



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

No. 40

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

26 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure today in giving this statement in our ongoing efforts to create employment throughout the Province in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Last Summer the Department of Social Services funded a beautification and community enhancement project in the Humber-Bay of Islands area. This project was brought about in response to a proposal submitted jointly by the Humber-Bay of Islands Tourism Association, the rural development associations of the Humber Valley, and the Bay of Islands South Shore, endorsed by the Humber joint council representing nineteen communities and towns, as well as the city of Corner Brook.

The Department of Social Services spent \$253,000 to employ fifty-five people in the total project with specific activities taking place in various communities throughout the area. The project was monitored very closely and evaluated by local departmental staff with input from local community authorities.

I would like to highlight and stress that the success of this project was due to the high level of support it received from community councils, other government departments, other

associations and interested groups in the communities concerned. The success of the project also demonstrated the kind of possibilities which exist for achievement when various community groups and agencies become involved in a co-operative spirit.

Mr. Speaker, after careful assessment of the results of last years efforts the Department of Social Services has again allocated significant funding this year for the local beautification and community enhancement project. I am pleased to announce that we have decided to increase funding to \$1.25 million this year. This will provide for the employment of approximately 350 people in the various communities throughout the region. I would point out here that the expansion of this project has been brought about through the co-operation of sixty-seven community councils and associations throughout the entire Western region, stretching from St. Anthony to Port aux Basques.

In announcing this project today on behalf of the government, I would like to stress three specific objectives. First, to enhance the natural beauty of communities throughout Newfoundland and develop a sense of community pride. Clean communities are better communities in which we can live and raise our children. Secondly, to present our community to visitors in the best possible light. This fosters and promotes tourism and makes our community a more attractive place to visit and to re-visit. The third objective that I would cite is that of providing meaningful and needed employment for 350 people throughout the Western Region. I am confident that those employed will experience

satisfaction in participating in such a worth-while endeavour. Certainly, those who participated last year had every right to feel very proud of their achievement.

Mr. Speaker, while this statement today is focusing on the community beautification and enhancement project, I want to point out that the government, through the Department of Social Services, has allocated in the 1985 - 1986 budget a total of \$25 million for job creation throughout the community development programme. These funds will provide employment for approximately 10,000 people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador - approximately 2,500 in the Western Region. This effort is being made despite general funding constraints, as it is seen as an important avenue to provide many people with the opportunity for employment as an alternative to social assistance dependency. The programme has proven its effectiveness in doing this and, therefore, will continue to be supported by government. I am very pleased to see 350 new jobs created in our Province as a result of this statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome funding for beautification projects. However, we would ask the Premier not to make so much of the employment aspect when the Premier knows that what we are talking

about here is a short-term, make-work project. Mr. Speaker, we would be much better off in this Province if we were seeing long-term jobs being created through encouragement of the private sector as much as possible but, however it be done, that we see long-term jobs being created.

Let us not, Mr. Speaker, accept the notion that make-work projects, whether it be for 350 people or 13,500 people, are the answer to unemployment in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is not. The answer to unemployment in Newfoundland and Labrador is getting the economy moving. It is proper government policies which, so far in this session of the House, has not been coming from this administration. That is the way we would see the people of this Province gainfully employed.

Mr. Speaker, we all accept that if their choice is welfare, social assistance or being employed on a project, I think people generally would prefer to be doing satisfying work that can improve their community and give them the satisfaction of going out and feeling that they are doing something for the money that they receive. It is awfully regrettable that all too often these days in this Province the choice people are given is social assistance with no work or a short-term, make-work project. The project, Mr. Speaker, and the stamps are the two main discussions this time of year in too many communities in our Province.

I am happy to see that there is an increase in the amount to be expended. I suppose that might have a little to do with the studies that have been carried out in Western Newfoundland

indicating, Mr. Speaker, that while we have an unemployment rate for the Province generally of over 20 per cent, on the West Coast of the Province that unemployment rate is closer to 40 per cent.

For the Premier to refer to increasing funding from \$253,000 to \$1,250,000 is a step, but it is a very small step towards meeting the dire need of many people on the West Coast of this Province who find themselves and have found themselves for sometime, Mr. Speaker, unable to find work. Again, I would say, we support additional funding, we think there should be more than is being provided here, but we would ask the Premier to start bringing in some policies, some programmes that will see 350 full-time jobs being created, rather than part-time employment of this nature.

MR. TULK:
Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise hon. members of the appoint of Miss Barbara Knight to the position of Assistant Deputy Minister in the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat with specific responsibility for constitutional and social policy areas.

Miss Knight graduated from Memorial with a Bachelor of Arts in 1968 and went on to the

University of Toronto where she received a Master of Arts majoring in Political Science in 1970. After graduation, she worked with the Government of Manitoba, later the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, before joining the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat in 1978. At the time of her appointment as assistant deputy minister, she was Director of Economic and Social Programmes.

Since joining Intergovernmental Affairs, Miss Knight has had a wide experience in most aspects of the relationship of the Province with other provinces and the federal government. In particular, she has had extensive involvement in constitutional discussions and more recently served as secretary to the offshore negotiating team.

Barbara Knight's appointment to this position is part of a realignment of responsibility and a recognition of the importance which government places on its relationship with the federal government in social policy and constitutional areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I have to say we are very pleased to see the appointment of Barbara Knight to the position of Assistant Deputy Minister in the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat. I have had the opportunity of working from

time to time with Miss Knight and I can say that she is a very competent and a very capable individual. She has performed good work for the Province, and, I know, will continue to do so in her new position.

Regrettably, we have too few women in management positions in government. We have made the point before, Mr. Speaker, that we need an affirmative action programme to ensure that there are more women given the opportunity to achieve high positions in the public service of this Province, at the assistant deputy, and at the deputy level, as well as the heads of Crown corporations and so forth.

This is no token appointment, however, nor should any such appointment be token. Miss Knight has earned her stripes, and provided good work. There are other women in the public service that I would ask members opposite to look at with a view to seeing whether we can escalate the rate at which the women that are providing very good service to the Province rise to the top of the department.

I think if you look at the percentage of women to men in the population generally, and you look at the percentage of women to men at the director, assistant deputy, deputy level, you see a very great tilt in favour of the male. We do not have a proper proportion of women at these higher levels of public service.

It is difficult to implement an affirmative action programme, I know, without arguments being raised that a person is getting a job merely because she is a woman, but I ask the Premier and I ask

Cabinet to take a very serious look, because I think the time has passed when we can put up with a continuation of a situation where we have such an uneven proportion of women to men at the higher levels of the public service.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not have a printed statement, as such, but I have some information to pass onto the House and onto the general public in keeping with government's commitment to keep the public fully informed with respect to the province's spray programme.

I can advise the House and the general public that the plans now are completed for the programme against the spruce budworm and we expect our operations to get underway late tomorrow, weather permitting.

Three small agriculture spray planes will be used in the programme. They arrived in the Province yesterday evening. We will be using, as I said before, BT and matacil on approximately 35,000 acres including some acres for environmental monitoring.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the general public will be able to obtain information on the programme by calling collect to a telephone number which I will make public in a press release, as well, 256-7451, once the programme begins. They can also obtain information, of course, from the department's regional offices

throughout the Province and, of course, from the Department of Environment offices throughout the Province.

The dates for the opening and closing of the spray blocks will be provided through the media on a daily and regular basis by the forest protection division of my department.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned once before, we are glad to see that the areas to be sprayed for the spruce budworm are down considerably and we hope that they will disappear in the very near future.

A couple of points concerning the minister's unwritten statement. I am glad to see that he has now made public the phone number and there is going to be a day-by-day information bulletin put out concerning where the spray is going to take place and so on.

I would wish he had given a little further information, Mr. Speaker, concerning the conditions under which the spray programme is going to take place, the kinds of restrictions that are placed on the actual emitting of the spray, the wind conditions, things like this and any conditions that are attached to aircraft taking off over residential areas, whether this kind of thing is permitted or not. I would hope that aircraft would not be taking off over residential areas and would take off away from residential areas

and that there be regulations that spray does not take place with wind speeds over five kilometers an hour or some such thing. I would like to see these things sort of laid out a little bit more definitively, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit, I would be happy to table tomorrow perhaps, a full list of the restrictions that are used, and I can tell the hon. member, they are many. The programme is takes very restrictive measures and cautious measures. In response to the hon. member's request, I would be happy to put that together for him and table it for him tomorrow in the House.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
I would also mention to the minister the fact that it is one thing to have these regulations, and it is another thing - and we have seen this in the past - it is another thing to make sure that they are followed and I would also like some information on that.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, he would have to be talking about the recent past. That is the only comment I would make.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like at this stage to welcome to the galleries Mayor John Barrett, Town Clerk Judith Barter, and Councillor Harold Driscoll of the Old Perlican Town Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome a delegation from the Town Council of Roddickton, the Strait of Belle Isle. The council is represented by the Mayor Laura Rowsell and Councillor Beatrice Fillier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome Mr. Alfred Pork and a group from the First Gillams Boy Scout Troop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the analysis of the budget presented by the Premier yesterday, I wonder if he would give us some indication of the impact on jobs, on employment of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians because of the cutback and the amount of money that is going to be removed from the Province. What will this mean in terms of increased unemployment or fewer jobs in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in this year we are not altogether sure whether in fact there will be a negative impact. That is something that we have not been able at this point in time to get a full handle on and therefore that is why we did not address it in the statement. That is a far more difficult measure to try to get. But what we will be doing now over the next number of weeks is monitoring the situation just to see, as we get more information from the federal government, whether in fact there are employment negatives associated with the budget. To this point in time we do not really have a handle on it. In looking at commodity taxes which will come in, and some other taxes which will come in next year, in looking at potential loss of revenue from old age security and so on, and other expenditure cuts in various departments, it is too early to tell just exactly whether there will be a negative or a positive impact as it relates to employment in the Province, but as soon as we get those numbers obviously we will be letting everybody know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is an amazing response now. The Premier mentioned that they were not sure of the impact this year, and I assume it must be this year he is talking about when he says he does not know whether or not there is a negative impact. Surely the Premier is not saying that if \$130 million is taken out of the economy of this Province that this will not have a negative impact on employment. Surely this is not

what the Premier is saying. Or is it that there was a very deliberate strategy not to talk about fewer jobs in this Province because the Premier knows he is not living up to his own mandate to create jobs which he put forth during the recent election?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, some amazing questions! The mandate that we received in the previous election is a mandate for three, four or five years. This is the end of June and we were elected in April, so I think the hon. member should be very cautious in his statements as they relate to whether we will live up to our mandate or whether we will not. As I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the other day, from April to May 9,000 more people were employed and we are looking for that to continue in the next month when the statistics come out. So, as I say, we have not at this point in time been able to quantify the impact upon employment in the Province as it relates to the federal budget. But as we get the information we will gladly pass it along to the Leader of the Opposition and anybody else who wants to know.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not do the Premier an injustice by not giving him enough time to show his stuff but perhaps if I did it might be excused by the way in which we have seen him do his

stuff in the first five years of his term in office where he promised 40,500 jobs in 1979 and, as of this year, we have fewer people working than we had in 1979. So I abjectly apologize, Mr. Speaker, if I have not given the Premier enough time. Perhaps he might indicate to us how long he would like. Is it fifty or sixty years in order to get that first 40,500 that we were promised in 1979? But why is it, would the Premier tell us, he has ignored the impact on jobs of the federal budget cutbacks? What is the reason that that was not contained in his analysis of the federal budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many years the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants me to indicate but, given the caliber of the Opposition, the opposite side, we will be here for the next fifty or sixty years in any case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Do not bet on it! Do not bet on it!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think there was a little Freudian slip there. I think the Leader of the Opposition recognized it too in his question and that is why he used the fifty or sixty years. We are only too glad, Mr. Speaker, over here to look at that kind of time frame on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are not afraid of that kind of challenge, Mr. Speaker. We will take that challenge on the chin

and move ahead and do the things in Newfoundland for the best interests of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. That is no problem.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we were right on target with our creation of 40,000 jobs but there were factors beyond our control which led to us not meeting that target. But we were on target in the first couple of years and had created over 20,000 jobs and were moving right on target until various things outside of our control stepped in to prevent that. We were moving in a very good direction. And if we were in our own world and did not have the world marketplace and the Canadian economy to contend with, we would have reached it, Mr. Speaker. But we are very happy to have that fifty or sixty years at our disposal now to work on what has to be done for Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Leader of the Opposition knows and everybody else knows that in trying to examine and assess the impact of various measures upon a provincial economy from a federal budget is a difficult proposition and the best you can do is estimate. All we could do, Mr. Speaker, in trying to get a comprehensive and detailed and substantive statement on the federal budget was to look at the arithmetic as it related to commodity taxes because you could relate it to the number of people in the Province and you could easily do an arithmetic equation to give you some kind of a number which has credibility. At this point in time, given the nature of the federal budget and the other impacts that have to be seen upon the Newfoundland economy, it is virtually impossible to try to

quantify what the employment impact will be. But, as I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), as soon as our experts can put together assessments, which are credible and which make sense, on that impact, then we will let the hon. the Leader of the Opposition know.

MR. FLIGHT:

You will look good the next election.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns the federal Fisheries improvement loans programme. The minister will be aware that that programme was put in place some years ago, and under that programme fishermen borrowed from banks, such as Scotia Bank and the Bank of Montreal, to improve their fishing effort, to improve their fishing gear and so on, and the accountability in case of default was the fisherman's gear would first of all be seized, and then the federal government would pay the remainder of the loan. Now, is the minister aware that the federal government has recently withdrawn the guarantee for the years 1977 to 1980 from at least one of the major banks in the Province, and that, indeed, hundreds and thousands of fishermen are now receiving, or will be receiving letters from the bank demanding the portion of the loans originally guaranteed by the federal government? Was the minister aware of that?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of how the federal Fisheries improvement loan programme works. Perhaps we are talking about the same thing here and perhaps we are not, but it is my understanding that under the programme the federal government put a loan guarantee in place and then, if there was a default on the loan, the federal government paid the deficiency and the bank had to use every means at its disposal to collect the deficiency from the individual person. If there have been any changes on that part of the programme I certainly have not been made aware of them personally, and I do not know if any individuals or officials in the department have. But it is my understanding that is how the programme worked, and if it is that part of the guarantee that he is talking about, or if he is talking about the whole guarantee for the whole programme being withdrawn, then, at least at the ministerial level, I have not been made aware of that to date.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

It is my understanding that the regulation that was in place was this: Once the claims passed 10 per cent of what was guaranteed, or what was loaned by the bank, the federal government could withdraw its guarantee. Now, it is my understanding that the

federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Fraser), under the Fisheries Act, has withdrawn the guarantee, to the Bank of Nova Scotia in particular, for loans that were guaranteed to fishermen and were guaranteed by the federal minister. If the minister is not aware of this, it is another case of where the federal minister, I think, in this case, has again carried out something to the detriment of Newfoundland fishermen without contacting his provincial counterpart. If the minister is not aware, would he now attempt to contact his federal counterpart and see if indeed he has withdrawn those claims, which I believe he will find to be correct, and will he reinstate the guarantees again for the fishermen of this Province?

Many of them are now being told, I understand, that they are going to lose their houses and so on in the Province to satisfy the bank's claims against them. Would he now attempt, in all fairness to the fishermen in this Province, to see if that is the case?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will, and we will attempt to do it immediately. The thing I can say to the hon. gentleman is that we are reviewing programmes that we have in the Province and we do not out of necessity have to consult with the federal government in a review of those programmes.

For example, we are reviewing the bank guarantee loan programme now as it relates to financing boats

through the Fisheries Loan Board, and that would not have any impact on any federal programmes. But, nevertheless, the problem, if it is as the hon. gentleman enunciated it, is a serious one, and I will undertake, as soon as Question Period is over, to have officials in the department, first of all, see if there is anything to the points made by the hon. gentleman and, if there is, then we will certainly make the appropriate representation.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I find the whole thing amazing that indeed if this has happened, and I understand that it has, that, again, the federal minister has not contacted his federal counterpart. We now see the death again of all this cooperation, a PC government in Ottawa and a PC government in Newfoundland and what a great thing that was going to be.

Let me ask the minister another question, though. Would he also try to determine whether the fishermen themselves at this point have signed any documents that they are to be held responsible for any of those loans? Did they sign any of those documents? Would he also try to ascertain whether the banks were indeed aware that the federal government could withdraw this guarantee at any time and therefore leave them without the cash that they rightly deserve since they own it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we will investigate those questions as well. Like I say, my understanding of the programme was that when the programme was put in place if there was a deficiency balance as a result of the guarantee then the federal government paid that and following that payment then the bank and/or the federal government had to take all conventional means open to a lending institution to recoup the difference even though the federal government had paid the deficiency. We will have those matters investigated and we will also contact the bank in question to see if they have been part of any negotiations that might have taken place.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, one other question. We have now seen again another example of where something is alleged to have gone on. I can tell the gentleman that fishermen are receiving letters and payment for loans are now being demanded from them. We have now seen another case of where the Newfoundland Fisheries Minister (Mr. Rideout) is a dead duck as far as the federal minister is concerned. That says nothing about the provincial minister personally, but would he now go back to his federal counterpart and tell him that it is not enough to be sensitive to the needs of the Newfoundland fishermen and to the Newfoundland fishery but we do need some structure in place whereby communication can be carried on between both levels of

government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there has been more sensitivity and more communications and more consultation over the last seven or eight months between the Department of Fisheries at the political level and at the officials level in this Province than we have seen in the last twelve or fourteen years. Now that does not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that from time to time we may not run into a communication problem. The fact of the matter is I have known situations in my own constituency long before I became a minister, or certainly became Minister of Fisheries, where banks have called in a loan under the Fisheries Improvement Loan Programme where the federal government went and paid the deficiency balance on the loan guarantee but the bank as part of the programme took a lot of other means to try to collect the difference as well. Now I have known that to happen. I do not know if that is what is happening now but, as I have said, I have indicated to the hon. gentleman that we will investigate the matter and take any and all appropriate action that might be necessary to protect the interest of the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I like the way you say that word, 'Naskaupi'.

Thank you, very much.

I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I have not had the opportunity to ask one before. It relates to young offenders, Mr. Speaker, specifically, with I guess what has been termed holding facilities for young offenders. The reason why I am bringing the question up in the House at all is I would like to let the minister know that I have made a number of requests to meet briefly with the hon. minister to discuss this particular question and one or two others as they relate, I suppose, specifically to my district and perhaps as it relates other districts in Labrador and perhaps other parts of the Province. I do not know what the problem might have been there. Perhaps the minister had not been advised that the request was made or whatever. I am sure as a responsible minister she would have responded had she gotten a request initially.

By way of explaining, within Happy Valley - Goose Bay there is a Royal Canadian Mounted Police Detachment which has a drunk tank. And the drunk tank is the only facility in our part of Labrador in which young offenders, those under a certain age, who have been convicted of offenses and are on their way to centres such as the Pleasantville Boy's Home, for example, are held. Now under normal circumstances, I suppose a few hours awaiting a flight or something like that, Mr. Speaker, that may not be a particular problem. But we have seen it whereby they have been there nine or ten days, and the problems relate to the fact that flights are not available, escort service is not available and so on.

What I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) is she aware that this situation does exist? And if she has become aware of it, has she taken steps to alleviate it?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I recall once earlier in this sitting the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) approaching me about a meeting to discuss this situation. I said that I would be glad to meet with him. I will repeat that now. Perhaps we can agree on a time after question period.

I am not familiar with the details of the situation in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, but I can assure all hon. members that the Departments of Justice and Social Services are active in responding to the requirements of The New Young Offenders Act. Again, I say to the member for Naskaupi that after question period we can agree on a time for that meeting. At that time he can inform me of his concerns about the facilities in his district.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I was not particularly referring to the actual verbal request by me, but I

have made a number through our secretarial system. The suggestion has been made and has been discussed at a local level, let us say, in the Naskaupi district that perhaps the government might consider making use of some section of the Labrador Correctional Centre to have it modified to accommodate young offenders who are being held awaiting transportation and I guess that could be part of the discussion we may have.

The situation is quite desperate, I might inform the House in that -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Maybe the hon. member would pose his question.

MR. KELLAND:

Your Honour, I am trying to get to that particular part. I was wondering if, perhaps, any consideration - I guess we are going to discuss that a little later - was given to some kind of a capital expenditure to modify some part of the Labrador Correctional Centre to make it an appropriate facility for the young offenders?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, there have been considerable outlays of public funds in recent years to significantly improve our correctional facilities in Labrador, as well as throughout the Island of Newfoundland. Again, I think this matter is one more appropriately addressed when

we have a meeting than going into the details of the problems in the Naskaupi district.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, just one final question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

This is not directly related, Mr. Speaker, but there is a planned federal prison for this Province, and if I understand correctly, the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) has made a recent statement that the federal government are awaiting the Province's moves now as to having that established. And I am wondering if there has been any recent representation on a part of the minister to the federal government to determine when that will be, where it will be and so on?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been recent representation from me and my officials to our counterparts in Ottawa about the need for a new medium security correctional facility in our Province. During the month of May there were talks between officials of the two orders of government which proved quite satisfactory at which the federal officials indicated - and this was a departure from their attitude under the regime of Mr. Trudeau - that they do indeed agree with our request for a medium security correctional facility for our Province. So I

anticipate progress in that area in the coming months. The issue of location remains. I take it that will have to be resolved co-operatively between the two orders of government. Perhaps the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) would care to give us his views on that subject.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will give you my views on that when I am ready.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt). I wonder if the Minister of Environment has given consideration to or will he give consideration to enlarging the area to be sprayed with bacillus thuringiensis to include all the spray blocks now scheduled to be sprayed with fenitrothion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that that spray programme is in place and that we will proceed with spraying the major part with fenitrothion as it is the only chemical insecticide registered by Agriculture Canada.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I was asking if he had given consideration to ever

doing it. The chief of the Forest Protection Services in Manitoba has announced that they are spraying 700,000 hectares of heavily infested forest with Bt and the reason he gives is because this has been proven environmentally safe. Obviously he must think it is effective. So I will ask the minister will he immediately contact this branch of the Manitoba Government to find out about their safe spray programme or is he really concerned about a safe environment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are quite open to looking at new avenues but, I mean, with the information that we have available to us from the experts whom we have consulted on this, the approach that we are taking against the hemlock looper is the right approach. I mean, it is cost prohibitive, as the hon. member knows. It costs, for example, to spray with Bt about four times as much. From the information that we have from the Canadian Forest Service and other recognized authorities in the country, fenitrothion is more practical and safe and can wipe out this forest pest that we have. So we have embarked on this spray programme after much consultation and we are quite prepared to stand by the decision that we made. We feel that it will be safe, that it will be done with sensitivity, I want to assure the hon. member once again.

I thought the hon. member, when the hon. member made a statement earlier today, was quite happy to see that we only had a small block now to be sprayed for spruce budworm infestation, that indeed

he was coming on side and was not against the spray programme. So, you know, we hope in July and August to wipe out this forest pest, the hemlock looper that we have, that is going to have a very devastating impact on our forest industry here in this Province. The hon. member cannot sit on the fence all the time. He has got to take a position one way or the other.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, this hon. member is not sitting on any fence it is the minister who is sitting on a fence. He stated that Bt cannot be used and here we have a Province spraying 700,000 hectares with Bt. Who is right? Who is wrong? I will ask the minister again if he would go back and check his sources and check with the Manitoba government to find out about their safe spray programme? This is what they are announcing. Will he go check with them, find out about their safe spray programme, and maybe he can learn something?

MR. SPEAKER :

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) raises an interesting point there. The fact of the matter is is the province of Manitoba spraying against the Eastern hemlock looper or are they spraying against the budworm?

MR. BAKER

May I answer that question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

They are spraying against an insect that is neither the budworm that is here or the looper that is here. But as the hon. Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) knows, or should know, these particular kinds of insects that operate in the same way and have the same life cycle are affected by the same chemicals or the same bacterial agents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Maybe the hon. member would pose his question.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I was answering a question he asked me. I know that is not permitted in Question Period. Will the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), number one, try to establish the fact that Bt is effective against the hemlock looper? And, number two, establish the fact that it can be sprayed? I have checked this out and it is possible to be sprayed. Number three, if it is effective, then will he, in his future planning, instead of spraying fenitrothion spray something that is safe?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member that he has not obviously been covering the information that is coming out on this every other day in the press. The fact of the

matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing experiments now with Bt. But I want to tell the hon. member once again, for about the twentieth time, Bt is not registered as a combatant for the hemlock looper.

MR. BAKER:

Or for anything else.

MR. BUTT:

But fenitrothion is. Now, how many more times do I have to tell the hon. member?

MR. BAKER:

It is not registered for anything else either.

MR. BUTT:

It is not but we are experimenting with it now in small spray blocks to see how it is going to work.

MR. BAKER:

Experiment with it all over.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

We are going to spray in small areas to test it here locally in our environment but we have no intentions, Mr. Speaker, in the ninth hour, of changing our programme because the hon. member stands in his place and comes up with some grandious ideas about something that is happening in Manitoba that the hon. member obviously knows very little about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy and Housing (Mr. Dinn) concerning the rap that the people of this

Province have been given with respect to reductions in the rural RRAP assistance programme, but since the minister is not here, and since the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) is not here, I will direct the question to the Premier concerning another rap that the people of this Province might be getting at the hand of their own government, and I have a letter here directed to the Premier. I somehow doubt the Premier is familiar with the problem. Sir, it has to do with the establishment of a Bay du Nord wilderness reserve. Many people in this Province, thousands of people in this Province as a matter of fact, are concerned that this is a further infringement, indeed an erosion of their rights, a taking away of their culture and heritage by the establishment of these vast tracks of lands for a wilderness area. My question to the Premier is what is the status of this particular wilderness area right now? Has it been declared or is there going to be a waiting period? Just what is the status of this particular wilderness area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, number one, let me say I am extremely proud that during my tenure as Premier of the Province we saw fit to bring in a Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act to protect various parts of the Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

And an Environmental Assessment Act which you ignore.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And the Environmental Assessment Act, which was applied to the

uranium development in Labrador, if the hon. member remembers. So I am very proud of that act and obviously the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has not read that act.

MR. LUSH:

Read this letter.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, the letter has to refer to the act. The hon. member's question was, 'Has this been declared a wilderness area yet? What is the procedure to be used? When is it going to be?' If the hon. member would only read the legislation! No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was in the House at the time this legislation went through. Do your homework. Let the members of the Opposition do their homework. If the hon. member did his little bit of homework he would find that there has to be public hearings where the various groups who are in favour of it becoming a wilderness and ecological reserve will make their position known, where those who are opposed to making it an ecological and wildlife or wilderness reserve will make their positions known, and then the board that is established, which is looking at them, will make recommendations as to whether it should be declared or not. So that is the process to be used.

It is one thing for the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Board to indicate their desire to allocate a certain piece of property on the Island or in Labrador to be so declared, but it is another thing for it to actually happen. There is a process under the legislation for that and I would direct the hon. member's attention to that piece of legislation, to that

really good piece of legislation that was brought in by this government to try to ensure that we safeguard our way of life and our quality of life in this Province for generations to come.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier can get up and beat his chest in his arrogant way all he likes, but there are people in this Province concerned about the way that this has been established. I have here a petition that has been circulated in Central Newfoundland, I have here a copy of hundreds of letters that are going to be directed to the Premier on this whole matter, and there is a lot of confusion, and it is no wonder there is a lot of confusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, first of all the area is declared a wilderness reserve. I want the Premier to answer whether it is during this period that there are going to be public hearings because this has been going on now for a couple of years and people are worried that this is going to become a fait accompli without public hearings. So can the Premier tell us what time the public hearings are going to be held?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Question Period is for urgent and pressing business. If the members of the Opposition

will do their homework and read the legislation that is passed by this hon. House, they would know the process, and the only people who are confused, Mr. Speaker, are the members of the Opposition.

MR. LUSH:

Read your letters and you will see how important it is.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And they are trying to now perpetrate that confusion on the rest of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Well, Mr. Speaker, contrary to popular opinion, the people who are interested in this process know how it works and now I think they should direct the hon. member to read it so he will know how it works, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Today is Private Member's Day and we are on Motion 5.

The hon. the member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Half my time gone!

Mr. Speaker, on opening day I gave notice that I would introduce a resolution dealing with the cutbacks of the VTS system, and, for the Liberals, that means the vessel tracking system. If it were not for the treachery of the former Liberal Government in Ottawa I would not be speaking on this very important matter today,

because the cutbacks would not have been put in place.

Mr. Speaker, I would begin the introduction to this important Private Member's resolution by indicating to all hon. members that the original proposal and discussion to close the Argentia Vessel Traffic Centre were made by the former Liberal administration - Does that sink in? - in Ottawa, who, through the Bureau of Management Consultants, an agency of Supply and Services of Canada, supplied the report on Newfoundland VTS centres, a report which was seriously flawed and biased against the Newfoundland coastguard region.

I simply point this out since there will be those who would wish to play politics with the issue and, in their simplicity, merely lay the blame for this ill-conceived and unrealistic decision at the feet of the present federal administration.

I say that the blame should be attached with those officials who completed the original report on the VTS system. Beyond this, it is our responsibility as representatives of the people of this Province to indicate the facts and to protect the interest of our people, whether decisions are made in Ottawa Liberals or Ottawa Tories, Washington Democrats, or Washington Republicans. Therefore, my preamble, is an invitation to all hon. members to debate the fact surrounding this important issue, the facts which dictate that this vital service be maintained and upgraded for our mariners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Vessel Traffic Services provide radar surveillance to shipping and, thus, it is one of the many important support systems for marine safety vessels systems, aids to navigation, lighthouses, and others. The over all mandate of the VTS Centre is, therefore to provide marine safety in areas where there is a significant volume of marine traffic. Search and Rescue is another key element of the work when accidents occur, together with environmental protection and consideration.

The Argentia Centre is responsible for the area of Placentia Bay in the area due South from Cape St. Mary's and Burin to the limit of the territorial sea. A remote radar site is functional at Arnold's Cove and at Pearson's Peak, at the Northern extremity of Placentia Bay.

As a result of the proposed closure, thirteen employees will be laid off or relocated from the Placentia region.

In a letter to the hon. John C. Crosbie, Minister of Justice, and Federal MP for the Placentia - Argentia area, the Federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Donald Mazankowski stated that, "however, as I am sure you can appreciate in this time of necessary restraint in government expenditures it is no longer feasible to continue the operation of the Argentia VTS Centre given the level of shipping operating in the area now or in the immediate foreseeable future." Thus, it appears that a decision on the faith of the Argentia VTS Centre was based on current inaccurate shipping statistics, and on the \$500,000 savings which would be realized.

However, I again indicate to all hon. members that the Federal Minister of Transport was basing his decision on a report which was seriously biased, a report which was subsequently demolished by the Vessel Traffic Services Division of the Canadian Coast Guard in Newfoundland. Their review and comment concluded the study is without any substantive validity. Accordingly, the study report is not considered to be a valid reference document from which to formulate a capital investment strategy for VTS in Canada.

To date, opposition to the proposed elimination of the Argentia VTS Centre has been wide-spread. The Premier of Newfoundland, the Provincial Minister of Transportation, the former Environment Minister, local mayors of municipalities, representatives of local service and area development associations, fishermen's groups from the Placentia Bay area, MHAs and others have condemned the cutbacks at Argentia.

All of the convincing and legitimate reasons centered on a number of basic and fundamental reasons. Number one, Placentia Bay is one of the most productive fishing areas on the East Coast of Canada with in excess of 1,500 fishing vessels less than sixty-five in length, involving over 2,400 fishermen navigating daily, year-round in Placentia Bay.

Coupled with this, 1,000 trawlers operate in Placentia Bay to and from the Marystown area. In addition to the significant fishing vessel movement, we have tankers, chemical carriers, phosphorus boats, container ships, commercial ferries, oil rigs and supply vessels operating in

Placentia Bay. The following schedule outlines the identified vessel traffic which complies with the reporting procedures for the VTS Centre at Argentia. In 1975, 1,775 reported; 1976, 2,900; in 1977, 2,400; in 1978, 2,900; 1979, 3,000; 1980, 3,500; 1981, 3,600; in 1982, 3,900, and in 1984, 3,785. Fishery Products strike was the reason for the lower figures there.

As well there were 400 unidentified vessels plotted on the Cuslett radar between August and September 1975 and 1976. Many hundreds, if not thousands of other marine-related traffic goes unnoticed and unrecorded each year. Placentia Bay experiences an above average amount of fog, making vessel movement more hazardous than most. Statistics from the Argentia Weather Office present and Argentia Airport past records that the number of days per year with fog reducing visibility to less than five-eighth of a mile averages 184. This clearly indicates a need for a traffic management system.

Is the Federal Transport Department willing to permit ferry boats accommodating in excess of 500 passengers to navigate haphazardly, without the VTS assistance, in a fog-shrouded bay risking collisions with fishing vessels, phosphorous carriers and oil rigs?

Would an aircraft be permitted to fly under such dangerous circumstances?

The VTS Centre at Argentia provides continuous service to over 300 aircraft a year which fly at low altitudes to destinations on the Southwest Coast.

Reduced communications will mean that fishing vessels and other mariners will experience difficulty communicating with shore stations. Navigational aids, buoys, are being discontinued and, at the present, are very fragmented. Light station automation will further deteriorate visual sightings of mariners in distress and malfunctioning equipment will take longer to repair, causing serious delays and rendering inadequate equipment unreliable.

This situation renders Placentia Bay, the largest, foggiest bay in Newfoundland, even more dangerous for mariners, notwithstanding the closure of the VTS Center at Argentia. Search and rescue operations have utilized Argentia frequently and, of course, the VTS Center is vital to their operations.

In a letter from Mr. R. A. Quail, Canadian Coast Guard Commissioner, dated January 22, 1985 to the Placentia Lions Club, he states that the entire area of Placentia Bay is served by a lifeboat stationed at Burin. Surely such a service is totally inadequate, and while Mr. Quail may wish to minimize Argentia traffic as a vital link in co-ordinating a response to any marine emergency in Placentia Bay, past experience indicates that such is the case. We are faced with the spectre, therefore, of reduced vessel surveillance and aids, coupled with seriously weakened search and rescue capability. Mr. Quail's only response was to indicate his preference for funding other alternative navigational systems for fishermen at some future date while, at the same time, ignoring the larger and more dangerous carriers.

In addition to the proposed elimination of the VTS center at Argentia, it is important to note that the Placentia Bay routing system established to reduce risk of collision between vessels, reduce the risk of grounding or fouling fishermen's gear, has been cancelled. This will give more freedom to the mariner to set courses that would take tankers and chemical carriers closer to shore and areas of concentrated fishing activity. This situation, in itself, places undue, unacceptable risks to lives, resources and property.

Much concern has been expressed that the elimination of the Argentia VTS Center will deter the anticipated high level of economic activity related to the offshore development proposals at Argentia, Marystown and Cow Head. During the next few years, it is anticipated that vessels and oil rig activity within Placentia Bay will increase dramatically. A number of sites, including Argentia, are scheduled for support and development services for the offshore petroleum industry. In a recent report by Mobil Oil it is stated that the VTS in Placentia Bay in five years will become one of the most needed centers on the East Coast. Traffic congestion will increase and the equipment and personnel should be kept in place to meet the demanding requirements of growing offshore activity.

Only a short time ago three oil rigs navigated to Marystown while another two oil rigs were moved to Argentia following the threat of ice on the Grand Banks. These oil rigs were assisted by nine offshore supply vessels. Mr. Speaker, residents of the Placentia area are understandably

upset and concerned that the long-awaited and scheduled oil-related development may be in some jeopardy. Indeed, the provincial Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) stated to Mr. Mazankowski in previous correspondence on the matter that the intended closure of the Argentia VTS Center will, we believe, be a severe deterrent to future offshore oil development related activity in the Placentia Bay area. We simply cannot afford in an already economically depressed area to lose out on the millions of investment dollars scheduled for our area, and in an effort to save the federal government a modest \$500,000.

Indeed, should the federal government restraint policy run counter-productive to its own development assistance strategy in Placentia Bay to which it has already committed millions of dollars at Cow Head, Burin Peninsula Development Fund, and Ocean Industries?

Another vital consideration which must be addressed is the environmental risk factor. Again the safety risks have been posed to Mr. Mazankowski in a letter dated December 13th. from the hon. Minister of Environment in which he indicated that "the real concern I have is that this increased traffic and foggy conditions will increase the probability of a collision with one of the phosphorus tankers shipping products from ERCO Industries, Long Harbour."

It has been argued, with general and scientific agreement, if one of the phosphorus vessels was involved in a mishap whereby its highly toxic cargo was released, 50 per cent of the seabed and

marine life would be systematically destroyed. One of the richest fishing grounds in Canada would be destroyed and the livelihoods of countless thousands of fishermen would be eliminated, virtually destroying the economic life of 100 communities throughout Placentia Bay and the entire East Coast of the Province. Such disaster is possible, though minimized under normal regulated conditions. However, the reduction of the Argentia VTS Center places the risk and potential of such a catastrophic environmental disaster above and beyond the benefits resulting from budget cuts of modest proportions being discussed here today.

Finally, cutbacks within this Province are not consistent with what is occurring in other areas. Just recently a new building to house the marine VTS was completed in Halifax and \$6 million will be spent on new equipment. All this to provide vessel traffic management services in and out of Halifax harbour where every ship has a pilot on board. At Lac Ste. Communium, on the Quebec coast, a center was established to assist ships navigating the St. Lawrence River. The center is manned around the clock with three personnel per shift even though there is less traffic than on the Cabot Strait, especially in Winter when the Strait of Belle Isle is closed to navigation.

As I indicated, the report by the Bureau Management Consultants, an agency of Supply and Services of Canada, concluded that a strategic plan for the VTS should not include new VTS for the Cabot Strait or Strait of Belle Isle and should not include the replacement of VTS systems at Placentia Bay or Port aux Basques at the end of

their current life cycle.

However, in response to the study a lengthier review was undertaken by a group within the coast guard. In strongly worded and detailed commentary, it concluded that the BMC study report is seen without any substantial validity and should not be considered a valid reference document from which to formulate capital investment strategy for the VTS in Canada.

It went on to suggest that the study is not a realistic representation of legitimate national concerns. Mr. Speaker, there can be no rationale for abandoning the VTS center at Argentia.

Given the environmental safety and the economic consequences, such action will result in: Each ship entering Placentia Bay will be a potential hearse; each phosphorus or oil tanker will pose an unacceptable potential for causing a major environmental disaster; and, the tremendous offshore related developments scheduled for Placentia Bay will be placed in jeopardy. It is critical to continue the present operation at Argentia.

I, therefore, urge all members to request that the Argentia VTS facility be maintained and that present radar site at Arnold's Cove, which is already covered, be relocated to the previously operational Cuslett site. This would effectively increase the present radar detection range by thirty-five miles affording the Placentia Bay VTS's own 90 per cent coverage as opposed to the present 50 per cent. The equipment is already in place and the cost of such a move would be

very little since it could be accomplished with the personnel already employed in the area.

Mr. Speaker, such action would not, and indeed, could not be tolerated in the aircraft industry.

Again, on behalf of the countless thousands of concerned individuals who depend on Argentia service, I do hope that the federal minister will reverse his decision.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) erred in his decision to approve the proposed closure of the Placentia VTS center. However, there is still time to correct the information flowing the minister. I feel sure that the delay in closing the facility on April 1, 1985 is an indication that further discussions and considerations are being held on the matter.

I might say that the minister was very sympathetic to a brief which I submitted to him and several of his officials during a meeting we had in Ottawa several months ago. At that time it became apparent that he was perceiving on the basis of improper, incomplete and inaccurate advice from officials who simply did not possess the level of information, local knowledge and expertise needed to make a competent decision on such matters. This document provides that the competency and the unbiased view of vessel traffic services within the Newfoundland region and the hon. member should be well served by reading it since the issue raised affects each and every fisherman and mariner in this Province.

If I could I would like to quote

several passages from it. They are startling and reveal the level of bias and deficiencies which went into the decision-making input on this vital service and how poorly we have been treated in comparison with other areas of Canada.

'One is hampered by numerous illogical and inconsistent analysis patterns which make the whole VTS study extremely difficult to question.

'Number three, the study area rankings are significant in error.

'Number four, the study has an input base which is fundamentally out of touch with the very essence of what the VTS is, who it serves and how it functions.

'Number five, the casualties most common to the Newfoundland and Labrador region, those resulting from fire, explosion, defects, sinkings, foundering, cargo ship hull damage are not included.

'Factors which dramatically influence risk in the Newfoundland and Labrador region, however, such as visibility, wind, sea, ice conditions have not been realistically assessed.

'Environment factors are improperly weighted, discounted or partially understood.

'Number eight, the basic principles of marine risk reduction as a function of both accident prevention and control have been excluded.

'Number nine, the study however, has chosen to disregard the most fundamental principle of VTS in addressing the regulated vessel

traffic function.

'The study has demonstrated no grasp at all of the impact VTS plays on the motion of a ships domain.

'The study talks of the VTS mandate. Vessels over sixty-five feet in length, but in disregarding the fact that the prime regulatory VTS systems in Canada addresses vessels twenty-five feet or more in length not sixty-five, it has demonstrated a failure to grasp who the VTS addressable community is in Canada, thereby demonstrating the lack of a conceptual and operational grasp of how the VTS functions in Canada.

'The search and rescue spin-off value allocated for St. John's is \$12,000, while Vancouver is allocated \$2, 484,000.'

Reality rapidly identifies that the conclusions are in error, the experts are all but ignored. The study states that visibility less than two kilometers increases risk 3.5 times.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

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

MR. PATTERSON:
I will be just a couple of minutes.

The study states that visibility less than two kilometers increases risk 3.5 time. However, expert research clearly demonstrates that if visibility approaches zero, as we frequently experience in Placentia Bay, risk increases 1000 times.

'Number fifteen, the study chose to divide the area of operation to fragment the traffic managed by Port aux Basques with the subsequent effect that it made totally erroneous conclusions and recommendations. The Newfoundland Coast Guard region submits that the gathering and tabulating of material was erroneous, and the criteria used to establish the navigational risk index is not sound. Consequently, the resulting judgement, conclusions and recommendations are also not sound. The document is not accurate, certain data used in navigational risk, marine risk, traffic forecast and life cycle cost is either wrong, out of date, or insufficient to achieve statistical validity. The data base used is totally inadequate.

The 14 per cent overall growth rate assumed for the port of St. John's has already - 1981-'83 - been exceeded by 5 per cent. The St. John's - Avalon port master plan study forecasts an increase in commerce, to 1990, by 83 per cent. The assumption that there will be no growth or decline on the East Coast was, and still is, not accurate.

Recent exploration agreements on impending oil-related development will cause significant traffic increases in Placentia Bay, Port aux Basques and other zones. The lack of regional input, plus unjustified decisions for the national study team, has led to

costs which are misleading. Information used in the background document is not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution directly affects many areas of Newfoundland. I have noted that some of the glaring inadequacies have been identified in the national VTS study by the Newfoundland region Coast Guard, an expert analysis team.

This resolution deserves our support immediately, before any action is taken which will seriously endanger our fishery, our bird and mammal habitat, our marine environment, our social and economic base, and endanger the lives of those who seek their living from the sea, or of those who use the sea lanes to reach our shores.

Mr. Speaker, the spectre of loaded phosphorus tankers navigating in Placentia Bay in dense fog, along with loaded passenger ferries, oil rigs, fishing trawlers, all without the VTS surveillance, is frightening and unacceptable.

I do hope that this debate today will again send the message to Mr. Mazankowski that the proposed closure of Argentia was an ill-conceived idea which will be shelved immediately. Thank you for the extra time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting

the member's motion, although we have to say that we are in a situation of some confusion and lack of understanding as to why it was necessary. With this new era that has been hailed of co-operation and consultation, what is the member for Placentia doing taking the time of the House to set out this resolution?

MR. SIMMONS:

Why did he not just call big 'Brian'?

MR. BARRY:

Yes. Why has not that brief, that the member read, been read to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the member for Newfoundland in the federal Cabinet, who represents the area, Mr. John Crosbie, one of the most powerful members in the federal Cabinet?

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Mazankowski has the brief, and he has a copy, also.

MR. BARRY:

Well, what is happeninmg?

MR. PATTERSON:

I do not know what is happening.

MR. BARRY:

Why is it at this time of a new Tory Government in Ottawa, when we are told that it has never been better - there is great consultation, there is great co-operation - why does the member have to come into this House and ask for the support of the Liberal Opposition to get the VTS system preserved for the Placentia Bay area?

Now, we are happy, Mr. Speaker, to support that. As a matter of fact, let the record show that in this House of Assembly last fall it was the Liberal Opposition

which raised this and pointed out that the Wilson mini budget of last November, or September, would be taking that away.

Now, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has gone on in some rigmarole that somehow this is the fault of the Liberal federal government.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes. Would you give me a minute?

MR. BARRY:

We gave the member an extra five minutes, Mr. Speaker. The member had his chance to speak extemporaneously. When members on this side are up speaking he is always leaping up, his up to his feet at the drop of a hat, he is part of the tag team duo of Heckle and Gibe.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is looking for a circus, I will gladly accommodate him, and I am sure I could outmatch him, if he wants to get into a battle of wits. Now, it has been fairly well established that the Liberal Opposition are not concerned with the cutbacks in St. John's, they are not concerned with the cutbacks at Argentia, they are not concerned with the cutbacks in Port aux Basques. St. John's has the fourth highest risk in Canada, Port aux Basques has the second, and they want to shrug this off. If you think you are going to get

me up here now to have fun with me, you are not going to do it, I can assure you of that. But you people are on record now of having no interest in the mariners of Newfoundland. If there is a tragedy off our coast tomorrow, you will be the first to jump up and say, Oh, the VTS system should have been put back in place. We were always for it, and he will try and fly like that, and he will want to be Premier.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what is going on? What is happening? Close her down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

This matter is too serious to have fun with. What I documented there was taken from a draft final report which was done by the Coast Guard in Newfoundland, and it would be wise for you gentlemen over there to study it before you start talking about it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Before we appeal your ruling, are you absolutely sure there was no point of order there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Absolutely sure.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such jibberish come out of the member! Maybe that is why he was so careful in his initial remarks, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is why he was so careful in keeping to his informal notes, Mr. Speaker, in the course of his presentation,

because when he gets up on an extemporaneous point of order we have to look at him in amazement and say, "What is going on?" Has the teacher's pet finally flipped, Mr. Speaker?

We are pointing out to the member we are on his side. We are going to give him every help we can, Mr. Speaker. Despite the abuse that he heaps on us every time we get up and try and give him a hand, we are on the member's side. We are going to help the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). His colleagues on the other side of the House may abandon him, his colleagues in Ottawa - Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Mazankowski, Mr. Mulrone - they may all abandon him, but we are going to be fighting with the member for Placentia for the vessel traffic surveillance system for Argenticia as we were doing in this House, Mr. Speaker, before the member for Placentia raised a voice. We shamed him into it, Mr. Speaker. We shamed him into it when we got up in this House.

MR. PATTERSON:

Not true.

MR. BARRY:

Look to Hansard. The member can go to Hansard. We were fighting for the people of Argenticia and the people of Placentia Bay before we heard a peep out of the member for Placentia. He was dumb struck.

I can understand why he was speechless. Getting such a sudden shock can only be attributed to that dirty blow that got him. You know, it is like a boxer, Mr. Speaker, when his opponent turns his head and he gives it to him right in the back of the head. Now that is what happened. As soon as the member for Placentia (Mr.

Patterson) got the federal government elected in Ottawa, after they said their thank yous, he turned around figuring all would be well, and what a shot in the back of the head he got from Mr. Wilson with his mini-budget! What a rabbit punch he got! And no wonder, Mr. Speaker, we did not hear a murmur from the member for Placentia, we did not hear a sound from the member for Placentia, not a peep for the first couple of weeks that we were here in this House, fighting desperately, just a handful of us, as we then were, just a bare handful on this side of the House, fighting. Our new colleague here, our new colleague can testify to the fact that we were there fighting tooth and nail for the vessel traffic surveillance system.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

I really feel sorry for the Leader of the Opposition because he has no knowledge whereof he speaks. But if he were prepared to take me on in debate on the VTS system in Newfoundland, and the national study, and the study that was done here in Newfoundland, I will take him on any place and I will demolish him.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to start appealing Your Honour's rulings

because we have to consider those points of order more carefully than we are doing when the member stands up, but I will let that one pass.

MR. PATTERSON:

You have not read the report. Have you read the report? No, Sir, you have not read the report.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the record of this House shows the indepth knowledge that we have. As a matter of fact, I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of having the member for Placentia give me a guided tour of the vessel traffic surveillance system at one point in time, at a point when he was still talking to me. I think he was still talking to the teachers at that point too, Mr. Speaker. But now he has lumped us all in. We are all a group of hooligans as far as the member for Placentia is concerned, the teachers, the Liberal Opposition, and 95 per cent of the population of this Province. They are a bunch of hooligans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the member for Placentia that I have spent a little bit of time on the water out in Placentia Bay when there was fog and it was not the type of fog that the member for Placentia is continually trying to spew out in this House either. And I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of that vessel traffic surveillance system for the small boat fishermen of Placentia Bay, particularly, Mr. Speaker, if we see, as we all hope to see, an increase in traffic going into Marystown, Mr. Speaker, and going into Come By Chance, it is even more crucial that there be that type of surveillance as they get up to the head of the Bay, and that was, of course, why it was

there when the tankers were moving into the Come By Chance refinery.

If this vessel traffic surveillance system goes we have to take it as a clear indication that the Government of Canada has written off any chance of reactivating the Come By Chance oil refinery. The member for Placentia should not forget that. The member for Placentia should be speaking out a little bit and questioning his colleagues in the front benches ahead of him, the Premier and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Why has not the member for Placentia been asking them what do they mean by saying that the Come By Chance refinery has been scrapped? What did they mean before the last election, before they had to shamefacedly back water because we had some bidders come in prepared to bid to reactivate that refinery?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Those bids are being assessed.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, they are being assessed. They are being assessed like this VTS. Is this being assessed as well?

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

Well, then, I would suggest the member withdraw this resolution. It is obviously premature. What is he doing wasting the time of the House if he is telling us that he feels the Government of Canada is going to go ahead with keeping a vessel traffic surveillance system there?

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

You may be a smart lawyer but I did not come down with yesterday's rain when it comes to this stuff. This was introduced when? This resolution was introduced the day the House opened here and then the decision was to close it in April, but only for Patterson and a few of his friends, and the Premier, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) and all the council, and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), we got a brief and we went to Ottawa with the brief and we put the breaks on. The breaks are on that resolution now and they may phase it out and they may not. But I certainly hope they do not and I certainly would like the support of the hon. members over there on this resolution.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I have to say it or can say it, I thank the member for pleading in such fine fashion. I am telling the member when all of the colleagues on that side of the House are struck dumb, as they will be when they permit the Come By Chance refinery to be trapped, when all of his friends in Ottawa, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Mazankowski, Mr. Mulrone, when they go silent, members on this side of the House will be fighting with the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) to keep that vessel traffic surveillance system open. I will have the member know that the member for Haystack, there on my right hand side, Haystack out in Placentia Bay, is also aware of

the fog and the navigation problems. As a gentleman who has his own little boat, he knows the risks of the small boatman.

MR. TOBIN:

Tell us about the day Tom Whelan made you put on your life jacket.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess I was out in Placentia Bay in a Boston Whaler, we should not have been out in a Boston Whaler, we should not have been out there in the QE II on that particular occasion. I do not think the vessel traffic surveillance system would have made a big difference had there not been longliners nearby but, as a matter of fact, I have to say that we were probably saved, maybe it was to the Province's loss that I was saved. Members opposite might have had an easier time, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) might have had an easier time had that vessel traffic surveillance center not been there, because, Mr. Speaker, we were not able to raise the longliners that we needed to help us directly from our small Boston Whaler, but we were able to go through the Argentia vessel traffic surveillance system and they in turn got a longliner to come out of Merasheen Harbour, Mr. Speaker, and save us, as we were at the mercy of the elements having lost the chain on our outboard motor, having no capability of navigating at all, totally at the mercy of the waves.

So I have a soft spot in my heart for the vessel traffic surveillance center, it saved my life, I think, to the chagrin of the government I am sure. I was out there myself and another gentleman who shall remain

nameless, whose vessel it was, but, Mr. Speaker, we were getting a little bounced around there, and had it not been for the fine assistance of the vessel traffic surveillance center at Argentia, we would probably still be out there but I do not think we would still be bobbing around.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why did you not wear a life jacket?

MR. BARRY:

I do not remember if we had a life jacket. I do not think we had to much in the way of life jackets. We should have but I do not remember that one.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the first part of this resolution, that the system provides a vital service for the safe navigation of vessels within Placentia Bay. I agree that its proposed phase out will jeopardize the safety of mariners including the hundreds of fishermen who operate within Placentia Bay on a daily basis. Fishermen from my former home town of Red Island still going back there, Mr. Speaker, going across the bay in small boats. They need the protection of this center. I agree that the risk to the marine environment will be placed at an unacceptably high level due to the unregulated and haphazard movement of phosphorus tankers, oil carriers, and other shipping. Mr. Speaker, I agree with that. As members opposite know, I am sure, basically they have like a couple of lanes on the highway system, you know, you come in in one set of lanes and you go out in another set of lanes, and the center keeps track of which vessels are coming in and indicates whether there is other traffic in the lane or coming out the bay.

I agree that the elimination of the VDS service will jeopardize the offshore oil and gas industrial development potential in centers within Placentia Bay, particularly, Mr. Speaker, the capacity of Come By Chance to operate as an offshore rig building center, and the refinery to operate. That refinery will not be able to operate if that center goes. If we lose that center, we know that the Government of Canada is condemning Come By Chance to dismantling. They are going to scrap Come By Chance if they do not keep this center open.

We agree that the fishery within Placentia Bay contributes millions of dollars to the provincial economy and provides hundreds of jobs for our people. We agree that the decision to eliminate the VTS operation at Argentia were based on a report which, whether seriously inaccurate, was incomplete. I am not sure if I still have a copy of it. I would be interested in the member pointing out the inaccuracies or the errors, but from my point of view it is incomplete.

MR. PATTERSON:

I have already pointed out at least twenty.

MR. BARRY:

Your remarks were so dynamic we were swept up by the emotion of the moment and did not quite capture the full content of the remarks.

We will look at that, Mr Speaker. But I will take a little caveat, a little note there, as to whether I agree that the report was flawed and inaccurate but I will agree that the report was incomplete.

Now, the resolution, "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Provincial Government intervene with the Federal Department of Transport in an effort to have this ill-conceived and unacceptable action immediately rescinded." We already asked for that last Fall. We asked for it again and this side of the House is completely in favour of that. Then, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provincial Government make strong representation to the Department of Transport to upgrade V.T.S. facilities which have been described by qualified Coast Guard personnel as inadequate for the safe movement of ships within the Newfoundland Region." Now here is where I have some concern. I have some concern about the way in which this member is prepared to stand up and use such vigorous language. This member is prepared to say, "Mr. Speaker, let us have strong representation". Now he is not prepared to condemn the Government of Canada for closing it down.

MR. PATTERSON:

If they close it down I will condemn them.

MR. BARRY:

Okay, okay!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now we are getting a little action here. Now we are getting at least one voice over there. I am afraid he may be a voice in the wilderness as far as people on that side of the House are concerned, but I knew, Mr. Speaker, that he would not sit back the way the Premier (Mr. Peckford) has been sitting back, as far as senior citizens'

pensions are concerned. We had to shame the Premier, we had to force the Premier into - how many attempts did we make in that resolution?

MR. BAKER:

I think it was eleven.

MR. BARRY:

I think it was about eleven attempts, Mr. Speaker, that I had to make before we finally shamed him into going along with a resolution that would see this Province take a stand as far as de-indexing is concerned. But even then you notice the Premier had to water it down. So I am not sure. Has the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) consulted with the Premier before he got carried away with drafting this resolution? Is the member sure that the Premier is ready to go that far and make strong representation? Is the member for Placentia sure that the Premier is prepared to go any further than he did as far as the senior citizens were concerned and say, "We do not support"? That is probably what he considers to be strong representation, for him to get up and say, "We do not support the closing down of the VTS system". That is what we will see coming from the Premier of this Province.

Now we had another member yesterday who got up and in the course of his speech - and I think the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will be dealing with this in a little while so I will not rush into this - was prepared to condemn the Government of Canada but, lo and behold, when he consulted with the Premier, when he consulted with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), he started to back water like a squid.

MR. PATTERSON:

A lobster goes astern, a squid goes ahead.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member may be from Placentia but I do not know how much salt water he has taken down in him if he has never seen the way a squid can reverse.

MR. TULK:

If he took any salt water it was swimming on the beach.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, a little bit of spray swept over the beach and got in on him. That is as much as he saw out in Placentia Bay.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly clue up. Even though the member for Placentia has obviously spent very little time out in Placentia Bay if he does not know that a squid has a very quick reverse system, even though he is obviously talking about what he has read or what he has heard the fishermen tell him, obviously he has never been out in the middle of Placentia Bay on a foggy day. It is all hearsay. The hon. hangishore from Placentia, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that it is all second hand information he is giving this House, we are delighted, Mr. Speaker, to pass this resolution and we say, let there be no further debate, let there be no further procrastination, let there be no more delay, let us get this resolution passed now and on up to Ottawa with very strong representation. Thank you very

much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Just a couple of minutes if I might. I just wanted to compliment the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) for the kind of effort and dedication that he has put into this particular issue. It is as a direct result of his persistence, the way he investigated and got down to the bottom of this issue provided us with the necessary information to put forward a position to the federal government, to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski), and to our federal colleagues, the point that resulted in an evaluation or re-evaluation of this whole process being done.

We are at a stage, Mr. Speaker, which was the reason for the importance of putting forward this particular resolution today, where this new report, the assessment of the original report, is being now looked at and assessed. We are at a crucial point, where I think the unanimous support of this House will go a long way in convincing the powers that be that the original decision to remove the VTS staff from both Port aux Basques and Argentia was a wrong one, it was based on ill-conceived opinions. The report is nothing but a roundabout way of trying to get at a truth that is not there.

The assessment done by the local people involved, the Coast Guard and the Water Transport Directorate, have shown that the

original report is a false one, the conclusions are false, based on false assumptions, and that the decision to close down the station in Argentia and to reduce the one in Port aux Basques should be reversed, and the sooner that is done the better. I am very pleased that the House is going to unanimously support the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) in his request to have this done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take thirty seconds to say that I fully support what the member for Placentia has presented here today. I have indicated to the Prime Minister, I have indicated to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski), I have indicated to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), and everybody else who would listen to me in Ottawa, as has the member for Placentia and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), that this decision will come back to haunt them in twelve to eighteen months flat, that they are going to have to re-open it, that it is going to have to be enlarged and expanded and enhanced, and that this was a very ill-conceived decision, that the studies on which it was based is rampant with inconsistencies, and that we have looked at it all. There is no question in my mind, and in the mind of the Government, that this was a very, very bad decision. We have tried to make that clear through the transport people. That Department

of Transport is bigger than the OECD and the United Nations combined. It is unbelievable, trying to get through the morass of decision-making processes that they have in place there. And I am sure the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) knows what I am talking about from a different perspective, but in the same kind of way, to try to get to somebody who makes decisions, and who makes these kinds of decisions void of the real facts of the matter. It is unbelievable! I will not take any more time, I support what the Leader of the Opposition said, 'Let us get on to get the resolution passed, let us get it into the hands of the people in Ottawa.

The Minister of Transportation for his part, and myself, will also, ourselves, communicate that we supported the resolution in the House. So let us get on and support this resolution and, I think, also thank the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who has done such an excellent job on research to bring this point to a head and to the House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the resolution presented by the member for Placentia regarding the removal of VTS systems from Argentia and Port aux Basques was carried unanimously.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to agreement, now that we have

disposed of the Private Member's motion on the Order Paper today, perhaps we could go into government business, and with consent of the House I move the House into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the Loan Bill.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has a resolution which we agreed to put together and he would present by leave. We told him we were prepared to do that as soon as the Private Member's motion was passed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes. Okay.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has been agreed that both side would take ten minutes in this resolution. I think it is very vital that all fishermen in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador be treated equally, and this resolution is subsequent to the petition which I presented in this House yesterday asking that the government of Canada, who brings in special programmes to help fishermen who are in dire need, will consider all fishermen and not just some fishermen. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the following resolution, seconded by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout): BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend to the federal government that they treat all fishermen of this Province equally; this would

include fishermen North of Cape Harrison, including Makkovik, Postville, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Nain, who are presently discriminated against by the policies of the Department of Employment and Immigration and Fisheries and Oceans pertaining to the special programmes of assistance related to excessive ice conditions on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, looking at the Hansard of yesterday, we realize that once again - and it is just following in the footsteps of the resolution that was put forward by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) - that once again we can see a government occupied by Central Canadians, who do not know the frustrations that people in isolated areas of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador have to contend with.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to make sure that the bureaucrats that are coming down with those policies or who are making those decisions realize that there are people in all parts of Canada that you have to pay special attention to and some of those people live in the district of Torngat Mountains.

I was utterly surprised, Mr. Speaker, to receive a copy of a letter that came in to the hon. minister on May 13. Mr. Speaker, if I can go back four years when the hon. Lloyd Axworthy was Minister of Employment and Immigration I would venture to say close to the same person wrote the same kind of a letter. It is practically the same letter that the hon. Lloyd Axworthy wrote me roughly four years ago and now we get a letter coming down from the Minister of Employment and

Immigration (Mrs. MacDonald) saying basically the same thing, saying if we have to change it for the people of the Northern Labrador Coast we will have to change it for the people in Ontario, or the people in downtown Ottawa somewhere.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to have individuals or ministers in Ottawa thinking that the same UIC conditions apply to downtown Ottawa or downtown Toronto as applies to Hopedale, Labrador. We have to see these recommendations change. Either wipe it all out or, at least, have UIC benefits or emergency payments that will help the people who need it who cannot fish.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I was talking to fishermen in Makkovik and they have, at least, another two weeks before they can put their nets in the water. It is not their fault. It is Mother Nature who is playing the trick. This is natural year after year. But, because there are people in other sections of the Province, people who fish in Makkovik in the Summertime from Fogo, from Twillingate, and so on, those people can sit back because there is ice off of Fogo or ice off Twillingate or ice off White Bay, that they can get this special benefit and they fish in the area where the fishermen in my district fish and they cannot get any help.

So with this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this resolution passed unanimously and tell the Government of Canada that we want to be treated fairly. The fishermen in Torngat Mountains want to be treated equally. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yes, this resolution came about yesterday evening as a result of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) presenting a petition to the House in which he asked in his opening statements that the federal government be condemned for discriminating against the people of Labrador, North of Cape Harrison.

Mr. Speaker, we find before us a resolution which is somewhat weaker and it seems to me to be somewhat repetitive of something that is already gone on by this government already. In speaking in support of the petition yesterday evening, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) clearly stated that the government had already been in contact with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

I do not doubt that he was, as a matter of fact, I believe he was. But my point to the member for Torngat Mountains is this, is that surely, and I believe the Minister of Fisheries did, surely when he sent the Telex he also recommended to the federal government, to Flora, who calls us 'fishers' surely he recommended to -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fisherfolk.

MR. TULK:

No, fishers, she has got the fishers, it was fisherfolk was Fall. Today it is fishers. If you look at the recent statements that comes out by her it is fishers. My point is that surely the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) then recommended, and I believe he did, I am not questioning him, surely recommended to Flora in Employment and Immigration Canada that those fishermen North of Cape Harrison be treated the same as the rest of the fishermen in Newfoundland.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) new this yesterday evening when he stood.

MR. WARREN:

I did.

MR. TULK:

Yes, you said it. Indeed he did and he got up and he said, we should condemn them. We should condemn the federal government because they have already been warned by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in Newfoundland, and we should now have reached the stage where we condemn them for their actions and demand that they not do this again. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was perfectly willing, when I put forward the resolution, to ask for leave of this House yesterday evening to condemn the federal government for doing that. I know that the member for Torngat Mountains was perfectly willing to do that but who prevented him from doing it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What difference does it make?

MR. TULK:

It makes all the difference in the world because this resolution now

is a nothing. This resolution is a nothing.

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
Let me finish. I have got my few minutes. You will know if you will listen. If you will close your mouth and listen you will learn something but as usual the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)

MR. SIMMS:
That is not parliamentary.

MR. TULK:
Well, it is not parliamentary to chew in here either so swallow it.

The member for Grand Falls, as unusual, is interrupting. As a former Speaker of this House he should be ashamed of himself, he should be ashamed of some of the actions that he has carried on back and forth across this House. He continually interrupts, Mr. Speaker, and he should get the gum out of his mouth. Tell him to be quiet or otherwise ask him to leave the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from the hon. gentleman, old landslide Simms.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) yesterday was perfectly prepared to put some teeth into this resolution. He was perfectly prepared to say, as I believe the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was, 'Let us condemn the federal government, let us make some strong representation to

them.' Instead of that, what have we got now? The member for Torngat Mountains has been duped by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). He has been told that he cannot condemn the federal government, he can only recommend, recommend to them again and recommend to them again.

I want to tell the member for Torngat Mountains that he is operating under the same set of circumstances and with the same problems as the Minister of Fisheries, he is being ignored. He is being told to be nice by the Government House Leader and do not offend Flora, who calls us fishers. Do not offend her because she is PC, she is Tory. Do not offend her, you be nice to her and you just recommend to her.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) mentioned Lloyd Axworthy and mentioned the letter. He said that the letter that he got from Flora MacDonald was probably the same letter that Lloyd Axworthy wrote and he is probably right but I wonder would it have been then from the Government House Leader, 'Let us recommend', or would it have been, 'Let us condemn'? The Telex machine on the eight floor of Confederation Building would have been flipping them out as fast as it could, getting the Telexes off to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the member for Torngat Mountains that I will put an amendment in place for him because his resolution needs an amendment to give it some strength to show that the member for Torngat Mountains has got some backbone.

MR. MARSHALL:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I want to point out to the House that the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is not in his seat, members in the House are supposed to sit in his seat and I would suggest that the Speaker direct the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to vacate the seat presently and occupy his own.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I can tell the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that he does not have a worry, there are certain people on that side of the House that we would let sit on that side permanently but the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is not one of them. He belongs over there because he has just got a few more brief years and then he is going to vacate his seat, his forty-one votes will be wiped out. So, Mr. Speaker, we are not interested in members that are going to lose their seats.

Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to the hon. member's resolution, perhaps he might accept it and perhaps he might not. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we add words to this resolution: BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn and further recommend - so, insert

the words 'condemn' 'and further recommend' - to the federal government. To give it some teeth. To show Flora who calls us fishers, to show the Lloyd Axworthys, to show the Central Canadians that we are not to be played with, that the fishermen in Northern Labrador North of Cape Harrison or on the South Coast of this Province or anywhere else are equal in Newfoundland.

The Premier talks about equality and as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) says, 'Be nice to our Tory buddies in Ottawa.' Forget equality when it comes to that. The member for Torngat Mountains will admit that after he stood up there yesterday evening the Government House Leader said, 'Now we cannot condemn them, recommend to them.' At the same time the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) had already made a recommendation and got nothing in return for the fishermen in Northern Labrador. It is time to condemn and to further recommend to them in view of that condemnation that this House has for them a unanimous resolution condemning them and further recommending them it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we got out from under our partisan politics that is being played by the Government House leader and certain people on that side for the sake of the people of Northern Labrador.

So, I move that slight amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is an amendment to the resolution: BE IT RESOLVED that this House - inserted the word 'condemn' and then the word 'recommend' and the resolution

continues as it was originally.

On motion, amendment defeated.

On motion, original motion as presented by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) carried.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We will agree on this side with even a watered down resolution. I want my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the people of Northern Labrador to know that. But I also want them to note that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was loudest in his 'nay' when it came to condemning his federal Tory buddies in Ottawa.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order. I mean, the hon. gentleman showed the courage of his original convictions when his own motion was defeated and he voted for the other motion. So he is obviously very confused.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions

relating to the Raising of Loans by the Province, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. DECKER:

I believe I have a few minutes left, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, I was trying to visualize how a lender would feel if this Province came to borrow \$350 million, and I tried to point out some of the weaknesses that the lender would see in the Province when the Province wanted to borrow \$350 million. I pointed out how much money is being wasted on some of the Icons that we see in various places around this Province, which is one point that would make a lender feel very insecure about advancing money to this Province.

Another place, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, that the lender would see a waste, would be in the fifty-two districts. Surely, Mr. Chairman, someone lost control of his senses when he came up with the idea that a Province the size of Newfoundland should have fifty-two districts. One of the most efficient times that ever this Province was run was when it was run by six people. We paid

off our debt and we became an independent colony once again.

MR. PATTERSON:

You should have been around. People lived on six cents a day dole money. Do you want to go back to that?

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, can you control that hon. gentleman from Placentia?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

All I hear is, 'I am against hooligans!' Now, Mr. Chairman, he probably wants to call me a hooligan. You know, I am appalled at that man! These are the tactics that the government will use. Every time somebody gets up in this hon. House and starts to make a bit of sense, members on the other side will try to stifle and muzzle us. This is a tactic they are using, Mr. Chairman, and to tell the truth, I am just getting fed up with it! I think that I deserve to be heard. I was elected to this hon. House to be heard and I see a weakness in this government, and I am saying that if I were a lender, Mr. Chairman, I would be concerned that someone came up with the idea of fifty-two districts for Newfoundland.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, did it have something to do with gerrymandering? I wonder was it a way that the Tories guaranteed themselves to stay in power for so long? Well, Mr. Chairman, if this is the tactic they were using, they are going to have to add a few more seats, because we are on the brink of changing that. But I should not say that too loudly because maybe, by the time the next election comes, Sir, we could

end up with seventy-five seats with the vast majority of them in the St. John's East area; maybe they would make two or three seats out of that area. So we have to be very, very careful when we make suggestions.

If I were a lender, I would be very, very concerned, in a Province the size of this, at all the money it takes to keep a member of this House, to pay his salary, to pay for his perks. To me, it is a waste of money. And then, Mr. Chairman, where you have fifty-two districts, it happens sometimes that the government in power ends up with so many members, in this case, thirty-six, that you have to make the Cabinet bigger to accommodate them; otherwise, the Premier would lose control of the House. All Cabinet ministers - I mean, they will agree - Cabinet ministers are 'yes' men and women. They have to be. They are appointed solely by the Premier, they are puppets of the Premier. They do what he says, they go where he says go and that is the way it is in our particular government today. So the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, is big because we have too many districts.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Big in numbers.

MR. DECKER:

Big in numbers, thank you. Big in numbers, Mr. Chairman.

If we were to make less seats in this Province, we would convince our lenders that the government in power is more capable of running the operation and also, it would save a few dollars, because we would be able to cut down on our Cabinet.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting

that the lender would see the Icons as being a waste. I am suggesting that the lender would see the fifty-two districts as being a waste.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many should there be?

MR. DECKER

There should be about eighteen or twenty in Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

Where will you be?

MR. DECKER:

I would probably be representing the Northern Peninsula and Labrador, I would say Naskaupi no doubt.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, that I would be concerned about would be the qualifications of the minister. If I were lending \$350 million, I would have to have confidence in the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). As a banker I would say, what are the man's qualifications? What does he do? Is he an accountant? Was he a bank manager? "No," they would say, "he was a baby doctor. He used to cuddle little babies, and pat them on the bottom." Mr. Chairman, can you imagine how fast my confidence would dissolve to nothingness if a Province were coming and asking me for the loan of \$350 million to be administered by a person whose ability and whose training and whose experience all rest in patting baby bottoms. You know, Mr. Chairman, it would shatter my confidence completely and I would have to say, "I do not think I can advance that \$350 million."

Another way, Mr. Chairman, I would look at the way the money is being spent, I would look at this

programme SEED, which I would like to refer to SEED as seed that fell by the wayside. Newfoundland put \$2 million of this \$350 million into a programme that was designed by Flora in Ottawa, without any consultation whatsoever from her counterpart in Newfoundland, no consultation. She just said, "Okay, Newfoundland, take on this programme, it might fit or it might not fit," and this government runs up to Flora like the little lap dogs that they have become since we have seen the change in government, like little lap dogs they are, they run up, they slap in \$2 million and the truth of the matter is that this year the programme was supposed to give 6,000 temporary jobs the minister told us when he made his ministerial statement. We have not got 6,000 jobs. We have only got 5,200 jobs, we are short on the prediction, \$2 million was taken and thrown away. Now how would the lender look at this kind of money which is being thrown away? Is he going to advance \$348 million instead of \$350 million?

You see, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to continue, and I am sure as long as we have the present administration, and as long as we have the present Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), we are going to have to continue to borrow, and if we are going to continue to borrow we are going to have to prove to the lender that we are a capable people, we are going to have to prove to the lender that we have prudent spenders, that we are careful, we are not going to waste this money on silly programmes like SEED.

You know this SEED was supposed to put people in career-related jobs. I would like to hear the minister sometime tell us just how

many of those jobs are indeed career-related, and after hearing that I think all Newfoundlanders would have to say to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to have an awful lot of waitresses in the future, that we are going to have an awful lot of gardeners in the future, or we are going to have an awful lot of people who are involved in the menial tasks in the future. Because this is what is happening. This SEED was supposed to be career-related, but in actual fact, it is the same type of jobs that we have seen the people involved in over the past ten years, which lack imagination, which basically involves digging holes in the ground and filling them up again, that is how useless they are. And yet, Mr. Chairman, this Province takes \$2 million that we had to borrow, and wastes this money the SEED programme. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is indeed seed which has fallen by the wayside.

If I were a lender, Mr. Chairman, I would also look at the fact that this Province is having elections too often. You know every time that someone comes up with a good idea for an election, that is not an excuse to have an election, Mr. Chairman. You do not have an election just because you have a good issue, just because you can catch the Opposition without having its act together. That is not the reason you call elections. It seems to be that this Province, whenever they come up with an issue that they think that they pull the wool over people's eyes, pull a bag over their eyes, fool them, deceive them into slipping another Tory Administration in, you go out and call another election. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the lender is going to look at that in

a very satisfactory way, and I think that when we go again to look for \$350 million the lender is going to wonder why we are looking for that kind of money and whether he can trust us to spend it to the best use.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. TULK:

How come you are looking at me and recognized him?

MR. SIMMS:

You are good looking.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for recognizing me. I had my hair cut just recently. I am sure this is the reason why I was recognized over and above the hon. member for Fogo.

Mr. Chairman, how do you respond to the hon. member who just sat down? He says that we have an expenditure budget of approximately \$2 billion. And the hon. member stands up and he says, "I am going to make some suggestions now on how you should handle your \$2 billion budget". That is what he says. So he says, "Now here are my suggestions: Do not make so many photos of the Premier". Now, as the Premier pointed out, we do not make photos of the Premier, that is done privately but he says that is a big thing. He says, "Do not send pamphlets around to the people of

this Province".

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, he did not.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes he did, last day. You do not have a good memory. I have an extremely good memory. But anyway he said, "Do not send pamphlets around to the schools and son on". Now we are supposed to be governing this Province, which indeed we are doing, and we are supposed to be informing the people of this Province on important issues, which we are doing. We could do it by smoke signals or we could send messages out by pigeon or something like that. But in actual fact since, I think it was, 1648 printing has been in vogue in the Western World and it has indeed spread throughout the world. So we use a technique that has been in place for about the last 400 years. Now the hon. member does not agree with that, but however.

Then he says, "We should not have so many districts in this Province". I presume he means we should not give away part of the Province, although the Liberal Party has tended to do that over the years. I presume we should keep the land here. When he says we should not have so many districts he does not mean we should give some of the districts to Quebec or whatever. But anyway, he seems to suggest that the people of this Province are getting too much representation. He seems to feel that there is too much democracy in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to think our budget is such that we can afford to spend a little bit on democracy in this Province and I do not think we will desist of that.

Now his next point was he does not like the Minister of Finance. He does not think that I have had a suitable upbringing to perform the duties I now perform. My upbringing led, in one way, to the care of children. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I have to deal with the hon. member opposite I can think of no better upbringing. I think that my training and my experience ideally suits me to deal with the hon. member opposite because he has a sort of child-like mind. He has a very simple attitude towards the intricacies of modern society and he has absolutely no concept, as an infant might not have a concept, of what is really going on in the real world. So I think, certainly in dealing with the hon. member opposite, my training and my experience is ideal.

Now, thirdly, and this is serious, I want to make a serious point here, he says that the SEED Programme, into which we have put a certain number of millions of dollars and associated with a large amount put in by the federal government, is a waste of time. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds, if not thousands of students getting benefit from the SEED Programme. The SEED Programme was put in place by governments and by private businessmen. These private businessmen employ these students - they pay partly, governments pay partly - they employ these students to carry out duties that the businesses think are worthwhile and the students, because I have great respect for the intelligence of the students of the Province, they take on jobs which the students think are worthwhile. Now the hon. member does not think this. He does not

think that students have any sense at all, that they do not want to go for jobs that are useful. He does not think that private employers have any sense at all. They do not want to hire people to do useful work. Now, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that and I just have to believe that the hon. member does not know what he is talking about when he is talking about the SEED Programme because he relates it to make-work programmes. The SEED Programme is not a make-work programme. There is a very large private sector aspect to it and the private sector does not make work because it costs money for the private sector to operate, so the private sector does not use its own funds to make work.

Now the hon. member, in actual fact, and you could tell this from his previous remarks and the remarks of the members opposite, they like make-work programmes. That has been in the Liberal tradition because make-work programmes make people dependent on government. They sort of lead people to say, "You cannot do anything without government". That is why you will notice that the members opposite always say, "Government create jobs" because if they were in there that is what they would be projecting themselves, jobs are created by government, i.e. people are dependent on government, keep us in power because you are dependent on us. Now that is a very, very nasty type of philosophy. It is the type of philosophy that is overturned now and reversed. The philosophy now is 'you out there, you private citizens, you private entrepreneurs, you private enterprisers, you create jobs. It is government's job to support you in you creating jobs, you are not

dependent on government, you are independent, private, worthy citizens and we have to support you, but we must not make you dependent on us. That is not our democratic Western way of life.' Now that is the opposite of what the hon. member believes, but it is our philosophy and we subscribe to it. We know that in this Province and in many provinces there are certain activities that have to be carried on by government. They are not appropriate or individual efforts, but nevertheless, the main thrust and the bulk of economic activity and the bulk of employment has to go on through private, independent, not dependent, effort. But the members opposite do not believe in this philosophy. This is why they have been out of power for fourteen years. Why they have not won an election for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

Sure, sure. I do not mind been here in August. That is what I am here for, I am elected here to help the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

That is why members opposite have not won an election for the last nineteen years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think I have responded to all the silly points brought up by the hon. member opposite. If there are any other silly points brought up by members opposite, I will be glad to respond to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I just have a point to raise with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I think that he slightly distorted what the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) said. What he said was that there were areas of our Province where there is no private sector. Now the Minister of Finance pounds his chest and says, that the SEED programme was a wonderful programme, an equitable programme and a fair programme. Perhaps, the minister could respond to my question, in the district of St. Barbe the Central Development Association, which is an umbrella association comprising seven communities from St. Pauls to Bellburns, where 300 young people, students, in two separate high schools were let out of school on Friday and not one single cent from the SEED programme. Where do those 300 young people go to look for Summer work, Mr. Minister? That is the question.

No answer?

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of questions for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I think our questions will be mostly answered on this side and I think

we will be prepared to put this bill through.

MR. FUREY:

No answer!

MR. TULK:

First of all, I wonder if he could indeed try to answer the question put by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), as to where the young people in his area are going to find jobs this year?

But the other question is, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. FUREY:

They had applications in.

MR. TULK:

- I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could tell us if there are any departments or sections of government that have now run out of funds because this government has neglected to bring in the Supply Bill before the House, if there are certain sections of this government or certain departments that have run out of funds and are unable to pay wages to their employees? Is he aware that there are any?

I tried to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) yesterday evening, and I got nowhere with it. Have they run out of Interim Supply in certain sections or certain departments? And are we now in a position where people cannot get paid until the Supply Bill is passed? And this government has not chose to bring the Supply Bill before the House.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the Interim Supply Bill was passed by this House which supplies funds to departments until such time as the main estimates are passed. That is still in place. The departments are being supplied by Interim Supply.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I know that the Interim Supply Bill was passed, I have heard rumours, at least, and I want the minister to confirm whether it is true or not that that Interim Supply has been used by certain sections, and by certain departments, and that the Department of Finance, for which he is responsible, is not now able to honour certain cheques that are being asked to be put through by certain sections of the government. That is what I am talking to him about. I am talking to him about, by the way, when I talk about Supply, Bill 32, which is now on the Order Paper which has to do with the rest of the financing of this Province other than Interim Supply?

I wonder could he answer that?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I never confirm rumours.

MR. TULK:

You do not confirm rumours.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I have a very short question for the minister, Mr. Chairman, and again it relates to Supply. I am wondering about the same question, if some departments or some divisions are running out of money, Mr. Chairman, because there was a seminar held in Buchans, Mr. Chairman, representing all of the one industry towns in Newfoundland and the Government of Newfoundland - I wonder if the minister would chose to tell the House why it was that his government chose to insult and give all the one industry towns in Newfoundland a backhanded slap in the face, Mr. Chairman, by not sending one minister, not one representative of this government was out to that three-day seminar. It was not just Buchans, there were fifteen communities from all over Newfoundland. A town represented in the district of the Deputy Speaker, towns represented by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), towns represented that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) represents, Mr. Speaker, and not one member of government, Mr. Speaker, had the decency to come in and indicate to those people that they were concerned with their problems. The purpose of that seminar was to try to find a way that other towns in Newfoundland when their one industry closed down will not find

themselves in the position Buchans found itself in.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was not a case of being specific about Buchans, the fact of the matter is that the Government of Newfoundland ignored completely, showed total callousness, total irresponsibility towards their responsibility to all the people in Newfoundland who lived in one industry towns. And before the minister gets this supply that he wants here he is going to have to spend a minute or two and tell the House of Assembly why, and tell all the people who live in those communities, and tell all of Newfoundland why his government, the Premier of Newfoundland and the Cabinet, chose not to have one representative present, not one.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the minister would take a minute to address himself to that issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member opposite wanted to get in a little political dig, it has nothing whatever to do with this bill so I do not think I am required to respond.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, without amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and has directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a certain bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

Resolution

BE IT resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative session convened, as follows:

THAT IT IS EXPEDIENT to bring in a measure to authorize the raising from time to time by way of loan on the credit of the Province the sum of three hundred and twenty-five million dollars (\$325,000,000) and such additional sum or sums of money as may be required to retire, repay, renew or refund securities issued under any Act of the Province.

On motion resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province" (Bill No. 25), read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973". (Bill No. 15).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to rise to introduce for second reading Bill 15, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act".

As hon. members will have noticed, Mr. Speaker, this bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, 1973", consists of four clauses. Clause 1 is intended to correct what has been, perhaps, a misunderstanding of what was really intended with respect to designation of essential employees. As we all know, section 10 of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act of 1973 has caused a great deal of problems, problems for unions in the public service, problems for government. Clauses 2, 3 and 4 will limit to health service institutions the requirements currently in the act with respect to the giving of certain notices of intention to strike, and also limits to health services in institutions the current prohibition with respect to rotating strikes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some background, if I could for a few moments, with respect to the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. That particular act has sought to provide a balancing of competing interests within the public service in Newfoundland by providing the right to strike for the majority of public sector employees together, of course, with a mechanism to ensure essential services would be maintained throughout a strike. Essential services are defined as those necessary for the health, safety and security of the public. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, because of a number of court

decisions on Labour Relations Board rulings, the essential employee provisions of the 1973 Act have proven to be unworkable, really, in practice.

For example, during the 1981 Lab and X-ray employees strike, there were certain procedural difficulties which resulted in the necessity of emergency legislation, at that time, being passed by this House whereby approximately 30 per cent of the bargaining unit were designated as essential. Now, flowing from those difficulties in that 1981 strike, Mr. Speaker, there was a thorough review of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, particularly in the area of essential employees, with the result that Bill 59 was presented to the House of Assembly. Now, that bill, Mr. Speaker, created a great deal of disappointment; there was a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed by the public service unions, by the labour movement in general.

We have done, as I said, a thorough review of that act and, of course, the intent of the bill was to establish a workable mechanism in order to ensure that essential employees would be determined either by agreement between the unions and the employer, or by the Labour Relations Board, before a strike could properly take place. Now, Mr. Speaker, while the essential employee sections of the act are of a general nature and apply to all employees and employers who bargain under the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, it was never the intention that every bargaining unit would necessarily require essential services. There are a number of situations, Mr. Speaker, where we know full-well

that essential employees will not be required. For instance, who could make a case that essential employees would be necessary in a strike of liquor store employees?

Bargaining units are determined and defined by the Labour Relations Board. There are certain management employees, Mr. Speaker, who are exempted from the bargaining unit and these employees, of course, are intended to maintain a service to the public during times of strike action. But, to repeat, Mr. Speaker, it was never the intention that essential employees, as such, would be determined or designated in all bargaining units.

Now, Mr. Speaker, government really recognizes the right of certain public service employees to strike, but government rejects the proposition that the right to strike pre-empts all other rights, including the right to public safety and security, and the right to health services. Government also rejects the proposition that no strikes should be allowed in the public sector. We do recognize that the right to strike ought to be there in certain bargaining units, among certain employees. In this crucial area it is necessary to establish a balance. And that is really the crux of this bill, to help to establish a balancing of interests between employees in the public service and the employer. A review of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act has led the government to adopt a number of principles. The first of these principles is a recognition of a general right to strike in the public service. The limitation of this general right, when it is exercised, conflicts with the

right of all citizens to security of person, to appropriate health and custodial care, and to the safety of public property. Limitations to the right to strike should apply only to essential employees, and, Mr. Speaker, that, again, is the real crucial aspect of this bill, it is the real intent of it, to limit the right to strike in the public service only to essential employees. Essential employees should include only those required to ensure security of person, to provide appropriate health and custodial care, and to maintain safety of public property.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to return to the bill, itself, it will be noted that Clause 1 states that Section 10 of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act is amended by adding immediately after Section 13 the following, and it would be Section 14: "This section does not apply to the following bargaining units for which a bargaining agent has been certified or for which a bargaining agent has been voluntarily recognized by the employer: (a) The bargaining unit comprised of employees in the establishment of the Lieutenant Governor; (b) the bargaining unit comprised of instructors in vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology, the Bay St. George Community College, and adult and continuing education centers; (c) the bargaining unit comprised of employees of the Public Libraries Board; (d) the bargaining unit comprised of employees of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation."

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House and belabour this, we all have a copy of the bill, but it goes down through all

of those bargaining units where we feel that the essential services section would not apply.

Clause 2 of the bill states that Subsection 2 of Section 23 of the act is repealed. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you go to Section 2 of Section 23, which, of course, was one of the amendments which were brought in by Bill 59, the bill which caused the problem among the public service workers, you will find that that has been deleted. That particular section was very disappointing to them. It stated that where notice is given to the minister pursuant to Paragraph (b) of Subsection 1 of Section 24, then if the employees in the unit do not strike on the date specified in the notice for to strike, no employee in the unit would be able to strike for one month from the date indicated in that notice for to strike, and then only if written notice of a second or subsequent proposed date on which the strike will start has been given to the minister, and at least seven days before the second or subsequent proposed date. Now, Mr. Speaker, that had general application. And here is where Clause 3 comes in, that Paragraph (b) of Subsection 1 of Section 24 of the act is amended by striking out the words, "And the date on which the strike will start." Clause 4, Section 24 (1) of the act is repealed and the following substituted, "No strike shall be taken by an employee employed in a health service institution unless a majority of the employees in the unit actually voting vote by secret ballot in favour of a strike having been notified by the bargaining agent as to the time and place of the voting; and, (b), until seven days have elapsed from the date on which the bargaining agent has given notice in writing

to the minister that a majority of the employees in the unit have so voted and the date on which the strike will start.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of this bill, and I do not think it is necessary for me to go over it in minute detail. The bill has been on the Order Paper for some time and I am sure members opposite will be very familiar with it and, when the time comes, will ask the appropriate questions on the bill.

I just want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of government to remove some objectionable clauses from the old Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, by clarifying the sections relating to essential employees, so that certain units, where essential employees are not necessary, will not be required to be designated, those are clearly enunciated in the act, and, of course, making these parts of the act where essential employees are necessary applicable only to health service institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have again great pleasure in giving this bill for second reading. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, over the years this government has passed some of the most offensive labour legislation ever passed in the Western World. Today this bill represents a weak, a feeble, a very minute attempt to appease the labour movement for the great damage, for the devastating damage of some bills that have been passed by this hon. House over the

past two or three years; I talk about Bill 59, and the minister mentioned that bill, and we should all put that bill as far back in our memories as possible. No doubt this bill is an attempt to eradicate from our memory the terrible, terrible element that was found in that bill, Bill 59.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the labour movement is going to be dancing around the streets of Newfoundland today because of this particular bill. I do not think they are going to be going around dancing and beating their chests. Now, it does represent an attempt, a very feeble, a very weak, a very minute attempt to try and thaw the icy, frigid relationship that has existed between this government and labour over the past few years. It is an attempt, and maybe we can find consolation in the old adage that big trees from little acorns grow. Maybe this will be the acorn from which big trees will grow. Maybe this will be the start from where we will see big changes in labour legislation in this Province. But as and of itself, Mr. Speaker, it does not do very much, it is not much of a concession to labour. Basically we have two things, one, is the declaration, the naming of those bargaining units which may not be classified as essential services, or the bargaining units under which their workers may not be classified to be performing essential services, and the others are related to our health institutions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that there obviously must be some laws with respect to essential services in health institutions and nursing care homes. We can agree that we must have some laws to govern the care of people who

are ill, and the aged, and people in these kinds of institutions. But again I am wondering about the changes in terms of being able to call a strike. The minister mentions thirty days, but I believe, in fact, it is thirty-seven days, because there must be seven days notice and then thirty days after that. So we are talking about thirty-seven days before a strike can really come into effect. The minister is shaking his head. That is my understanding of it, that there has got to be seven days in which the notice is given, and then thirty days - on the seventh day they can call the strike - so that makes thirty-seven days.

Then, of course, there are all sorts of problems in between of having to declare essential services, which can further delay the process. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not as good as the people in labour would want to see it, I am sure, but it is an improvement, and, I suppose, they will be able to live with it. But the amazing part about this bill is the naming of the units, of the workers who are excluded for essential services. Mr. Speaker, the naming of the people and of the units not to be included, not to be listed as performing essential services, demonstrates to what incredible depths we had sunk in respect to collective bargaining in this Province. Let us look at it, Mr. Speaker, the ones that are excluded, not to be named essential services: "The bargaining unit comprised of employees in the establishment of the Lieutenant-Governor." Well, we will not say much about that at the moment, but we will go to the next one.

"(c) the bargaining unit comprised

of employees of the Public Libraries Board." Mr. Speaker, what a progressive step for the workers of this Province, the Public Libraries Board. Since when did we consider that to be an essential service? I did not know that our people were such avaricious readers, Mr. Speaker, that they could not be declared essential services. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the groups listed here are proof positive of the tremendous depths to which we have sunk with respect to labour relations in the Province.

Look at the next one. This group here does not perform an essential service: "(d) the bargaining unit comprised of employees of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation." Well, it is good to know that the people at the Liquor Corporation do not perform an essential service. Mr. Speaker, this is just a bit of window dressing, lip service, that is all, to try and appease the labour movement in this Province, to try and eradicate from memory Bill 59, to eradicate the terrible state in the collective bargaining process to which Bill 59 had plunged the labour movement in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about anything great in this particular bill. As we look down through the list of workers who are excluded, one can only lament the situation that this bill was necessary to be brought in so that we can declare these people as not performing essential services. As I have said, I do not think that we will find that the labour movement in this Province is going around beating their chest about the wonderful benefits that this particular piece of legislation, Bill 15, is going to bestow upon them in this Province today. The

minister in introducing the bill mentioned again the serious attempt by government to give the right to strike to the majority of those under the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can again listen to, or pay attention to, or put credence in what people in the labour movement are saying, then this bill does not go very far in terms of assisting, in terms of helping restore that right to strike, or to give that right to strike, or much in terms of advancing the cause of collective bargaining in the Province. Because, as I have said, if we listen to the union leaders in the Province today, just a couple of weeks ago one of the labour leaders in this Province, Mr. March, I believe, said that within the public service his union has 12,000 workers and out of that 12,000 workers 10,000 can still be declared to be performing essential services. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important statistic, if that indeed is correct, that out of the 12,000 workers in NAPE, 10,000 of these workers can still be declared to be performing essential services. That means that 10,000 workers are essentially without the right and the process to full collective bargaining, 10,000 out of 12,000 are still denied the full rights of collective bargaining because they can be declared to be performing essential services which, for all intents and purposes, hamstring and stifle and stifles the efforts of unions and bargaining agents representing these 10,000 workers. So what we have, in effect, out of the total of 12,000 unionized workers in the public service, only 2,000 are not to be declared to be performing essential services and, I guess, that is what this list here does.

So what this list does, really, is eliminate, it is just 2,000 out of 12,000. So there would be 2,000 workers who would be deemed not to be essential employees. That is what the Leader of NAPE has said as recently as two to three weeks ago.

What Bill 59 has done, Mr. Speaker, this bill naming essential employees, what it has done is given the government complete control of the collective bargaining process. It has given the government complete control of the collective bargaining process and removed it, essentially, from the workers, from the unions. And as I have said again, and I want the minister to address this point, there are 12,000 workers and out of that 12,000 workers only 2,000 would not be classified to be essential employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how does that restrict and stymie the efforts of the public service in terms of bargaining with the government if there are only 2,000 out of the total unionized workers in the public service deemed not to be essential employees, and the rest, 10,000 workers, can all be deemed to be essential employees? Now, that is under the present legislation. Now the minister might not do that.

MR. TULK:

Is that what this does?

MR. LUSH:

Well, of course. Yes, of course.

This is what the Leader of NAPE has said. I was at the meeting where he said it. As a matter of fact, that was 12,000. I suppose the numbers of workers under NAPE now would be 14,000, because they have picked up some extra members

over the past few weeks. They are sort of building all of the time. But that was correct as of about a month ago, there were 12,000 workers and 10,000 could be deemed to be performing essential services and 2,000 could be deemed not to be providing essential services.

So, Mr. Speaker, that points out to what benefit this bill will be to the labour movement in this Province. It is simply window dressing, it is a bit of lip service, it is an attempt to appease the labour movement in this Province. It is an attempt to thaw, as I said before, the icy, frigid relationships, or relationship, which has existed between government and the labour movement in this Province for the past two or three years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is just a rabbit's effort to try and wipe from the memory of people in the labour movement within the public service the outrageous and iniquitous aspects of Bill 59. Now, one would have thought that with such an outrageous and iniquitous bill that today the minister would have come in with a much more progressive bill, something significant, something substantial.

Now, what the minister might like to do when he speaks again, for the benefit of all hon. members, is to name the bargaining agents who are not included here, name some of these larger units that are not included in this particular bill so that hon. members will know what they are doing. Mr. Speaker, we come here and we pass bills and they are not necessarily studied, it is just a reaction to a crisis situation. And this is why we have some of

the bad bills that we have in this Province, some of the bad labour bills. I did hear the minister put a name on it - what was it he called it? - situational, situational bills. If a situation arises, and he referred to the Lab and X-ray technician people at the trades school, then we bring in a bill to try and rectify that situation, and we have nothing but a myriad of bills throughout the Department of Labour. Such a mess! I am wondering if the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) really believes in this bill today. I wonder if he really believes that this is a good bill? Because we have had other ministers come here and laud bills, praise bills for what they were going to do for the labour movement in this Province in terms of promoting harmonious relationships. I am sure there were hon. members who got up and spoke very positively, very favourably, spoke in euphoric terms of Bill 59, and what a disaster it was. What a disaster Bill 59 was, what a disaster Bill 37 was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, that is the one.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we can name them, those disastrous bills, those bills that were meant to bring the labour movement in this Province to its knees.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister of Labour really believes that this is a good bill. I wonder if he believes that this is the most progressive legislation ever brought in by this government, or does the minister have some doubts about this bill? Is this the bill that the minister really wanted to bring in? Would

the minister like to lengthen this list of workers, this list of bargaining agents who may not be determined to be essential employees? Would the minister like to lengthen that? Are there other groups that he would like to include in there? Could the minister tell us that he is working on his colleagues to get other groups included in this list, or does he think that is the way it is going to be forever and a day?

Mr. Speaker, the fact that now the employees of the Public Libraries Board cannot be deemed to be essential services, that is going to be a very, very praiseworthy thing throughout the Province of Newfoundland. People will realize now that employees in the libraries can go on strike.

Mr. Speaker, we have the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, the Workers' Compensation Board, and the bargaining unit comprised of the plant employees of the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. That is another big one. But what is important is not the 2,000 workers here who may not be classified to be performing essential services, it is the 10,000 who are left out in the cold, and we are not referring to the people who work in our health institutions. There are many more bargaining units within the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, and 10,000 of these are left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, I will finish up by saying that I do not think we will be seeing parades in St. John's or in Corner Brook tonight over this progressive piece of labour legislation, but, again, it is a token effort to try and thaw the icy, frigid relationship that has

existed between government and Labour, and we hope that it is a start of big things to come, we hope that the minister will come back in the Fall with a much improved bill in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 27, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.