle not only Corner Brook but the whole West Coast. We do not want the credit for saving Corner Brook. It is our duty to provide jobs, to make sure that our industries flourish and we are doing our best to make sure that that continues, whether we do it alone or in consultation with the federal government. 'Because we are not Tories we have to be against everything,' that attitude has to change. It has to

change as it changed in the dying days of the former Liberal administration in Ottawa. As I said, maybe they saw the writing on the wall and in a flurry they started to sign all of those agreements: the agreements that were reached on St. Lawrence mine, the convention center, paper mill modernization, Cow Head, down in my colleague's district, and on and on it goes. However, when there is no need to fight, this confrontational attitude, this fight, fight, fight attitude, this attitude that my colleagues on the other side have, definitely has to change if Newfoundland is going to prosper and flourish. Today we see an example of how they are representing the people in Corner Brook, when they do not even discuss with the major unions over there the reasons why they are fighting what we are trying to do for the West Coast. Now, apparently the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said he discussed it with the various union leaders. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, he is actually calling the President of the Joint Paper Workers Union a liar, because he says that he was not contacted at all. So somebody is very, very much confused.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it being Private Members' Day, we have a very important resolution on the Order Paper and I want to concentrate on that resolution, a resolution which says that 'both governments should continue to negotiate agreements.' Now, what do we want agreements for? First of all, with the agreements we have already negotiated and with the basis for agreements that we have started to lay, Newfoundland started to move out of the doldrums this past year. And much to the chagrin of the members

opposite, we will be signing a major agreement on the offshore, an agreement which will give all Newfoundlanders a shot at a better future. There is no doubt about that at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

But we have discussed that over and over, Mr. Speaker, and I will not elaborate further because we are going to be hearing much more about it in the future. But, we need many, many more agreements. My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) in fact, spoke for a full twenty minutes on the need for a better means of transportation in the Province and I must say that, to a certain extent, I certainly second what he said. Our transportation network certainly leaves a lot to be desired. I doubt that there are very few members in this hon. House who are not affected by the poor road conditions that we have in our Province.

MR. TOBIN:

Do you have problems?

MR. HEARN:

Do I have problems? I have 142 miles of problems, that is unpaved road; there are 265 miles altogether. And most members have the same thing. Why is it so necessary to have a good agreement on transportation? A short time ago a study showed the amount of money it would take to upgrade the roads in Newfoundland, a phenomenal amount that certainly cannot be financed by our own Province. We need help from Ottawa, and it is their responsibility to help improve our road network. Transportation not only affects the mode of travel

and whether or not you have to buy a new car every year compared to every four or five years, it also affects our food prices, as we saw in the report done by my hon. colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Brett). The cost of transportation varies with the type of road conditions and, consequently, the cost of food is in direct correlation with the cost of transportation.

The fishery has also been affected. All of our outports scattered around the coast have to send their product to market. In many cases operators who are quite willing to operate fish plants to provide jobs hesitate to do so - and I ran across one yesterday - simply because of road conditions in various areas.

We have the tourism industry in our Province being negatively affected by the poor road system that we have. There is no place on this Island, Mr. Speaker, that has more tourist potential than the Avalon loop which includes the districts of Kilbride, Ferryland, St. Mary's - The Capes, and Placentia. Mile for mile anywhere on the Island, and perhaps I could say anywhere in the world, there is no other place where you will find a variety -

MR. SIMMS:

You are stretching it.

MR. HEARN:

I am not stretching it. It is factual, I can take you up there and prove it to you.

Mile for mile no other place in the world has as much to offer the tourist as the Avalon loop, and basically what is keeping us from reaching the tremendous potential we have is our roads.

Education: Many of our outports, because of the small size of the settlements, have a centralized school system and sometimes children have to travel for hours. In one case in my district they have to spend almost two hours on a bus to get to school, mainly because of the condition of the roads.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, but the member has only been there a couple of years.

MR. HEARN:

That is right. It is certainly improving, there is no doubt about that.

The Liberals had a tremendous philosophy when it came to roads in the Province. In my district they did not do anything with them. In the many years they were in power they did not put one inch of pavement in my district.

MR. SIMMS:

What?

MR. HEARN:

Not a solitary inch in twenty-three years. From 1972 up to 1984 - there was a gap of three years, when the area was represented by a Liberal member - there were 128 miles of pavement laid and roughly an extra thirty miles of road are completely upgraded and ready for paving this coming year, all done by the PC government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

The Liberals had another philosophy. Instead of ignoring certain districts for reasons that I will not get into, they went to small communities and they said to

the people, 'It will cost a lot of money to build you a road.' We are going to the people and we are saying to them, 'We know it will cost a lot of money to build you a road, but we will do it. It will take time. You have to have patience. Money is scarce, but we will build your roads eventually.' And inch by inch, foot by foot the roads are being built. But the former Liberal administration said to them, 'Boys, instead of building you a road we will move you out, we will resettle you.' As a result of that Liberal plan many of our small outports around the Island were resettled and their complete social fabric, as far as the outports of Newfoundland go, was destroyed completely, and the Liberals will never, ever be forgiven for it.

Besides transportation, Mr. Speaker, we also need agreements in many other areas. Technology development, I have to throw that in there before I get into one of the main ones because of my colleague from Ferryland, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). With the opportunities that we have ahead of us in Newfoundland, one of our greatest drawbacks is in the field of education. At present we cannot fill vacancies in the technical side of things, the opportunities that will be there for people in the work force. The new Fisheries College - well, I should not say the new Fisheries College, the former Leader of the Opposition would be upset, but the new building will provide many extra courses above and beyond what the former Fisheries College could provide and certainly will move a long way towards offering the types of courses that we need in order to be able to attain the

positions that will be available to our young people. The challenge is tremendous for our young people and I am sure with proper planning, and certainly through the Department of Career Development, we will be able to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

Just a short while ago I had the opportunity to meet with the Federal Minister of Science and Technology, Mr. Tom Siddon, and we made arrangements to sign a memoranda of agreement to work in a co-operative spirit to make sure that Newfoundland progresses as it has been progressing this past twelve years under the Tory Administration so that we will be able to meet with and cope with the challenges that lie ahead in the field of science and technology.

I would also mention that we have to finalize some agreements in relation to the fishery. We can talk about our transportation needs, we can talk about our educational needs, we can talk about our forestry needs, etc., but the prime resource in Newfoundland, the one that was there before the white man came, the one that will be there long after our time, and the one that will keep bread and butter on the table of Newfoundland is the fishery. There is no doubt about it.

Right now the fishery is in a state of flux. We hope that in a very, very short while we will see some stabilization. Finally I feel at least that we have put together the group of people who can once and for all bring about a firm agreement as it comes to the FPI problem. Up to now it has been a disaster, a fragmented disaster. I think now we have the

Board of Directors and the chief executive officer who can easily bring about the type of company that can meet the needs of the fisheries in Newfoundland, and when I say fisheries I mean from the side of the fishermen, the side of the plant workers, the side of industry. But there was a whole lot more to the fishery in Newfoundland than Fishery Products International, the new supercompany. We have to concentrate on the inshore fishery as it affects the many small outports that are around the Island. The majority of Newfoundlanders depend on the fishery whether they be fishermen themselves, whether they be plant workers, whether they be working in other aspects of the fishery, or the businessmen, of course, who depend on the dollars that are generated from the fishing industry. We have to discuss and finalize with the federal government the problem of jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, it is terrible to have to shout over fifteen people, all of whom have a chance to speak. If they have no more to offer than they are offering right now I suggest they keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

We have to settle the problem of jurisdiction, of who has complete jurisdiction over the fishery. We are told now that once you go an inch beyond the seashore the federal government has complete jurisdiction. We have all seen examples in the past and from both

sides of the House we have heard the criticism of some of the decisions made in Ottawa concerning the fishery in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Now that is an honest statement.

MR. HEARN:

That makes sense.

MR. TULK:

Now that is an honest statement.

MR. HEARN:

Yes. I would not have said it if it was not. Licencing has and still is a problem. It is a problem that has to be faced jointly by you, by me, by all involved. Resource management; if we do not properly manage our resource, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to have a fishery.

On the harvest end, we are not at all concentrating on some aspects of harvesting that avail many opportunities to fishermen in Newfoundland. There are many species that are presently not being utilized mainly because of poor planning in relation to the harvesting stage.

Processing, once again, has been a problem throughout the whole Province and once again we have to make sure that we have a hard look at processing in the Province, the efficiency of processing because this is what will probably lead to the viability or the non-viability of the various fish plants.

The total fisheries infrastructure has to be looked at and of course here we will be looking at joint funding, federal and provincial, to make sure that the fishermen around the Island have a base of operation. We have been spending

a lot of money perhaps in areas where it is very, very hard to justify that spending.

MR. TULK:

Flora MacDonald likes the term 'fisher folk.'

MR. HEARN:

Fisherman or fishermen.

MR. TULK:

Fisher folk she calls them. Just imagine going down to Twillingate and calling them fisher folk. They would kick you over the wharf.

MR. HEARN:

Insurance has to be looked at. Every year we hear of tremendous losses by fishermen. We do not have an insurance programme for fishing gear. The federal and provincial government I understand are interested, we have been doing some work trying to put something in place. The union has to take a different outlook on this entirely.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in this debate I would like to pick up on something that the member for Stephenville

(Mr. Stagg) pointed out to us, and that is that he is philosophically a Liberal as are many, he said, on that side of the House. Now he said it was everybody on that side of the House but I have to disagree, as I will point out in a moment, as the logic in my argument follows.

Maybe the root cause of what is already seen as the problem that necessitated the member for Torngat Mountains' (Mr. Warren) amendment, is that members opposite are having difficulty in dealing with the Government of Canada, because it is absolutely clear by now that the Government of Canada is not small "l" liberal, Mr. Speaker. Now if we have to point out anything, Mr. Speaker, we can just refer to the statements coming out of the Wilson budget and the analysis of that budget, Mr. Speaker, which indicates that the main factor in the Wilson budget is to make sure that the economy is improved by keeping business healthy. And you know the way that is to be done? It is by keeping wages low. Now that is the approach taken by Mr. Mulroney and that has been documented, Mr. Speaker, and in fact it was admitted in a report of the Conservative Party itself, a report on technology and unemployment.

Now I will submit to the member for Stephenville that is not a small 'l' liberal philosophy. It is not a small "l" liberal philosophy to improve the economy by keeping wages low; nor is it a liberal philosophy, Mr. Speaker, to hire 700 police investigators to investigate the UI rolls to make it harder for those who are thrown out of work by the recession that has been brought on by hon. members opposite and their

lack of concern for the unemployed in this Province, Mr. Speaker; neither is it a liberal philosophy to bring in the storm troopers to make it harder for individuals to get the things that are due them. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins) and the Premier stood up in the House and said that they agree with the trend of the Wilson budget. Now let us read this. The Premier said, "I do not have any general reservations about -

MR. STAGG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for Stephenville on a point of order.

MR. STAGG:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is misconstruing my remarks in trying to indicate that this government is a right-wing government. I ask him who brought in the collective bargaining in the Public Service in Newfoundland? Who brought in collective bargaining for the Newfoundland Teachers Association? Who legitimized the Fishermen's Union? These are activities which are on the left of the political spectrum. Ask him to direct himself to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sure the hon. member for Stephenville is aware that he has not raised a legitimate point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the member said so I doubt if I

missed anything.

MR. STAGG:

You know what I said.

MR. BARRY:

We had the Premier in this House get up and say, "I do not have any general reservations about Wilson's statement. In specific areas I am going to look for more detail" - listen to this! - "to see if in fact it has a negative impact or a neutral impact or a positive impact on the Province." I wonder if members opposite have found out yet whether it is a positive impact or a neutral impact or a negative impact?

MR. DINN:

A positive impact.

MR. BARRY:

A positive impact! The Wilson Budget has a positive impact? Could we hear more of that.

MR. DINN:

In housing.

MR. BARRY:

Do all members agree? Cutbacks in CBC, positive? Increased ferry rates, positive? Cutting people off the UI rolls, positive? We now have ascertained, we have it clear, Mr. Speaker, that not everybody over there is prepared to take the line of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and say that we should have a liberal philosophy, a small 'l' liberal philosophy, because one thing is clear, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the Government of Canada is not small 'l' liberal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has gotten up, the Premier and other members, and they justified these harsh measures because they said, too

much money has been spent in the past on social programmes, and it is time to get back to revitalizing the economy and cutting back on social programmes. Mr. Speaker, do you know that a survey by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has confirmed that Canada spends a smaller percentage of its national wealth on social security programmes than five of the seven richest Western countries? We are sixth on the list in terms of spending on social programmes. Figures from 1982 indicate Canada devotes 11.8 per cent of Gross Domestic Product to social services compared to an average of 14.1 per cent for the other rich industrialized countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that a liberal policy, to say that we have too much spending on social programmes when we are number six on a list of seven?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) what might be in his own mind a very interesting speech, but it is as usual a very, very boring speech, number one, but, most importantly, it has nothing at all to do with the resolution

or the amendment put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important because members have such a short time in which to deliver their speeches that they be directed to be relevant to what is contained in the body and the content of the resolution. It is obvious that that the Leader of the Opposition is not doing that, and neither does he appear to be intending to do it. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a relevant point of order here and that Your Honour should direct the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to be relevant in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A good point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is now being directed to be relevant to the amendment.

MR. BARRY:

An excellent point of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this conflict in philosophy may explain why members opposite are having difficulty in getting agreements with the Government of Canada, and why, Mr. Speaker, people are leaving the Province in droves, seeing no future here.

MR. DINN:

Not true! Not true!

MR. BARRY:

Not true! Not true! I refer the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to the recent figures released by Statistics Canada showing an increase in the number of people leaving Newfoundland

this year. An increase, Mr. Speaker. They are leaving in droves. There is going to be nothing left but the bare rocks here, Mr. Speaker, if these members opposite are not turffed out. Fortunately their time is running out, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, we see they are in the dying days of their administration. And the best witness to that is the fact they will bring in closure to try and stifle debate in this House. That is the sign of a government in trouble. That is the sign of a dying government, Mr. Speaker.

I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It is noted that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

It being Private Members' Day and six of the clock, I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, December 13, 1984 at three of the clock.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

December 12, 1984

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

BY THE

HONOURABLE JEROME W. DINN

MINISTER OF LABOUR

Answer to
Question provided
by Hon. member for
Labour, 12 Dec. '83

MR. SPEAKER I WISH TO PROVIDE THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS WITH ANSWERS TO CERTAIN QUESTIONS RAISED DURING THE INTRODUCTION OF BILL 18, "AN ACT TO AMEND THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT" AND ALSO WITH RESPECT TO BILL 2, "AN ACT TO AMEND THE BOILER, PRESSURE VESSEL AND COMPRESSED GAS ACT". I WILL ALSO ADDRESS SOME OF THE CRITICISMS AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS WHICH ~~THE~~ HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION HAVE RAISED IN ORDER THAT THE RECORDS ARE SET STRAIGHT AND IN PARTICULAR SO THAT I MAY REITERATE THE HIGH PRIORITY AND IMPORTANCE WHICH GOVERNMENT PLACES ON THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF WORKERS IN THIS PROVINCE.

1. IN RESPONDING TO THE CRITICISM THAT GOVERNMENT, AS AN EMPLOYER, HAS A POOR RECORD OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT, I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON SEVERAL POINTS. WITH RESPECT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEES WHERE REQUIRED UNDER THE ACT, I WANT TO STRESS THAT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THESE COMMITTEES IN GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES CAN ONLY BE DONE ON THE BASIS OF CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE EMPLOYER AND THE WORKERS INVOLVED. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT AN IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE IN THE ACT IS THAT "THE PERSONS REPRESENTING THE WORKERS ON THE COMMITTEE ARE TO BE ELECTED BY THEIR FELLOW WORKERS OR APPOINTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONSTITUTION OF WHICH THE WORKERS ARE MEMBERS". IN PRACTICE THE WORKERS, USUALLY THROUGH THEIR UNION, WILL SUBMIT THE NAMES OF THEIR MEMBERS FOR A GIVEN COMMITTEE

AND GOVERNMENT, AS AN EMPLOYER, WILL ALSO SUBMIT NAMES SO THAT THE COMMITTEE CAN BE ESTABLISHED. THIS MEANS THAT THE PACE AT WHICH COMMITTEES ARE ESTABLISHED IN GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES, OR ANY WORKPLACE FOR THAT MATTER, IS INFLUENCED BY THE SELECTION OF WORKER REPRESENTATIVES. SINCE THIS IS ONE OF THE IMPORTANT RIGHTS OF WORKERS UNDER THE ACT, IT IS ONE AREA IN WHICH I WOULD BE RELUCTANT TO INTERVENE, PARTICULARLY AS IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT A HIGH DEGREE OF CO-OPERATION HAS BEEN EXPERIENCED IN THIS EFFORT AND THAT BOTH SIDES INVOLVED IN THIS MATTER RECOGNIZE THAT PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO HIGH RISK WORK ACTIVITIES SUCH AS THOSE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO ME INDICATES THAT APPROXIMATELY 100 COMMITTEES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED IN GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES AND THAT THIS IS A CONTINUING, ONGOING PROCESS.

ON THE BROADER QUESTION OF THE SUCCESS OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY DIVISION IN ESTABLISHING JOINT WORKPLACE COMMITTEES IN BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR WORKPLACES, I CAN INFORM THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THE LATEST REPORT SHOWS 823 ACTIVE COMMITTEES. WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE MANY SEASONAL OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THIS PROVINCE, THE FIGURE IS ALL THE MORE IMPRESSIVE. AS A MATTER OF FACT, GIVEN AN AVERAGE OF 8 MEMBERS ON EACH COMMITTEE, THIS REPRESENTS A VIRTUAL ARMY OF PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE MONITORING AND IMPROVEMENT OF WORKING CONDITIONS, AND COULD NOT BE DUPLICATED BY STAFF FROM THE DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY BY ANY STRETCH OF THE IMAGINATION. NEEDLESS TO

SAY THE COMMITTEE PROGRAM IS ONE OF THE PILLARS OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION AND I SALUTE THE WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS THROUGHOUT THIS PROVINCE WHO CO-OPERATE IN MAKING THE COMMITTEE PROCESS SUCH A SUCCESS.

MR. SPEAKER IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN KEEPING A WATCHFUL EYE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY ACTIVITIES WITHIN ITS OWN AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY SINCE THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT CAME INTO FORCE IN 1979. IT WAS OUR BELIEF AT THAT TIME AND EXPERIENCE HAS REINFORCED THIS, THAT EVENTUALLY GOVERNMENT WOULD NEED TO APPOINT A CO-ORDINATOR OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY TO MANAGE THE MANY FACETS OF THIS IMPORTANT WORK WITHIN THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR. WE HAVE EXAMINED THE MANNER IN WHICH CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS HAVE DEALT WITH THIS MATTER AND I HAVE ALSO CONSULTED WITH MY COLLEAGUES, THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES AND THE PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD WITH RESPECT TO THE NEED TO IMPROVE CO-ORDINATION OF THESE ACTIVITIES. I AM PLEASED TO ADVISE THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT GOVERNMENT IS CURRENTLY CONSIDERING THE APPOINTMENT OF A HEALTH AND SAFETY CO-ORDINATOR. IT IS MY VIEW THAT THIS MOVE WOULD BE ONE OF THE MORE SIGNIFICANT MEASURES WHICH GOVERNMENT COULD TAKE TO ENSURE THAT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF WORKERS IN THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR IS PROPERLY MANAGED.

I SHOULD STRESS TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THE CONCERNS OF GOVERNMENT, AS AN EMPLOYER, OVER OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY MATTERS, GO FAR BEYOND THE IMPORTANT ISSUE OF ESTABLISHING JOINT WORKPLACE COMMITTEES. BY EXAMPLE, A CO-ORDINATOR WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR EQUIPPING AND OPERATING

A MODERN FIRST AID ROOM IN THE NEW CONFEDERATION BUILDING EXTENSION COMPLEX. AS WELL, FIRST AID FACILITIES THROUGHOUT GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES, FIRST AID TRAINING, GENERAL HEALTH AND SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND FOLLOW-UP INSPECTIONS WITHIN GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES WILL ALL BE CO-ORDINATED BY THIS PERSON. THIS WILL GREATLY IMPROVE THE CAPABILITY OF STAFF IN THE DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY TO ORGANIZE TRAINING AND SEMINARS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND TO FOLLOW-UP ON PROBLEMS IN THE WORKPLACE AS IDENTIFIED BY JOINT WORKPLACE COMMITTEES. ALL IN ALL, I VIEW THE APPOINTMENT OF A GOVERNMENT CO-ORDINATOR OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY AS A VERY SIGNIFICANT MEASURE.

2. WITH RESPECT TO THE LABRADOR WEST DUST STUDY, I STATED IN MY REMARKS DURING THE INTRODUCTION OF BILL 18 THAT IMPORTANT CONSULTATIONS ARE ONGOING AND WILL CONTINUE LATER ~~THIS MONTH~~ BETWEEN THE VARIOUS PARTIES; NAMELY, THE COMPANIES AND UNIONS, TO ADDRESS A DRAFT OF "THE CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF SILICOSIS". I SHOULD EMPHASIZE THAT THE CODE OF PRACTICE BRINGS TOGETHER A NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DUST STUDY AND ONCE IN PLACE WILL REPRESENT GOVERNMENT'S FULL COMMITMENT AND REQUIRED ACTION AS A RESULT OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

THE CODE OF PRACTICE WILL LARGELY BE A TECHNICAL DOCUMENT WHICH WILL ESTABLISH THRESHOLD LIMIT VALUES (TLV) FOR VARIOUS ZONES OR WORKING AREAS AT THE MINING OPERATIONS. IT WILL SET OUT DUST MONITORING PROCEDURES AND ALSO ESTABLISH WORKER EXPOSURE LIMITS, BEYOND WHICH A WORKER MUST BE MOVED TO A LIGHTER DUST AREA. IN ADDITION A REVISED MEDICAL SURVEILLANCE

PROCEDURE WILL BE INTRODUCED WHICH WILL HAVE THE IMPORTANT FEATURE OF REQUIRING CLOSER LIAISON BETWEEN THE LOCAL MEDICAL EXAMINER, THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY DIVISION AND THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION. THIS LATTER FEATURE IS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE HEALTH OF WORKERS IN DUST EXPOSURE OCCUPATIONS IS CLOSELY MONITORED.

3. MR. SPEAKER I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO COMMENT ON CRITICISM THAT THE STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY IN MY DEPARTMENT ARE GUILTY OF EMPIRE BUILDING AND WOULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE IF THE HIGHLY SPECIALIZED STAFF, WHICH IS THE MAJORITY OF CASES IN THE DIVISION, WERE PROVIDED WITH ADDITIONAL TRAINING SO THEY COULD INSPECT A BROADER RANGE OF WORKPLACES AND EQUIPMENT. IF ONE CONSIDERS THE TYPE OF SKILLS INVOLVED IN THIS PROGRAM SUCH AS ELEVATOR INSPECTION, MINES ENGINEERS AND PRESSURE VESSEL INSPECTORS, ONE CAN READILY CONCLUDE THAT LITTLE, IF ANY EFFICIENCY, WOULD BE ATTAINED BY HAVING THESE PEOPLE INVOLVED OUTSIDE OF THE SPECIALIZED AREA FOR WHICH THEY ARE TRAINED. THIS MATTER HAS BEEN CONSIDERED ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION AND IT IS GENERALLY CONCLUDED THAT TO MOVE IN THE DIRECTION OF GENERALIZED INSPECTORS WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF LOWERING THEIR LEVEL OF COMPETENCE AND CONSEQUENTLY THE STANDARD OF SAFETY IN THE WORKPLACE. AS A MATTER OF FACT, WHEN THE LEGISLATION WAS BEING DRAFTED, CONCERN WAS EXPRESSED BY THE MINING INDUSTRY THAT SPECIALIZED STAFF, INCLUDING MINING ENGINEERS, BE RETAINED IN ORDER THAT THE INSPECTION PROGRAM WOULD NOT BE WATERED DOWN.

ONE AREA WHERE CONSIDERABLE PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IS WITH RESPECT TO OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENE. WHEREAS PRIOR TO THE CREATION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY DIVISION IN 1978-79, OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENE PROGRAMS WERE LIMITED TO MINING PROPERTIES ONLY, THE HYGIENE PROGRAM HAS BEEN EXPANDED TO COVER ALL WORKPLACES THROUGHOUT THE PROVINCE. BY EXAMPLE, WHEN WORKERS COMPLAINED OF PROBLEMS IN THE LABORATORY AT THE CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND HOSPITAL IN GRAND FALLS, A HYGIENIST FROM THE DEPARTMENT INSPECTED THE FACILITY AND MADE RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH ESSENTIALLY CONDEMNED THE LABORATORY. BASED ON THESE RECOMMENDATIONS, GOVERNMENT ACTED AND PROVIDED THE FUNDING FOR A NEW LABORATORY.

4. MR. SPEAKER WHEN I INTRODUCED BILL 18 I MADE REFERENCE TO AN IMPORTANT PROVISION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT, WHICH IS THE RIGHT OF A WORKER TO REFUSE TO DO ANY WORK THAT HE/SHE HAS REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE IS DANGEROUS TO HIS/HER HEALTH OR SAFETY. IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM AN HONOURABLE MEMBER, I CAN INFORM THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT ONLY 9 INSTANCES HAVE BEEN REPORTED TO MY DEPARTMENT WHERE A WORKER HAS EXERCISED THAT RIGHT. BEARING IN MIND THAT THE ACT HAS BEEN IN FORCE SINCE JUNE 1979, OVER FIVE YEARS, THIS IS A TESTIMONY TO THE WORKERS OF THIS PROVINCE WHO HAVE NOT ABUSED THIS RIGHT, BUT HAVE EXERCISED DILIGENCE AND CARE OVER OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY MATTERS. IT SUGGESTS AS WELL, MR. SPEAKER THAT GENERALLY SPEAKING, WORKERS IN THIS PROVINCE ARE NOT EXPOSED TO UNUSUALLY HAZARDOUS WORKING CONDITIONS.

5. WITH RESPECT TO THE CONCERN WHICH HAS BEEN RAISED OVER THE SIZE OF THE INSPECTION STAFF IN THE DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY, I HAVE EARLIER PROVIDED INFORMATION ON THE EXPANSION OF THE DIVISION FROM 84 IN 1979 TO 102 AT PRESENT. MOST OF THIS GROWTH HAS BEEN IN THE GENERAL SAFETY INSPECTION BRANCH, THE HEALTH AND SAFETY EDUCATION UNIT AND IN OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENE, AS THESE WERE THE MORE DEFICIENT PROGRAM AREAS AT THAT TIME. TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT THE INCREASED CAPABILITY IS DIRECTED AT GENERAL WORKPLACES SUCH AS CONSTRUCTION, FISHING, LOGGING, COMMERCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL AREAS.

MR. SPEAKER I WANT TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO STRESS THAT THE NUMBER OF INSPECTION STAFF IS NOT THE MAJOR POINT TO CONSIDER. IT IS GENERALLY RECOGNIZED THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO VISIT ALL WORKPLACES THROUGHOUT THE PROVINCE ON A FREQUENT BASIS, THE LOGISTICS ARE SIMPLY AGAINST DOING THIS. ACCORDINGLY, THE THRUST OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT IS THAT WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS IN A CO-OPERATIVE APPROACH ARE THE OBVIOUS AND APPROPRIATE PERSONS TO IDENTIFY AND CORRECT UNSAFE AND UNHEALTHY WORKING CONDITIONS. IN SO DOING THE NEED FOR INTERVENTION BY GOVERNMENT INSPECTION STAFF IS MINIMIZED. FOR THIS REASON WE HAVE PLACED CONSIDERABLE EMPHASIS ON THE JOINT WORKPLACE COMMITTEES AS MY EARLIER COMMENTS INDICATE. NOTWITHSTANDING THIS, MY DEPARTMENT KEEPS A CLOSE WATCH ON THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF AND WILL ENSURE THAT THE CAPABILITY TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINTS AND REQUESTS FOR SERVICE IS MAINTAINED. IN THIS REGARD MY DEPARTMENT

IS CURRENTLY RECRUITING TO FILL A NEW POSITION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE OFFICER WHOSE DUTIES WILL BE TO CONCENTRATE ON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES, ASSIST COMMITTEES IN SOLVING PROBLEMS AND ENSURE THAT PROPER FOLLOW-UP ON PROBLEMS IN THE WORKPLACE OCCURS.

6. MR. SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO A QUESTION WHICH AROSE DURING A DEBATE OF BILL 2, "AN ACT TO AMEND THE BOILER, PRESSURE VESSEL AND COMPRESSED GAS ACT", I CAN ADVISE THAT THE BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL ADVISORY BOARD DOES NOT HAVE A WOMAN APPOINTED TO IT, HOWEVER, I ALSO DRAW THE ATTENTION OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS TO THE FACT THAT THE BOILER, PRESSURE VESSEL AND COMPRESSED GAS ACT IS VERY SPECIFIC WITH RESPECT TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY BOARD AND ALLOWS LITTLE DISCRETION ON THE PART OF GOVERNMENT. SECTION 28 OF THAT ACT IN EFFECT STATES THAT THE MEMBERSHIP WOULD CONSIST OF A REPRESENTATIVE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN THE DESIGN, MANUFACTURE, ASSEMBLY, ERECTION OR INSTALLATION OF EQUIPMENT COVERED UNDER THE ACT; A REPRESENTATIVE OF OWNERS OF PRESSURE SYSTEMS; TWO REPRESENTATIVES OF HOLDERS OF FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATES UNDER THE ACT; TWO REPRESENTATIVES OF PROVINCIAL TRAINING AGENCIES INVOLVED IN TRAINING OPERATORS UNDER THE ACT AND A DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVE. NATURALLY IF ANY OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS CHOOSE TO NOMINATE A WOMAN, I WOULD BE MORE THAN PLEASED TO ACCEPT THAT NOMINATION. HOWEVER, IT MUST BE RECOGNIZED THAT THE MAJORITY OF MEMBERS ON THE ADVISORY BOARD WOULD, BY NATURE, HAVE

A TECHNICAL COMPETENCE IN THE FIELD AND OBVIOUSLY THE VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS NOMINATING REPRESENTATIVES ARE GUIDED BY THIS FACT. THIS IS NOT TO SAY, HOWEVER, THAT WOMEN WITH COMPETENCE IN THE ENGINEERING FIELD ARE NOT AVAILABLE AND I HASTEN TO INFORM THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS THAT THE ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SERVICES BRANCH IN MY DEPARTMENT, WHICH IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING THIS LEGISLATION, HAS ON STAFF A WOMAN WHO HOLDS A DEGREE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND IS RESPONSIBLE FOR APPROVING DRAWINGS SUBMITTED FOR THE DESIGN OF BOILER AND PRESSURE SYSTEMS. THIS IS INDICATIVE, I BELIEVE, OF THE FACT THAT NOT ONLY IS MY DEPARTMENT PREPARED TO APPOINT WOMEN TO ANY ADVISORY BOARD, BUT IS ALSO WILLING AND PLEASED TO EMPLOY THEM WHEREVER THE OPPORTUNITY EXISTS.

IN CONCLUSION, MR. SPEAKER, I WANT TO REITERATE THAT I COULD CONTINUE FOR SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME IN BRIEFING THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS ON MANY OF THE POSITIVE ACTIONS WHICH GOVERNMENT HAVE TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY. I TRUST THAT I HAVE ADDRESSED MOST OF THE QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS RAISED DURING THIS DEBATE AND WILL BE PLEASED TO PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

THANK YOU.