



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 5

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Thursday, 2 May 1985

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, over the past several days a number of statements have been made relative to the proposed Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. In the main, those statements imply that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has deliberately "stonewalled" the establishment of the corporation. For the record, I wish to indicate that this government remains fully committed to the establishment of the corporation in question and I am fully confident that both orders of government will reach an agreement on the overall structure and mandate of the proposed Corporation in the not too distant future.

As most hon. members of this House may recall, the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation proposal was initially recommended by the Task Force on the Atlantic Fishery which was made public in January, 1983. At that time the Task Force recommended that the Governments of Canada, Quebec and Newfoundland-Labrador co-ordinate economic and social development initiatives in the areas north of 50 degrees, which in Newfoundland would include the Great Northern Peninsula and Coastal Labrador. The Task Force further recommended that the Canadian Salfish Act be amended to allow the Canadian

Salfish Corporation to be the designated delivery instrument for fisheries, economic, social and community development in the northern area of Newfoundland and Quebec. It will be noted that the Task Force recommended special initiatives for the area in question to deal with its view that chronic under-employment and instability of the fisheries economy characterized this regional fishery.

For reasons best understood by the previous Federal administration(s), there was little progress made on the establishment of the proposed Northern Fisheries Development Corporation prior to the Canada/Newfoundland Fisheries Restructuring Agreement of September 26, 1983. Both governments committed themselves to the establishment of the corporation in question in this agreement. Immediately following the signing of this agreement a number of exploratory meetings were held between respective governments. For its part, the Province was most anxious to proceed with the establishment of the corporation under any conditions which were reasonably favourable to the Province. However, little progress was made simply because the Federal government would not accept any delivery vehicle other than the Canadian Salfish Corporation. Given the fact that the Province only had one representative on the Board of Directors of the Salfish Corporation, the Province, by default, would not have had any meaningful say in the decisions affecting a large area of this Province. Moreover, there was no assurance conveyed that the Province would be given a larger voice in the Canadian Salfish

Corporation. For these and other reasons the Province rejected the Saltfish Corporation option as the delivery vehicle for Northern Fisheries.

In recent days, reference has been made to the fact that \$15 million which was allocated by the Federal government in 1983 to facilitate the establishment of the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation is no longer available. From this Government's perspective, we have every confidence that appropriate funding will be secured at the Federal level once both governments reach agreement on the overall structure and mandate of the corporation in question. The previous Federal administration (s) insisted that this \$15 million was only available in the context of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation being the delivery agent for Northern Fisheries. In our view, this was an unreasonable position and was totally unacceptable to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador since it precluded consideration of any other options.

Immediately after the present Federal administration assumed office, discussions relative to the establishment of the proposed Northern Fisheries Development Corporation commenced between our respective governments. Both governments approached the issue in a sincere manner and in January of this year respective Fisheries Ministers established a federal-provincial working group to prepare a comprehensive proposal for consideration by governments. I am pleased to advise the House that this proposal will be finalized and submitted to myself and to my Federal counterpart, the hon. John Fraser, Minister of Fisheries and

Oceans, over the next week. I am also pleased to advise that I will be discussing this very important matter with Mr. Fraser within the next several weeks, I believe it is May 22 or 23, at which time I have every confidence that we will agree on a common approach relative to the establishment of the corporation in question.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate the Province's commitment to the establishment of a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. I am also confident that the Federal government is also firmly committed to its establishment. In this context, it would appear that an ERDA agreement, or some similar funding vehicle, would be the most appropriate mechanism to fund the corporation in question. Indeed, preliminary discussions have already taken place on this matter and this issue has been addressed within the context of the overall proposal which is now being finalized and which will be the subject of a meeting between both governments in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that we are glad to hear on this side of the House that some eighteen months after signing that agreement that we now see some movement on the part of the provincial government to see that there are appropriate actions taken on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Let me also say to him that it is the belief of this side of the House, and the belief of a great many people in Newfoundland, that

indeed the government were stonewalling on this thing. And I think the credit rather than go to the Minister of Fisheries, should go to my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and the member for Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) and I believe Mr. Tobin as well, in getting the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry to unanimously agree on Tuesday of this week that the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation should be set up.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible) set up (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Would you ask the Premier to be quiet, Mr. Speaker? Maybe what we are really seeing now is an indication of the similar type situation that my friend from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was talking about yesterday, where the Federal Tory Government was finally agreed that the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation should go ahead and now they have perhaps told the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland that it is time for him to move rather than the other way around. Perhaps that is what has happened.

MR. FLIGHT:

No perhaps.

MR. TULK:

More than likely what has happened is that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and his colleagues have finally got the Tory Federal Government to agree to move and now the Provincial Minister of Fisheries has got the green light that he can do something with it as well.

MR. FLIGHT:

Instead of the other way around.

MR. TULK:

Instead of the other way around, instead of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries pushing to see that this Northern Fisheries Development Corporation is set up for the people of the Strait of Belle Isle, the people of St. Barbe, the people of Torngat Mountains, and the people of Eagle River.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We will look after these people.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I know the minister is touchy about this but I would ask him to quiet down over there. In regards to the previous federal government, here is another little trick that we see this minister using. With regard to the previous federal government wanting to use the Canadian Salfish Corporation as a vehicle of delivery, I would ask the minister, if he wants to make those kinds of accusations, to come in and table the documentation in this House that indeed that did happen. If he cannot, then I have to say to him that he is bluffing. I think he is bluffing.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, about the minister's statement. He talks about funding under the ERDA agreement. Does he know yet, and this seems to me to be an admission that indeed the minister does not know, yet he assured the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) yesterday that that was to be the case, where that \$15 million or \$16 million, the Premier seemed to indicate that it did not matter how much it was because the money was going to be

available - is coming from? The minister, I understand, Mr. Fraser, has said that it will not come under that agreement. I believe he has made that statement. Is that correct? Would the minister table some of the documents in this House backing up the statement that he has made today? He has used the old trick of trying to blame a previous administration for something that did not happen when in fact, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, and the people in those four districts that I just mentioned, know full well that the stonewalling and the lack of action on this vital issue, on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation, came from this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER
Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, the department responsible for administering the \$2 million of provincial dollars to create jobs for youth, I would like to take this opportunity to state the basic guidelines of the programme and to provide an accurate report on the status of the programme to date.

Mr. Speaker, I might say this is somewhat necessary to do today after some very false impressions were left in the House the other day by the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), who said that some of the funding mechanisms were different from municipalities than they in fact actually are.

When the Province contributed \$2 million to the Summer employment programme, it was agreed that in a spirit of co-operation with the federal government this money would be allocated according to guidelines already established and the Province would provide equal input to the approval of the proposals. A federal/provincial steering committee was therefore established to recommend the approval of some 6000 Summer jobs for the youth of our Province.

Before I relate to you the success of this programme to date, I would like to take the time to explain several of its key elements relating to programme priorities, special measures and wage guidelines.

The intention of the Summer employment programme is to give priority to career related proposals

We expect that all applicants will ensure that women, women in non-traditional occupations, natives and disabled participants are given equal opportunity to apply for on approved proposals.

With respect to wage guidelines, I would like to draw particular attention to the subsidy provided to municipal sector employers.

The federal and provincial governments will pay to municipal employers, 75 per cent of the minimum wage and 75 per cent of all mandatory employer contributions, such as UIC, CPP and vacation pay.

The member for Gander (Mr. Baker) was saying that it was 50 per cent for municipalities and argued vehemently that it was 50 per cent. In fact it is 75 per cent

of all of the dollars related to wages for these Summer students.

The municipale employer is therefore required to contribute only 25 per cent of students' wages and benefits. The programme is not designed to provide capital grants but to provide contributions to the career development and advancement of the youth of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I would like to place in proper perspective, the response from municipalities to the programme by providing data gathered from the number of applications received so far.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You have none from the municipalities?

MR. POWER:

According to the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) we were getting none from the municipalities, but in fact the truth is just the opposite to that. Close to \$1.5 million of the \$7 million available has been requested by community and town councils for the sole purpose of providing youth with meaningful Summer employment. This figure is over 20 per cent of the total available to all employers and not far behind the \$3.7 million that has been applied for from the private sector.

The largest percentage of applications has been gathered from other employers, which include non-profit organizations, such as community recreation committees and various service and charitable organizations.

I feel very confident in saying that many of these organizations submitted their proposals

following consultations with their town and community councils about the viability of their ideas as they relate to the needs of their community.

MR. CALLAN:

What is the reason for this?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, because we have to correct some members of the Opposition from time to time who want to give us faulty information, and that is the purpose of this statement. The member for Gander (Mr. Baker) gave a very faulty impression of what was happening and these are the facts. If the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) cannot take it, then he should leave the House.

If the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) cannot understand that 75 from 100 leaves 25, then there is not a whole lot I can do for him.

Within the next several weeks my federal counterpart, the Hon. Flora MacDonald, and I will jointly announce the creation of 6,000 jobs for the youth of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

This, Mr. Speaker, is the aim of the Summer Employment Programme, jobs for youth, an aim which I intend to pursue so that our students, during and after their years of education, can enter the job market with greater skills and confidence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, responding to the statement, obviously the truth hurts and the minister had to bring this statement into the House to clarify things. The fact is, 40 per cent of the youth of this Province are unemployed. Six thousand jobs are going to be created. We have more than ten thousand students in university, there are the students from our high schools, the Fisheries College, the College of Trades and vocational schools around the Province, so six thousand jobs will not be enough, will not mean all that much. Also, the new programme replaces the Canada Works Youth projects and introduces incentives. It is geared, Mr. Speaker, more towards the larger urban areas. It is not involved with capital. Whereas in semi-urban areas and rural areas, fifteen or twenty people in a community would be employed, now, these councils can afford only 20 per cent and will not be able to offer adequate employment.

This side of the House, Mr. Speaker, always welcomes programmes which spend money on youth and job creation in the Province, but \$2 million spent on youth programmes is not much considering the majority of our population is under age twenty-five and the Province spends well over \$1 billion annually..

As the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has said, this programme has good points but it does not provide enough capital. The 75/25 ratio sounds good but it is only on wages, so the councils, or

recreation groups, or the non-profit organizations have to come up with the capital.

I would point out, too, Mr. Speaker, that the moneys provided here are moneys left there by the former Liberal administration.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the new programme is a rehash and a cutback of the original Young Canada Works programme and it is depriving our youth of the job opportunities they should have.

The six thousand jobs so created is a start on creation of the thirty or forty thousand jobs needed. We hope that next week the Premier will come up with another \$2 million to put into the programme. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It is in relation to the present strike at Memorial University, where we have a group of workers who have been down-trodden and walked upon, and they are crying out for the assistance of the minister.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this government has indicated its willingness to offer the olive branch to labour, I am wondering whether the minister can indicate to the House what steps he has taken in recent days to try to bring about a successful

resolution to that very serious strike?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that over the last three or four days, and nights, I might add, my officials have been conducting negotiations between the union representing the striking employees at Memorial University and the employer. He would do well to take note, I think, that two other units at the university have already settled their collective agreements and the fact that this particular unit has not seen fit to settle for approximately the same settlement that the other units have settled for is creating some difficulty. I do not think there is much more I can say about it. Negotiations, as he well knows, are sensitive and they are at a critical stage now. I will give a further report on it as matters progress.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned this was a very serious strike. If I may be allowed just a brief preamble, what we have here is an unusual strike in the sense that the strike has been rendered useless as a weapon in this particular case in terms of the nature of the institution, students not wanting to lose dollars invested in their education and everybody feeling obligated to help students to get through. Therefore, the strike is a useless weapon in this

particular situation, and thus the seriousness of it. Sir, it seems as though it is a strike that can go on forever. So in terms of these factors, Mr. Speaker, can the minister undertake to bring his great experience and great knowledge to bear on this situation to bring an early resolution to this strike?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that we have a great deal of experience in our department. I trained a good staff, I would like to think, in my department. We have very good people and they are bringing their good experience to bear on this dispute. Of course, all strikes are serious and critical and we do not like to see them go on, but I am sure he would be equally upset if I were to interfere with the rights that they have. It is a legal situation, a legal strike, and the fact that this particular strike, he says, is not the weapon that it ought to be, well, there are no essential employees or anything like that that affects the rights of all of the employees other than those exempted from the bargaining unit to strike, so it is a normal situation as far these matters are concerned.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all satisfied that the minister is recognizing the gravity of this situation. My final question to

the minister, Mr. Speaker, again in view of the circumstances that I have described, is would the minister undertake over this weekend to see if he cannot get these two parties together and get them locked in a room until those workers are given, Mr. Speaker, a successful resolution to their just demands?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member ought to recognize that if I am going to get involved in the mediation or conciliation of every dispute that goes on, there is no need for the other staff in the Department of Labour. I just told him in the best way I can that we have one of the most experienced people in the Department of Labour dealing with this dispute. I am being briefed on it on a daily basis, I have asked questions about it, I am satisfied that everything that can be done up to this point has been done. We will continue and whether it is weekends or nights or whatever, the hon. member can be assured that we will put our best efforts into settling this strike as well as the others that are ongoing.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard).

As we speak there is an ongoing labour/management dispute continuing in the brewing industry. As a matter of fact

this morning I believe there was some percipitous action taken by one of the groups that was locked out of the Carling O'Keefe Brewery. This dispute is continuing to drag on and it is actually now affecting other groups, such as farmers who are relying on the spent grain as a means of feed for their cattle. Since one of the major items in the dispute at this point is the switch from bottles being used in the brewing industry to aluminum cans, and since there are some very severe questions that should be asked about what that impact will be on both the employment levels in the industry and also on the environment, I would like to know, considering that that seems to be the central core of the dispute here, will the minister use his prerogative to call for an industrial enquiry to look into the whole question of the switch from bottles to cans?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take under advisement the suggestion that the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has made. He has asked that we consider an industrial inquiry; I will certainly take that under advisement. We are well aware of the difficult situation in this brewery strike. It has some complications which I will not discuss here. Again, all of the negotiations are sensitive. These negotiations are particularly sensitive but the answer to the hon. member's question is I will take it under advisement and I will report back.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I want to take a moment to congratulate the minister on her historic appointment.

Mr. Speaker, my question is based on two facts. In May of 1984 the then government in Ottawa announced a \$16 million programme for the construction of a new federal Forest Research Centre in the city of Corner Brook to serve all of Newfoundland. The second fact: In November of 1984 the new government, the current government in Ottawa, took this \$16 million away from the city of Corner Brook and from the people of Newfoundland. Now the Minister of Justice is the Cabinet voice, I understand, for Corner Brook. What representation has the minister made to her federal counterpart in Ottawa to have this \$16 million put back on the table for the construction of this new federal Forest Research Centre in Corner Brook?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is really asking the hon. minister a question that is not within her portfolio and not within her Cabinet duties. It is here on page 130.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It has to be in the portfolio you are responsible for in government.

MR. MARSHALL:

It has to be in the portfolio for which you are responsible in government, Mr. Speaker. You know, Question Period is for the purpose of asking questions of the ministry in accordance with their responsibilities and their duties, and he has asked the hon. minister a question relating to her position because she happens to be a member from the Corner Brook area. So it is clearly out of order. Here it is under (x).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

It is appropriate for the hon. gentlemen because in this case if they look it up they will be able to understand and read. So it is page 130 and it is under (x), "deal with an action of a minister for which he" - this is before the Charter of Rights and the bill that the minister is bringing in but it applies to 'she' as well - "is not responsible to Parliament, or with matters not within his" - her or its - "official knowledge."

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is talking about something under X, perhaps he could have gotten to why - X, Y, Z or whatever you want to call it. But what the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was doing is obvious. We know the minister is not responsible for anything in Corner Brook, he does not have to tell us that, but the minister

could have stood in her place if she wanted to - she did not need any help; the Premier had told her to answer the question - and referred the question if she did not feel like answering it. The member for St. Barbe has put a question to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) because it -

MS VERGE:

I just said I would answer it.

MR. TULK:

You will have your chance. Take your time! He just stood up and asked her a question and she could have deferred it as a minister of Cabinet, but it is our understanding that she is somewhat responsible for Corner Brook. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Come on, now! Let us either follow the rules of the House or not follow the rules of the House. And if we are going to follow the way that the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) says, then we better for something on fisheries on the Southern Shore, direct it to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and refer something for the Baie Verte Peninsula, regardless if it is forestry or fishery or social services, to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and we would have a real field day here over the next while during this session of the House. We have to adhere to the rules of the House.

Let the hon. members opposite go home and over the weekend look over who is responsible for what in Cabinet and direct their questions to the appropriate minister as is provided for under the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. minister does not need to reply to any question that is not within her own portfolio. That question is not in order.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I did not see a Minister of Forest Resources and Lands there. Are you prepared to answer that question?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

With the leave of all hon. members, I would like a chance to respond to this question in the absence of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MS VERGE:

- considering the fact that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is new to the House and obviously does not understand the rules of procedure. I would like to put this matter in perspective. It was the PC members of the House of Assembly for the Corner Brook area who took the initiative in getting

forestry management and research for our Province centered in Corner Brook -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

- when in September 1982, we went public and called on the Liberal federal government of the day, of which the member for St. Barbe's former boss was a part. We called on that government to build their proposed new federal Forest Research Centre for the Province in Corner Brook instead of Mount Pearl or St. John's where they were examining a site for the construction project. We went public then and called on the federal government. We were quickly backed by our Premier and the provincial government who endorsed our efforts to get the proposed federal Forestry Centre in Corner Brook instead of St. John's since that kind of activity is natural to the Corner Brook area, whose main industry is the pulp and paper mill.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, did we speak out at that time, but we moved our entire Provincial Forestry Headquarters from St. John's to Corner Brook. We made that pledge in December 1982, and we actually accomplished the move within two years. In those two years the Liberal member of Parliament for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), the member for St. Barbe's former boss, repeatedly promised that if only some of the provincial Forestry workers could be moved from St. John's to Corner Brook then, of course, since the two groups work hand-in-glove, the federal Center would come to Corner Brook.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government had two years to work on that. Was there any action? No. Was there any site selection effort? No. But, Mr. Speaker, very conveniently, on the eve of the federal election, there was a deft manoeuver with money allocated for the Corner Brook Harbour development being traded off and ostensibly promised for a Forestry Centre.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The Premier stood a few minutes and tried to give my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) a lesson in parliamentary procedure. Surely the minister knows that Question Period answers are supposed to be brief. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that she answer the question and keep it brief. What is she doing?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. It is just another example that the truth hurts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I asked a question. I said there were \$16 million put on the table, the federal Tories took it away, what representation have you made?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, if I might sum up, what my colleagues and I on this side of the House have done is not only make representations to the federal government, but do everything within our power to concentrate provincial Forestry Management and Research in Corner Brook. Now that has been accomplished in the two and a half years since we set that goal for ourselves. Right now the entire provincial Forestry Headquarters is in place in Corner Brook.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only did we do that, but in the same time frame we were instrumental in getting a new owner/operator for the pulp and paper mill in Corner Brook through intervening and making sure that Bowater conducted an effective divesture effort through taking an initiative and seeking proposals from experienced operators and then putting in place a financial package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MS VERGE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the provincial

government has two key ingredients of effective Forestry Management and Research in Corner Brook today. The provincial headquarters and a good viable pulp and paper mill which is now being modernized to the tune of \$200 million modernization programme. Since the PCs took over in Ottawa last September -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I would just ask the hon. minister if she would try and make her reply a bit more brief.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, we have the provincial forestry headquarters in Corner Brook, we have the pulp and paper mill flourishing there now, and we are aggressively pursuing the third component of Newfoundland and Labrador's Forestry Management and Research Centre, namely the federal forestry centre. And, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues, the members of the House of Assembly for the Corner Brook area, we are actively pursuing this with our representatives in Ottawa, with the new forestry minister and the Newfoundland representative in the Federal Cabinet. And, Mr. Speaker, rest assured that I will not rest one day, as I represent the people of Humber East, until the federal forest research centre for this Province is in Corner Brook in a brand-new building.

MR. FUREY:

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, either the minister is engaging in mental obfuscation or selective amnesia, I am not sure which. But let me quote from

September 22, 1983, and I will use her words, and she used these words facing a government that was not prepared then to move the forestry centre from St. John's to Corner Brook, and she said, verbatim, "I think the people of Corner Brook have been betrayed." And her former forestry minister also added, verbatim, I quote, "This federal government has hung the people of Corner Brook out to dry."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the November 8 statement -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What was she doing?

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. minister was answering a question. The hon. gentleman has the right to ask questions, not to make a speech which is what the hon. gentleman was doing. If the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with the answer, there is a procedure in this House that he can implement. Also, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 31 (d) - and I would not really be getting up on a point of order, I should explain, with the new member; but I understand that the hon. gentleman was a close confidant and an employee of Mr. Tobin so I know he is well versed on parliamentary procedure anyway - "Oral questions must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper

extracts or preambles of any kind." So the hon. gentleman is doubly out of order, Mr. Speaker. He should be requested, if he has a question, to ask it. If he is dissatisfied with the answer, there is a procedure to take. But he should not be able to make a speech, which he is doing, and it is out of order to be using preambles, letters, newspapers, et al.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to engage in this kind of thing where the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is continually standing, using points of order to do away with Question Period, that in itself is an abuse of the House and he is very good at it. He is very good at it. But we just heard a minister go on for about ten minutes on a very simple question put forward by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey). And in regard to what he was quoting from, I did not hear the member from St. Barbe say that he was quoting from either a newspaper or anything else mentioned by the minister. Perhaps he heard her say it. Is that possible?

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. The Government House Leader is just using up the time allotted for Question Period so that he does not get embarrassing questions put to his ministers.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon.

the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is getting a bit ridiculous. We know that some people on the opposite side of the House are new and all the rest of it, as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) said, but this was a supplementary to the original question. This was not even the original question. We do allow some prefacing and we do not get up on points of order with the original question. But this was a supplementary. As for the Opposition House Leader getting all upset because the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) happens to have done her work on behalf of Corner Brook and they are all embarrassed over there, well, that is too bad, Mr. Speaker. We have a very competent person representing the West Coast, Humber Valley, Corner Brook and representing her constituents, and we are proud of her on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member was getting into a rather long preamble to a supplementary question. I ask him if he would now put his question.

MR. FUREY:

Well the further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is very, very short. Where is the \$16 million for the city of Corner Brook for the federal Forest Research Center?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. I would like to know what the former federal Liberal Government had allocated for a Forest Research Center for Corner

Brook. I remember last May the St. Barbe member's former boss, the MP for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) announcing money that he had promised twice for the Corner Brook Harbour Development - first for Curling, then for Seal Head - was being shuffled inland to build a forestry center. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a shell game if ever we saw one in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the Premier and it involves a question I asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) I believe it was on Tuesday. It was concerning the glut situation and the need to get involved in salting fish, certainly during the glut period. In his reply, the minister, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the market for salt fish was not that good. Mr. Speaker, people in the private sector will dispute that statement. In fact, they say that there is a good market for salt fish. In light of their statements, in light of the fact that the marketing of salt fish is the responsibility of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, in view of the fact that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation has a mandate to which the Province of Newfoundland must agree - in other words, the Saltfish Corporation operates in the Province and exercises its mandate by leave and by licence of the Province - in view of the fact that salt fish

consumption in the world amounts to over 250,000 tons per year, in view of the fact that Newfoundland's contribution to that market is less than 8 per cent, in view of the fact that experts say that that 8 per cent can very well become 25 per cent with some aggressive marketing, would the Premier undertake, Mr. Speaker, to have an investigation carried out into the operations of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation? There is some suggestion or some suspicion that maybe that corporation is not being too aggressive in its marketing policies. We all know there is a big market for salt fish, we know that Newfoundland has the potential to satisfy that market, and we know that it is not. Would the Premier agree to have a select committee of the House set up to investigate the Canadian Saltfish Corporation or at least invite its officials as witnesses as a witness to find out what their marketing policies are, to satisfy ourselves that they are doing all they can, if in fact they are, for the marketing of salt fish? Would he undertake to have that kind of an investigation carried out hopefully by a select committee of this House?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, amongst those words is a question. I am afraid the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) may be living in the past on this whole question of salt fish. When the hon. member was a minister on this side of the House he spoke very eloquently of the excellent work that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation was doing and defended it to the death. That was while he was on

this side of the House. Suddenly now he has a different perspective and opinion of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. Let me say the reason why I think the hon. member is living in the past is that we have in the last number of months been looking at the whole salt fish market and it has deteriorated. Now, at the time when the hon. member for Twillingate was involved in politics before, that was not true, there was a very strong market for salt fish. That market has deteriorated and there has been an inventory at the Saltfish Corporation of fish that they bought last year. The market has been reviewed not only by the Saltfish Corporation but by people in the Department of Fisheries, locally, and Department of Fisheries and Oceans, federally, by the Fishing Industry Advisory Board we have that looks at markets and tries to determine whether there is a greater market than has been said.

That is number one. The market is not as the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) says. Now, if the hon. the member for Twillingate gets up and alleges that certain people in the private sector say there is a great market, then I would call upon the member for Twillingate to submit the evidence: What is the name of the private sector group that says there is a market somewhere, and where is the market? Because if he is actually interested in helping the fishermen of Newfoundland, then he should provide the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) with the information on that market so we can get on to feed that market, which would therefore help the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador. So we should have some evidence produced

rather than having the member get up and vaguely say that the private sector says there is lots of market for salt fish.

Secondly, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, as I understand it, is a federal corporation. We have a representative on it; that was done jointly years ago by a former, former, former, former, former government, or whatever, here in Newfoundland, with the Canadian Government. So I do not know, even if I did agree to some kind of a Select Committee or an inquiry, whether in fact we have the jurisdiction or the mandate so to so. But, from all the evidence that we have, Mr. Speaker, the Saltfish Corporation is doing a good job in trying to market the salt fish from Newfoundland and it would be a shame, if suddenly and prematurely, we indicated that we would get a whole lot of this glut fish, build up all the inshore fishermen's hopes over the Summer and we had a real glut season, and we asked them to put 10 or 15 or 20 per cent of their supply of fish into salt fish, only to find out next Fall or Winter or next Spring that we had that in inventory and could not pay them. Then we would be in real trouble.

So I think, sure, we have to look at what we can do for the glut season besides the desks we have set up to help divert fish here and there where there is still an over-capacity of processing, and we divert the fish from Twillingate or from Musgrave Harbour to some other plant somewhere else. We will do that as much as we can, but we have to be very careful that there is actually a market available if we are going to put it in some other form than into fresh and sell it

to the plants, because otherwise we are going to find ourselves in trouble. And, by the way, let me just finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying that for the first time in its history, since its inception, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is losing money. Every other year since the Saltfish Corporation was established, it was making money and therefore, obviously, was doing a good job. There is no reason to indicate that there is anything with management that has caused it to lose money, other than the fact that the market for salt fish has deteriorated. So whilst it may sound good on the surface and whilst salt fish was in a good market position a number of years ago when the hon. member was in this House, obviously now he is out of touch with what the fishery is all about in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have gone on now for a number of days. It is still early in the session. Just a very brief point of order, namely, that if the government is going to have a Question Period, then they should observe the rules of the House which say it should be basically short questions, short answers. If the Premier and his members want to make a mockery of Question Period they can, by getting up and giving long-winded speeches in the guise of a reply to the question. The Premier did this today, other members did it yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) did it a few minutes

earlier. Mr. Speaker, Question Period becomes a farce if this is going to go on.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The audacity of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to get up and make that point of order. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was almost as long, if not as long, in his question as I was in my answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, you know, it is tit for tat. I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition was, but the member for Twillingate asked a very long question. He prefaced it - we did not get up on a point of order - he preambled it and then asked his question. And my answer was very little longer than the question that the hon. the member for Twillingate asked. So, okay, if we are going to have fairness and equity in the House, let us have it on both sides and let us not get up on facetious points of order when somebody on the hon. member's own side of the House was violating the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order, but I would like to make the comment that the whole purpose of the Question Period is to get as much information from the government

side as possible. So if the questions are brief, the answers are brief and the preambles are as brief as possible - and in supplementaries, no preambles at all - I think we will get far more information.

The time for Question Period has expired.

ooo

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I think now might be as good a time as any to present this motion. I mentioned this to the official Opposition this morning. It is the intention of the government to ask the adjournment of the House today until Monday at 3:00 p.m. The reason for it is there is a meeting that most members of this House will want to be attending tomorrow in Springdale.

MR. FLIGHT:

Most members?

MR. MARSHALL:

I have difficulty in defining the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I am sorry - it is deeply ingrained in my soul - as members of the House. I meant on this side of the House. Do you want to line up? Is that an application? But, Mr. Speaker, I move that when Your Honour leaves the chair today that this House stand adjourned until Monday at 3:00 p.m. instead of tomorrow at 10:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Notices of Motion

It is moved and seconded that the House adjourn this afternoon until Monday at 3:00 o'clock.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:
I realize the correct procedure, but if the hon. gentleman wishes to make a comment, that is fine.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK
Mr. Speaker, we realize that the government side of the House want to get their party members down to Springdale tomorrow and, if we are accorded the same courtesy at times, then we see nothing wrong with it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We have done it before for you.

MR. TULK:
Yes, I know. We see nothing wrong with that kind of thing. We understand that there is probably going to be a Springdale leadership review conducted by the minister.

MR. MARSHALL:
I would just like to say, as we have had in the past, and we are quite prepared to do it, we anticipate that the hon. gentlemen during the next three or four years might have two or three leadership conventions and we will certainly adjourn the House for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
You have heard the motion. Those in favour 'Aye', those against 'Nay'. Carried.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:
I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Judicature Act", "An Act To Provide For Arbitrations", "An Act To Amend The Department Of Justice Act", "An Act To Amend The Justices And Other Public Authorities Protection Act," and, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act."

MR. BARRETT:

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Style The Department Of Development As The Department Of Development And Tourism."

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Registration Of Psychologists".

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975".

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Act."

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983."

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Daycare And Homemakers Services Act, 1975."

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Preservation Of The Historic Resources Of The Province."

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act".

Orders of the Day

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act. (Bill No. 14).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to introduce Bill 14, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act." Mr. Speaker, I think the greatest satisfaction I get from the introduction of this bill is that the bill addresses items of major concern to labour. They are items that labour in this Province has brought to the attention of government for correction over a number of years in briefs to government as a whole, and, in

particular, in briefs to various Ministers of Labour.

I think several provinces have brought in amendments to legislation similar to the ones contained in this bill. In bringing in these amendments, Mr. Speaker, government is endeavouring to bring about a balancing of interests between workers and their employers, between unions who represent units of employees and employers in the Province.

The bill basically consists of four main clauses. The first clause is an amendment dealing with the holding of hearings by the Labour Relations Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Labour Relations Board in this Province has been in existence since shortly after we entered Confederation, since 1950. From then until quite recently, the last three to four years, the Board lived in the belief that they had the sole discretionary power to decide whether or not to hold a hearing on an application of any kind coming before the Board.

Approximately three or four years ago the Board made one of its ordinary, average decisions to reject a hearing in a particular application. The Board's authority was challenged through the courts. The courts upheld the challenge and, of course, since that time the Labour Relations Board has been obligated to hold a hearing in every case in which a request was made for a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is a need for expeditious handling of labour matters less they fester, get sore and cause problems in the labour movement. That need to hold hearings in

every case has caused delays of applications coming before the Board, not only delays, but it has caused unnecessary expense to the government and unnecessary time for the Labour Relations Board, which is a part-time Board. We have seen necessary to correct it at this particular time.

As far as it is possible to do so, Clause 1 of the bill will clothe the Labour Relations Board with the necessary authority to decide, or to have discretionary power, with respect to the granting or denial of a hearing in any application which comes before the Board.

Clause 2, Mr. Speaker, deals with voting procedure. Primarily in the bill, as it stands now, Clause 2 deals with voting procedures to determine whether employees in a bargaining unit, represented by a bargaining agent, wish to continue having the bargaining agent represent them in collective bargaining.

At the present time there is a difference between the procedure for votes in dealing with applications for certification and in dealing with votes for applications for decertification, or applications for termination bargaining units. The bill has been distributed, I understand, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members will be aware of the amendment there. I want to state at this time, in accordance with what government has stated, and with what the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), my predecessor, the Minister of Labour said when he held a news conference - I accompanied him as his deputy minister at that time - there would be an ongoing review of

labour legislation with a view to tidying up that legislation or correcting any unwanted aspects of that legislation.

In accordance with that policy and, in accordance with what I have stated since I became Minister of Labour, I intend to lead into an amendment to this bill when it reaches Committee of the Whole, which will change the whole procedure for voting and representation votes ordered by the Labour Relations Board. The amendment which I will propose at that time will change the system. I should explain what the system is now. The system at the moment-

AN HON. MEMBER:

When are you going to propose it?

MR. BLANCHARD:

I am going to propose it when the bill is deal with in Committee of the Whole. I will lead in an amendment.

At the present time, a union which makes an application for certification to the Labour Relations Board must receive a majority of all the employees in the unit in order to be certified. It must receive the support of a majority of them. Under the amendment which I will propose at that time, there will be provision for a quorum. Where a quorum of 70 per cent of the members of a bargaining unit vote, then a simple majority of those voting will decide upon certification.

Mr. Speaker, that amendment will address one of the most agonizing things and one of the items which has been drawn to the attention of the Department of Labour more than any other matter, I think, during the last twenty years.

Thankfully, I am proud to state here today that we intend to correct that.

MR. FENWICK:

What if there is no quorum? (Inaudible).

MR. BLANCHARD:

I am not sure of the procedure here, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) will have an opportunity to ask questions on the bill when it is presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, Clause 3 of the bill will deal with first collective agreements. Mr. Speaker, when a union is certified by the Labour Relations Board it is normally the procedure that the parties give notice to bargaining collectively, they bargain and either they make a collective agreement or they avail of the services of the Department of Labour's conciliation officer, conciliation board or whatever. It is to be assumed that they will consummate a collective agreement at sometime in that process.

We have found that first collective agreements quite frequently turn out to be a rather acrimonious procedure for unions and employers. In order to correct that situation this bill will make provision, where either of the parties request the minister, the minister may direct the Labour Relations Board to settle the terms and conditions of a first collective agreement. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that this particular amendment addresses a problem which has been brought to the Department of Labour on many, many occasions over the last several years and, again, it ought to be recognized that we are coming into

a new era of co-operation with labour and management.

Mr. Speaker, Clause 4 of the bill would provide that all future collective agreements must include a provision requiring employers to deduct an amount equal to union dues from the wages of employees, whether or not they are members of a trade union, and remit the amount to the union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say approximately 90 per cent of all collective agreements in the Province contain some form of union security provisions. It is often a modified version of the Rand formula. This is really what we are talking about here, the Rand formula. For the benefit of the House, I would like to say that the Rand formula was a formula devised by the late Mr. Justice Ivan Rand when he was a mediator in a dispute affecting Ford Motor Company and the United Automobile Workers back in 1946, I think it was.

Even though most collective agreements contain some provision or form of union security, we have found, and indeed we found in the prolonged strike at the Newfoundland Telephone Company last Winter and into the Spring, the question of the Rand formula, I estimate, caused that strike to go on two or three weeks or perhaps longer than it might otherwise have gone on. There were three bargaining units. In two they had union security provisions and this matter did not come into question. In the clerical unit, the third unit, it was a newly certified unit and the Rand formula became a critical issue.

We will now be proposing to amend

the act to provide for the deduction from the wages of every employee of an amount equal to the union dues. It will not require a person to join a union who, for instance, for religious beliefs or other reasons, does not want to, or cannot become a member of a trade union. It will simply mean that they will pay for the services that the union is rendering when they go to the table and negotiate a collective agreement. When the union incurs expenses and costs negotiating and providing other services, then the members who are not in the union will pay for that service.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I said at the beginning that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce this amendment to the Labour Relations Act and I sincerely hope that it will herald the beginning of a new era of co-operation with labour. I sincerely hope that it will enhance the settlement of disputes and perhaps prevent disputes between labour and management.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me congratulate the hon. minister on two things: one, on being appointed Minister of Labour. As we all know the gentleman comes to the portfolio with a vast degree of knowledge, experience and expertise in the field of labour relations. So we want to congratulate the minister and we hope that his sincere intentions

of bringing co-operation and harmony to labour relations in this Province will indeed materialize.

Secondly, I want to congratulate the minister on his fine explanation of the purposes of the bill. I sincerely and genuinely say it is the best explanation that I have heard of a bill since I have been a member of this House. Again, I want to congratulate the minister for that fine job.

The minister indicated that he looked forward to co-operation with the labour movement in this Province and I sincerely hope that will happen, but I am sure the minister realizes that in this Bill 14, although he has addressed some of the concerns of the labour movement in this Province, he has not addressed some of the larger and more contentious concerns of the labour movement of this Province. I will get on to these in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I do not have to warn the minister in this respect for the minister knows that he has inherited a portfolio with a lot of problems. He has inherited a portfolio with a lot of messy problems. Mr. Speaker, the climate for labour relations in this Province has not been good. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there has been a terrible situation for labour and all people associated with labour in this Province over the past six or seven years. The climate has been anything but harmonious.

Indeed the government has displayed a hostile attitude towards the labour movement in this Province. They have demonstrated anything but a

cooperative and harmonious attitude to the labour movement in this Province and I think, Mr. Speaker, the numbers of strikes that we have had over the past four or five years demonstrates that, as well as the numbers of man-days lost in the Province.

Unfortunately, the bill came a little too quickly for me to be able to get together the statistics which I will do over the next few days, but if it is anything like the past, Mr. Speaker, then we rank among the highest provinces in Canada in terms of strikes and man-days lost, although sometimes it is hard to make the comparison because of the way the statistics are done. Over the past few years we have had more strikes, we have had more man-days lost than any other Province in Canada and, Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates that there is something wrong with the labour relations climate in this Province. I suggest that it has had to do with the hostility shown by this government towards labour in this Province with the bad bills and legislation that passed through this House in the last three or four years. Some of the bills the hon. the minister was very familiar with because he was deputy minister at the time. We understand the situation. Now that he has got clout we hope that he can rectify matters, whereas before, I suppose, he almost had to do what he was told in many respects and could not bring to bear the kind of legislation that he would abdicate. I am sure the kinds of legislation that passed through this House in the past two or three years were not the kinds of legislation that the hon. the minister would want passed.

I am sure Bill 59, Mr. Speaker,

for example, is not a bill that the hon. the minister would want to see passed through this House. The hon. the minister, I think, was deputy minister at the time, but now he is in the position to correct and to rectify and to bring in more conciliatory legislation, to bring in legislation that is more in line with labour legislation throughout Canada then the horrendous piece of legislation that was contained in Bill 59 and in other bills. I believe Bill 37 and some other bills were passed when the minister was deputy minister of the Department of Labour.

These bills - and I think the minister acknowledges this - these bills were prepared hastily, they were prepared as situational bills. I think he called them situational legislation. Any time that you bring in legislation to try and meet a particular situation it is bound to have loopholes, it is bound to be bad legislation. The minister, I am sure, would be the first to recognize that it was bad legislation and now he is trying to patch up that legislation. Mr. Speaker, we need more, we need a complete overhaul of the labour legislation in this Province. I am not sure that a patching up will do the job. So the minister inherits, Mr. Speaker, a portfolio full of problems. I am sure he is not going to be looking around for want of work and want of activity. I am sure he is going to find plenty of work.

Just about everywhere you look in this Province, Mr. Speaker, there is a strike. I realize that the minister is not going to eliminate all the strikes. I would not expect that kind of performance from the minister. Nobody does

but, Mr. Speaker, we have an inordinate number of strikes in this Province. As I have said, everywhere we look, for example, at school boards, there is a strike in one region, when that one is solved there is a strike in another region. So we go from one group to the next.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the strike at Memorial University that I questioned the minister about today. I just want to comment on that strike again, at this particular time, because that strike is reaching, Mr. Speaker, a very crucial situation. Here we have a group of workers, as I said in my question, that are helpless, Mr. Speaker. They are crying out to the minister for help because, as I have said, the strike has become an ineffective weapon for them because of the nature of the institution. Students were forced to cross the picket lines, naturally, to ensure that they got an education and to ensure they did not lose their money. Here they were with thousands of dollars invested and they could not see it all go down the drain so close to the end of the academic year. Of course instructors and professors were put into an awkward position because they too had an obligation to the students, with the tremendous investment in dollars that they have paid, so they too were forced to cross the picket line. So, Mr. Speaker, the strike was ineffective and here we have those workers up there now in a situation where there are demands from just low paid workers. They are crying out for the minister's knowledge and the minister's expertise to help them resolve this strike and I am sure he is going to do it because the circumstances of the situation

almost necessitate that if somebody does not come in and act, if somebody does not force the bureaucracy at Memorial University to meet with these workers, to get at the bargaining table to resolve this situation, this strike could go on indefinitely.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are back at the bargaining table now.

MR. LUSH:

Well I am glad to hear that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They have been back the last three or four days.

MR. LUSH:

That is good.

Then the minister should ensure that they do not come out of there until they got the thing solved, they should not let the University officials walk away from the table until they have given these workers, Mr. Speaker, a resolution to their just demands. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have a minister that is concerned about that and I am hoping that he can demonstrate that concern in a very meaningful and tangible manner. I hope that his colleagues will allow him the freedom and the flexibility to carry on the job in the way that he knows it should be done. I am hoping that his colleagues will not tie him down. I am hoping that they are going to give the hon. gentleman complete freedom and complete flexibility to deal with the labour relations problems in this Province because surely the minister has the knowledge, surely the minister has the expertise required to deal with the labour situation in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at the bill today that the minister explained and its four clauses - and I will not go into all of them because, as I have said, the minister went through them and explained them well - but Clause 1, I suppose, I have a concern about this. Again, really, I am concerned whether or not the Labour Relations Board will be perceived by the courts to have the power that the minister indeed says they will have. I think that is a concern because I think the minister alluded to the fact that the Labour Relations Board always thought that they had the power. Indeed, it did not work that way in the situation that the minister pointed out - establishing a precedent - and then all applications, when they received them, required a hearing. We are not sure that it should not be that way from time to time. I know the minister mentions the necessary delay and expense in this kind of thing, but maybe there might be some criteria, some conditions whereby it might be possible for a hearing, but I will leave that, Mr. Speaker, for a little later. I just wanted to raise the concern that I know is expressed by labour in this Province, whether, indeed, the legislation will have sufficient teeth to be able to give it the clout and the power that the minister intends for the Labour Relations Board to have.

Clause 2, which the minister also went over, concerns voting. Of course, we will comment more on that when the minister introduces his amendment, but there is no question that this was an aggravating, antagonizing situation, and we will await to see what the minister's amendment will be. Of course, if he does

anything, it will be an improvement on what the situation now is in that respect. We certainly hope that he does a complete overhaul of the voting system that will be favourable to the people involved in labour unions in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Clause 3: Again, the minister points out very well the purpose of this particular legislation with respect to first collective agreements, and certainly, I think that kind of legislation was necessary, particularly during the first time, when people are not sure of where they are going and employers are sometimes reluctant to accept the bargaining unit, and all these kinds of difficulties, problems and complexities that come into a first-time collective agreement. So I think that will be favourably accepted by the labour movement throughout the Province.

I suppose the biggest one is Clause 4, the Rand formula. Now, this is not a revolutionary idea. You know, hon. gentlemen opposite sort of think that this is a new kind of thing, that this is a revolutionary idea, that we are the first in the Western world to come up with the Rand formula. The fact of the matter is, we are almost the last to adopt this very progressive legislation with this very progressive method with respect to paying union dues, Mr. Speaker. I think all hon. gentlemen will agree with the Rand formula where all people in a bargaining unit must pay their union dues. That is only right and proper. If a particular person is going to reap the benefits of a particular group or unit, well, that person should also pay the fees. I suppose it

is similar to the town supply of water. If you are going to hook up to it, you are going to pay for it.

The Rand formula, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. We should have had it a long time ago, and here we are, about the last place in the Western world to accept that very progressive formula by Mr. Rand, who developed that formula. I do not know when it was, but it seems to me we are talking about forty years ago, for sure, that it first came on the scene.

MR. BARRY:
1946.

MR. LUSH:
1946. By golly! Thirty-nine years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing revolutionary about it. We certainly welcome these amendments, but there is nothing revolutionary about them. They are very ordinary, very minor. They have been in collective bargaining agreements throughout the rest of Canada for many, many years and we are just beginning to get them now. But, Mr. Speaker, we welcome any progress. That is not at all to take away from what the minister is recommending here today. I would not dare try to undermine any efforts that the minister is trying to make to improve labour/management relations in this Province. It is an improvement. They are favourable and we welcome them. We only wish that the minister would go a little further. We look forward to seeing a bill coming in here dealing with, Mr. Speaker, the provision of successor rights. I wonder if the minister is going to deal with that? That is a concern with the

labour movement in this Province. It is a very serious problem that labour has to deal with, particularly where we have contractors who get a contract for a year or two and all the members become members of a certain bargaining unit, then when a new contractor gets that bargaining unit here, the workers are left without a union, left without any collective agreement. Now, that is the kind of major legislation we would like to have seen the minister deal with. That is the kind of amendment that the minister should have brought in. Then he would have been showing his real concern for the big labour problem in this Province. That is what we would look forward to. But, Mr. Speaker, we are happy with this little bit of window dressing. We are happy with that, and that is just what it is, a little bit of window dressing, a little bit of lip service. We acknowledge that. We are certainly going to support it. There is nothing there that we find any substantial disagreement with. I was going to say, no real, substantial disagreement with all of them. But naturally, we will express some concerns and some loopholes that we see as we go down through them and as other members speak.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say everything about this bill. I want to leave something for my hon. colleagues. Suffice it to say that what we see here is fairly reasonable. We do not think it is revolutionary, but we see that it is an improvement. It represents an improvement to what was previously the situation, so we can accept most of this legislation with some minor changes that we will talk about as the debate progresses.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we see an indication why there has been such a sad record of labour relations on that side of the House. Nobody else seems to be interested enough to get up and have a comment on the bill. I think with all due regard for the experience of the new minister, he is going to need some assistance from some of his colleagues on the other side of the House. We are going to have to see some members on the other side start to become involved in the matter of labour relations if we hope to see the present government avoid the same slippery slope that it has been on for the last several years when it comes to dealing with labour relations in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is one matter in Clause 1 that I am not sure whether my colleague referred to it or not. We were discussing it earlier that we have concern with respect to the lack of a hearing being provided to parties.

AN HON. MEMBER:
I will clarify that for you later.

MR. BARRY:
Well, I heard the minister and I heard his words quite clearly where he talks about unnecessary expense and unnecessary time in providing a hearing for people. I would have to ask the minister,

unnecessary in whose opinion? It is not unnecessary in terms of the party who is asking for the hearing because that party believes, when they makes the request for the hearing, that party believes it is necessary or they would not be making the request. So the minister is using a little weasel word there, a little slippery word, to pass over the fact that there is a very basic right in British parliamentary practice and in British common law that the rights of an individual are not to be interfered with without that person having been heard and having the opportunity to explain why or why not the matter should proceed as the particular administrative board wishes it to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of sitting on a Labour Relations Board and serving for a couple of years there and I know it is an annoyance, a nuisance for the Chairman and for the members of the board to have to have a hearing and set up a special time and sit down for a morning or an afternoon or maybe even a couple of days and listen to members of the labour movement or employers, depending upon the circumstances, talking about the reasons why they want the decision of the board to go one way or the other. But, you know, it is not the convenience of the Labour Relations Board we are concerned about. It is not whether or not it is more inconvenient for the board. It is the parties, Mr. Speaker, it is the employers out there who are concerned that matters may take place with respect to certification of a union, for example, when they may question whether the union has, in fact, the support that it says it has

or, on the other hand, it may be a union that wishes to have the hearing where it wants to point out there are certain unfair labour practices which have been engaged in. Mr. Speaker, this taking away of the right to a hearing is not a minor or insignificant matter. I believe we have an indication of how the courts look upon this from the way in which they have managed to interpret previous sections of The Labour Relations Act where this government attempted to take away the right to a hearing. The courts have managed to ignore those sections - not ignore them - they have managed to interpret them in such a way as to find that the parties are entitled to a hearing despite what has been put into the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we are going to see the same challenge exercised before the courts with respect to this particular paragraph. Do you know something? It is not just in Newfoundland, but over the last thirty or forty years in Canada, in just about every province, we have had a long series of this type of thing where a legislature has tried to take away the rights of individuals to be heard. We have a long series of cases where the courts, who, in this particular area, and it is a thin grey line that the courts have to walk because they have to be subject to parliamentary democracy, where the courts do not make law, they interpret law. This is the modern cliché in any event. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are likely to see even greater judicial activism in this type of area now as a consequence of the new Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedom where, again, we have references to the rights

of individuals not being taken away without due process of law. There are implications for hearings contained in the sections of the new Canadian Charter.

So, Mr. Speaker, it may not be necessary for us to fight all to hard against this particular clause because it may very well be that the courts are going to find a way around it. The courts have said, in areas like this, that they consider themselves to be the protector of the ordinary person in the street. While they are subject to direction from a legislature, that direction must be absolutely unambiguous and clear. If there is any way that they can interpret a paragraph in a statute, or a clause in a statute, that tries to take away the rights to a hearing, they are going to interpret it in that fashion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that I would like to hear more from the minister. I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, that it is necessary to take away the right to a hearing of either an employer, or a union member, or a union, before the Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the minister look at this: Maybe the problem is that the time has come in Newfoundland for a full-time labour relations board, for a labour relations board constituted in a fashion where you have a board sitting full-time with a permanently appointed chairman and members, and alternates, if necessary. I know the chairman is probably being paid virtually on a full-time basis right now, but the board is not sitting full-time. I ask the minister to also look at, if it is the board that is having problems keeping up with the

demands of time and so forth, as a result of hearings being requested, is the board getting the support that it should be getting with respect to legal advice? It was not getting it over the past several years. It has been assigned a lawyer from the Department of Justice and inevitably that lawyer ends up being assigned a number of Crown corporations, in addition to the board, and other matters down in the Department of Justice. That lawyer does not have the time to give the board the legal advice it requires. And even though the chairman is a lawyer, from time to time the research that is needed, in order to deal with a particular point of law, is just not there. I ask the minister to look very carefully at whether the Labour Relations Board is getting the support that it needs. Maybe that is what the minister should be looking at. Instead of taking away the right to a hearing, maybe the minister should be looking at whether the Labour Relations Board, as it is now constituted, is sufficient for today's modern age of labour relations in this Province, and whether the board is getting the backup that it needs with the additional volume of work that has come about. Unfortunately, the volume of work has come about, to a large extent, because of the sad, desperate, attitude of this government to dealing with the labour movement generally.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have, I would say, to listen to the minister more fully and we will have another opportunity in Committee of the Whole to deal with this question of taking away the right to a hearing. But I am not satisfied from what I have heard yet that we should go along with

this first clause. The other three clauses, Mr. Speaker, I believe, are generally progressive steps and a step forward.

In 1946 Mr. Justice Rand was set up in a commission to investigate a labour dispute. I believe it was in Ontario. As part of the recommendations coming out of that dispute he made a recommendation that there be, what they call, an automatic checkoff of union dues, even though employees of a company might not be members of a union.

Mr. Justice Rand recommended that if the union had a majority of employees, as it normally would when it was certified, if the union had a majority of employees, he suggested there was nothing wrong with forcing other employees, against their will - and this was a significant part - to pay dues to the union. This was a somewhat controversial item back in 1946. We have seen it work and work well in other provinces of Canada so it should not be as controversial today in this Province. I have heard some employers come out and fight against it, but I believe there is really nothing of any great significance for an employer to be concerned about. Here is the rationale, here the reason that Mr. Justice Rand had for saying that employees who were not members of a union, who did not vote for the union, who did not support the union in the application for certification, but now find themselves working for a company where the union has been certified after maintaining a majority of the employees, here is the reason Mr. Justice Rand gave: He said, "all of the employees, the employees as a whole, become the beneficiaries of union action." In other words, if the union goes out on strike and

it gets higher wages it is higher wages for everybody. And he said, "And I doubt if any circumstance provokes more resentment in a plant than the sharing of the fruits of unionist work and courage by the non-member." In the other words, the non-member is there, not paying into the union, and he gets the higher wage after the union members have hit the bricks and have gone without their salary and have taken the chance, at times, of being fired and so forth. That created a lot of resentment. He said, "It is irrelevant to try to measure the benefits in a particular case. The protection of organized labour is premised as necessary security to the body of employees". He said, "But the company in this case admits its substantial benefits for the employees have been obtained by the union, some in negotiation, and some over the opposition of the company. It would not, then, as a general proposition, be inequitable to require of all employees a contribution towards the expense of maintaining the administration of employee interests of administering the law of their employment." And he went on, "The obligation to pay dues should tend to induce membership," in other words lead to an increase in membership, "and this in turn to promote that wider interest and control within the union, which is the condition of progressive responsibility. If that should prove to be the case, the device employed will have justified itself. The union, on its part, will always have the spur to justify itself to the majority of the employees." And, "It is always in the power of the majority, if they wish, to decide to change their bargaining representatives."

There were a number of cases that challenged this type of formula in the courts but the courts upheld the Rand formula. Mr. Speaker, I think that today, in Newfoundland, this is not a radical step. This is something, that if it tends, as I believe it will, to improve relations between employers and employees, to improve stability within the trade union movement, then I think it is something that I think we should support in this hon. House.

I must take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to comment upon the labour relations record of this government. How many new members do we have over there? There are three new members. We will wait and hear their stand. We will see how they approach the matter of labour relations. I have to say all the other members have shown that they are losing touch with all sectors of the Newfoundland people but, more particularly, losing touch with the labour representatives and ordinary workers in this Province. Mr. Speaker, they are rapidly losing touch with the grass roots, and particularly with members of the trade union movement.

I think that this is an appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, with a new minister, with the beginning of a new Assembly, to see new approaches taken and I cannot think of two better ways, Mr. Speaker, for this government than to show that there has been a change of attitude with the election than to see a lifting of this freeze that has been imposed on government employees and going back to free and open collective bargaining with the Public Service of this Province. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, no better way than to see an extension of an olive

branch to the teachers of this Province, recognizing particularly that it will be the children in the classrooms who suffer if we do not see better relations develop between government and the teachers' union.

Now I have to point out that the President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association has stated that teachers cannot trust this government. He was speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the government before the election and I know that he is going to be prepared, as will everybody in this Province, to look and await new initiatives, new attitudes, new approaches, by the present government. We have a new government since the election. Mr. Speaker, I call upon members opposite to show that it is new in all respects, new in terms of the approaches that it will take to the trade union movement of this Province, new to the approaches it will take in dealing with the often very legitimate concerns of labour and new with respect to the approaches it will take with respect to the teachers of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a marvellous opportunity for members opposite to now show that we have a new progressive era of labour relations in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we will be looking closely. There will be a honeymoon period when members opposite can do virtually anything that they wish short of mass murder I would say, members opposite in the honeymoon period will be able to get away with a lot without receiving undue criticism from the general public. Members opposite will be able to put the boots to the labour movement. Members opposite, the Minister without

Portfolio, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), could continue for some time to come to put the boots to the teachers of this Province, the public employees of this Province, the ordinary workers of this Province, with whom I know the member has had very little other than a nodding acquaintance, Mr. Speaker.

I think the member for St. John's East should be put out into the work force. Chairman Mao in China, you know, did not have a bad idea when periodically he would just walk into a government department, or walk into an office building and say, "Hold it. Everybody out to the fields, everybody out in the factories, everybody out to work to see what the real world is all about." Now maybe that is what the member for St. John's East needs, and other members of the Cabinet over there. Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the problem. They are too far removed from the ordinary situation, the ordinary milieu and the ambience of the work force. Even the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), Mr. Speaker, who loves to work with his hands, he himself is in a very rarified atmosphere when it comes to understanding how the ordinary working person in this Province keeps body and soul together. I think it is the dust from the savoury which he dries it, Mr. Speaker, every Fall. He inhales a little bit too much of that in the drying process. I think that there might be other plants that periodically get mixed up with the savoury. Because, Mr. Speaker, some of the speeches that we hear from the member for St. John's North would make one wonder what he has been inhaling in that savoury drying building.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the topic at hand, and this is a very real problem and it is not our problem, it is our health, it is to our benefit, but the problem of members opposite, some of whom are now back like the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), back in a tired - how many terms is this? Three, four, five, a lot of terms. He managed to get in by a landslide this time, Mr. Speaker, but he is looking like he is ready to go. He is looking like he is ready to go, Mr. Speaker. And we have other members opposite, when you look at them they are looking pretty tired over there.

The biggest problem for government now is losing touch, these members who are back now for their fourth or fifth term in some cases - their last term in all cases - they are losing touch with the ordinary working person in this Province and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier should give some thought to sending the members of his Cabinet out into a working situation, a sabbatical. It might be only for a couple of weeks, but drive them out to the factories, Mr. Speaker, the few that are left operating in this Province, drive them out to the construction sites, the few of them that are going in this Province, drive them out Mr. Speaker, to where men and women are working on the roads in this Province. Drive them out, Mr. Speaker, to where the farmers are working. Drive them out to the fishing trawlers, and to the fish plants, and give them a feel again for what it is to work and earn one's living by the sweat of one's brow, and then perhaps they will be more sensitive to the needs and the very legitimate concerns that are being raised by the workers in this Province who feel that

members opposite, who feel that the people who were in government before the last election, are ignoring their concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have shown, not only that they have lost touch, but, unfortunately, all too often, they have been prepared to be non-neutral. Instead, Mr. Speaker, of members opposite intervening in labour disputes in a balanced way, how many times did we see in the last session - how many letters went out? - how many times did we see a letter going out from the Premier to the paper workers in Grand Falls warning them not to ask for too much in the way of wages; telexes going out from the Minister of Labour up to Labrador West area, to put the pressure on steelworkers, to put the pressure on people in the plants. Look, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) looks quizzical. Mr. Speaker, we can go on. We can talk about the many times that this previous administration intervened in labour disputes on the side of the employer usually, not showing the balance, Mr. Speaker, that the new minister knows will be important. I hope that the new minister keeps this Cabinet on its toes. I hope he has the courage of his convictions and manages to convince members of government to remain neutral in labour disputes. It is not just the minister, Mr. Speaker, that has an obligation to the workers of this Province and to the employers of this Province to remain neutral, it is government as a whole. They have not maintained that neutrality in the past, Mr. Speaker. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the sands of time are running out as a result of this sad approach to

labour relations that we have seen from members opposite. The sands of time are running out. And all too quickly will we see, not just the large majority that we have of the labour force no longer supporting members opposite, Mr. Speaker, but over a few more months of the same insensitive type of action that we saw before the last election, there will not be a member of the labour force that will be prepared to support members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, going back just briefly to the Rand formula, or that portion of the Rand formula which is being incorporated by Clause 4, I think it is, of the act in question, Mr. Speaker, there have been concerns raised by employers. They felt that it took away from the rights of individuals and that there was something that was against the grain to impose on individuals the obligation to pay over dues to a union which they were not supporting, which they did not vote for. But I think, by and large, Mr. Speaker, the benefits that flow from this type of provision outweigh the costs. There is a certain legitimacy in the point that is made by employers, because there is no question the rights of individuals are being affected. You are taking away the free will of the individual to decide where his or her money is going to be paid. But if I could just mention one of the concerns, which ties in with the concern that individuals may be prevented from joining a union.

This whole notion of union security clauses, of which this is an example, was originally challenged because it was felt that the lack of internal

democracy in certain unions might keep members out. You might see individuals being kept out of the union, but forced to pay dues. I will be interested, at some point in time, hearing the minister's comments and views on whether he feels that there is sufficient democracy within the union movement. Whether the union shop and closed shop, which we tend to see negotiated in many construction contracts around this Province, whether this is conducive to the mobility of labour and an equal of opportunity of individuals to obtain employment. I think we have some need to clear the air and have a little discussion as to how hiring is being done, for example, on large construction projects. I get a lot of individuals coming into me who are saying they would like to get a job, but they go down to the union office, they want to join the union, and they are told there is a long list of 5,000 union members with seniority. Sometimes a lot of these are in other provinces. A large portion of the membership list may be working elsewhere. We would like to get the minister's views, at the appropriate time, and it maybe in committee, Mr. Speaker. Is this type of closed shop or union shop, is this making it difficult for the ordinary individual, for the young person who is just getting out of trade school or university or high school, to get a job in this Province because of that type of clause being negotiated in collective agreements?

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that comes up periodically is the question of whether there is, in the case of a strike about to be called, a democratic procedure being followed in the course of

the union meeting? I guess the most common example is where there is a call for a strike vote by way of a show of hands. Does the minister have any views with respect to the adequacy of existing procedures for ensuring that there is fairness within the union as well as outside in the collective bargaining process? Now unions are very quick to dismiss this. The union leaders are very quick to get up and start complaining if anybody dares question whether they are dealing fairly with their membership. That is fine. We have a responsibility, and the minister has a responsibility as well not just to weigh this, but to deal with this type of issue.

Sure we know that the labour movement, just like union leaders, just like other special interest groups, want to have their cake and eat it too at times. They want to avoid any scrutiny of the way in which they run their shop internally. But as members of this House we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to the entire spectrum of the general public. We have an obligation, not just to the union leadership, we have an obligation to the union membership. I often have individuals call me with concerns with respect to the way in which they are dealt with by the union leadership, and these are union members.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

May I interrupt the hon. member for a moment?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Today being Thursday, there are three questions to be debated at the adjournment at 5:30 p.m. The first is by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) regarding the future of the Come By Chance oil refinery; the second is by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) regarding the coastal boat service; and the third is by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Premier regarding the Saltfish Corporation.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The ordinary argument against what I have just said, of course - and to be fair, we have to put out all sides of these issues - when it comes to the question of the internal operation and management of a union, the union executive, the leaders, will say in the course of emotions running high in a strike vote, and so forth, that the way in which the strike vote is carried out is for the union membership to decide, not for government, or the Minister of Labour, or this House, or the employer or anybody else. We have to understand, I suppose, from time to time, that particularly where there is a close vote, there is a certain jockeying that goes on in terms of a union executive which has its particular views with respect to the desirability or undesirability of a strike. There is a certain amount of

politicking that goes on within a union, just as within the general population, just as within other groups in society. Union leaders are very anxious not to see any limitations put upon their ability to influence their membership to go one way or the other, to go the way that they wish to see them go, I should say. Union leaders, union executives want to be able, for the sake of what they think is in their members' best interests, to, at times, maybe cajole a reluctant majority into taking a position, maybe to structure a meeting in a certain fashion so as to ensure that a militant minority will be able to carry the day in setting up a situation, not because they just want to run roughshod over the membership, but because they believe that the general membership of the union may not be seeing the long-term and may be too influenced by the short-term. The union executive may feel that if there is a strike, or in some cases, if there is a non-strike vote at a particular time, that it will be in the better interests of the membership than the majority of the members, themselves may see at a particular point in time.

I am sure union leaders themselves recognize that to ignore the wishes of the majority over an extended period of time is not possible. It is unhealthy. It leads to a very genuine problem which may fester away for a period of time, but will ultimately boil over into a nasty situation. But I think, in the context of a review of the labour laws of this Province, we have an obligation to the people of this Province, to the ordinary members of trade unions, to enquire whether, in fact, we have a sufficient degree of democracy within the various

unions in this Province. We have to take a look at the procedures, and we should not be scared off by one or two union leaders coming out and saying, "That is our business." It is not just their business, Mr. Speaker. It is the business of all members of this House, it is the business of all members of society to ensure that any sector which can have influence on the entire community, on the entire Province, as the trade union movement can have, then we have to ensure that everything possible is done to ensure that we have the most democratic method of proceedings. But, Mr. Speaker, while saying that, I put a very, very grave qualification there, and I say that we must not, in any way, permit such an examination of procedures or review of labour legislation to take away from the power which now exists in the trade union movement in the course of collective bargaining. We must not, in any way, let such an objective review of the procedures followed in the course of strike votes and other internal union decisions be used as an excuse to take away the rights which the trade union movement has fought for very hard for so long. We must make sure that we keep that proper balance between the employer and the employee. I know that that is what the minister is trying for in this legislation, and the minister may have agreement at the present time from certain representative groups with respect to this clause to do away with a hearing before the Labour Relations Board. If so, I think those groups are being short-sighted. I think that if the minister went out and enquired amongst the employers generally and enquired amongst unions generally, he would find that

there are concerns about taking away this right to a hearing which will permit a Labour Relations Board to make a decision which, at times, with all good intentions, may miss something that one of the parties could have brought out with a proper hearing before the Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Speaker, I think my time is just about up. I would end my remarks with the caveat that the minister is going to have to do a little more convincing on this clause that takes away the right to a hearing before the Labour Relations Board. We are going to have an opportunity, either now, in this legislation, or in the course of the debate on the estimates of the minister's department, to explore the minister's psyche, the minister's philosophy, and see whether or not the minister is going to try to bring this government into a new direction; whether or not this minister is going to show that he is a new minister, that he is not, in fact, the one, who behind the scenes, as deputy minister, possibly responsible for many of these sad situations we have seen develop. We will have to, at the proper time, I think, investigate to what extent was the new minister responsible for Bill 37? To what extent did the new minister have an input into having that Bill 37, with its retroactive amendment of labour standards laws of this Province, come before this House? The minister is going to have to inform the House. Did the minister support that legislation? Does he still support that legislation? Does he think it is good legislation?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The minister was not in the House.

MR. BARRY:

No, the minister was not in the House. He was only the deputy minister of the department, Mr. Speaker. I am doing this out of courtesy to the new minister to indicate to him that when the minister comes with his estimates before this House, or before a committee of the House, and when we start debating the minister's salary, one of the very real things that members of this House and members of the general public want to know is what is the philosophy of the minister with respect to labour relations? What is the philosophy of the minister with respect to the retroactive amendment of the labour laws of the Province. Is this what we can expect to see in the future from this new Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), other retroactive legislation? Did he, as deputy minister, recommend that bill go before the House? Did he, as deputy minister, object to the bill? These are questions, Mr. Speaker, that are going to permit members of this House and members of the general public to get a full understanding of the philosophy of this new Minister of Labour, to permit us to know where labour relations is tending in this Province, where and wither tending the labour relations under this new minister and under this new administration. Do we see the same old trudging along in the same old narrow-minded ruts? You know, with the prominent position that I see the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in, he is still sitting at the Premier's -

MR. TULK:

That is the evil.

MR. BARRY:

No, you could not call him an evil genius because you would be wrong

on one count anyway. Mr. Speaker, I would not want to use a term like that.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for St. John's East still sitting at the Premier's right hand where he can whisper his ultraconservative ideas into the Premier's ear. Mr. Speaker, when I see that I have to wonder to what extent we are going to see any real change in direction with a new Minister of Labour and to what extent we are going to see the new Minister of Labour being able to overcome the ultraconservative approach to labour relations, which I believe would probably see the employer being entitled to use the lash.

MR. TULK:

The cat-o'-nine-tails.

MR. BARRY:

The cat-o'-nine-tails would be brought back. That would be the first amendment to the Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker, if the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is permitted to run amuck in the area of labour relations. There would be many, many rights to dismiss on the grounds of insubordination, Mr. Speaker. Insubordination would run the whole gamut from requesting one day off a year or requesting something less than eighty-eight hours a week work before going into time and a half or double time. That would be the sort of progressive measure that we would see from the member for St. John's East. So I have real concerns as to whether this rookie minister is going to be able to stickhandle any sort of progressive labour legislation through, assuming - and that is a big assumption - that the new minister is progressive. When I

look across the House, and I hear what they call themselves over there, at times I think it should be called the regressive Conservative party when I see some of the policies they are putting forth in the area of labour relations.

There is some progress being made in the amendments that are being put through in this particular legislation but there is nothing that really gets to the essence of what is wrong in this Province today in the labour relations field because, what is wrong is a government that has not shown that it cares about the ordinary working person. The minister is not going to exhibit that concern and that compassion by bringing in this form of technical amendment. The minister is going to have to show a little more oomph in what he brings before this House in the way of labour relations legislation. He is going to have to show that he is going to depart significantly from the sad rut that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and other members have had this government trudging in over the past several years.

MR. BLANCHARD:

We have been trying to address labour concerns.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, now the minister is making a statement there that we will require some clarification. If the minister is saying that these cover all the concerns of labour, I will be very happy, Mr. Speaker, to have the minister stand up and take that position before this hon. House because I believe the minister knows that he has not gone very close at all to dealing with all the concerns of

the trade union movement. He does not deal with all of labour's concerns in these few wishy-washy paragraphs that amend the Labour Relations Act. We will be dealing with some of labour's concerns particularly when we get to the next bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act.

Mr. Speaker, what we need from this new minister is some very real signal that there is a change in direction. Now I am waiting for it.

MR. BLANCHARD:

It is in that bill.

MR. BARRY:

No, it is not in that bill I am afraid, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the minister holds up and waves the bill. The change in direction is not contained in Bill 14. Bill 14, Mr. Speaker, will not be enshrined in a golden plaque down in the lobby of Confederation Building. We will not, Mr. Speaker, in 700 years time be referring back to Bill 14 in the way the Magna Carta is referred back to. Bill 14, Mr. Speaker, is one great yawn - one great yawn - for the majority of the labour movement, for the majority of workers in this Province and for the majority of employers in this Province. It is a yawn and if the minister thinks that this is a significant new step - and if he does I would like him to confirm or deny when he stands up - but if this is what the minister is going to put forth as the flagship of his future labour legislation then regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in the same old rut that we have been in for the last three years. We find ourselves with a complacent government, a government that is satisfied that

all it need do is keep the lid on, Mr. Speaker. The extent of long-range planning in labour relations, Mr. Speaker, is how to let the strike drag on as long as it can until everybody gets tired enough and depressed enough and discouraged enough to try and get in and get a settlement that nobody is happy with. Mr. Speaker, the workers of this Province deserve more than this type of complacent attitude. The workers of this Province deserve a minister who is prepared to pitch in feverishly and eagerly. I would have expected to see, Mr. Speaker, a new Labour Relations Act coming up, definitely a new Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, and not, Mr. Speaker, these few puny amendments that we see coming before us today, both in this Bill 14 and Bill 15. This is the total extent of legislation that we have seen so far from this government, these two puny bills. I am sure they provide great fun for lawyers and a few labour specialists. I am sure that they will have these under their pillow tonight, they will fall asleep reading them. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, most people in this Province are going to fall asleep at their desks when they try and read them, because it is one big yawn.

We have to see, Mr. Speaker, a little more of a dynamic approach by the new minister. We have to see a little more compassion, a little more of a sign that the minister cares that we have a work force out there that feels that it is oppressed, Mr. Speaker. I say again, it feels itself oppressed by this administration.

AN HON. MEMBER:
As in Russia.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would say that Mr. Gorbachev is showing a lot more willingness to get out and find what the ordinary Moscowvite is concerned about than the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and a few others over there. Mr. Gorbachev, I would say, by the time we watch him for another few months, Mr. Speaker, is going to say "yes, we do have in Moscow," I would suspect, "a government that is more down to the level of the ordinary working individual."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why don't we emulate Jarulzelski? He is all in favor of labour.

MR. BARRY:

Well, you know, he has managed to get a few benefits that have improved the lot of the ordinary working person. Mr. Speaker, I read the other day that Mr. Gorbachev was out walking around the streets of Moscow, talking to the ordinary Moscowvite. He was actually out walking around the streets of Moscow asking the ordinary Moscowvite how they were doing in the factories and how they were doing in the farms, and how their jobs were going? When was the last time we saw the member for St. John's East walk around the streets of St. John's or Corner Brook or Gander?

MR. TULK:

During the election. He had to get out and knock on doors this time.

MR. BARRY:

He puts half of the population in the Province in deadly peril every time he gets the old ten speeder out. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that in cruising along at about fifteen to twenty miles an hour he gets a chance to find out

what the concerns of the fishermen, the farmers, and the other workers in this Province are. Now perhaps he does. We will be with great interest listening to the minister's contribution to this debate.

MR. TULK:

We will see what he learned in Springdale.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there has been mention about this tripartite conference that is to be set up now. Do we have the full consent of the labour movement to this approach of a tripartite discussion with respect to what I understand to be a - What do we call this? - a project agreement for offshore concrete platforms? This will be another area we will be interested in hearing the minister on. Is this an idea that labour is fully prepared to participate in, or is this something that is being shoved down labour's throat? Is this something that the minister or government and possibly certain employers have decided would be a good approach? Is this something that the labour movement is fully involved in discussions on? We will be very interested in hearing the minister and his views on this type of approach to labour negotiations in the area of offshore oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen project agreements before. Some have worked and some have not worked all that well. If I recall correctly, the one at Churchill Falls, during the construction of that project, worked quite well.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

With the leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the following constitute the Committee of five under Standing Order 84 (a) for the purpose of preparing a report to this House with the complement of the standing committees referred to in that Standing Order: The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), and the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

MR. BARRY:

Is that the Standing Committee on committees?

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, it is not really a Standing Committee. It is dissolved after committees are established for the assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that the following members, the member for St. John's North, the member for Port au Port, the member for Carbonear, the member for Fortune-Hermitage, and the member for Bonavista North be made a committee pursuant to Standing Order 84 (a). All those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Those against, "Aye".

On motion, carried.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to project agreements, my recollection is that the project agreement for the Churchill Falls project saw a fairly smooth operation for the Churchill Falls project, saw a fairly smooth operation of that construction activity, and saw a project kept on budget or under budget. I do not believe there was a large degree of labour dissatisfaction. There was some question about whether or not Newfoundlanders were getting employment from time to time on the project.

DR. COLLINS:

In those days the Liberals would put people in jail if they went on strike.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, no, it would be unkind to set up - I would not have to be too specific with respect to the physical reasons, but the minister seems to have certain gaps in recollection. It is a selective amnesia, I think, with respect to the history of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, a project agreement on the Come By Chance Refinery, I think, did not work very well. Did they not have an umbrella agreement with respect to Come By Chance? I know it broke down in later days, but maybe my recollection is wrong there. Maybe I am suffering the same plight as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). But, Mr. Speaker, the setting up of a project agreement does not, in itself, ensure industrial harmony, does not, in itself, ensure that the project is going to be carried out with ultimate efficiency. It does not matter what the agreement says, the blunt, brutal reality of

industrial relations is, if the agreement is not fair to both sides, you are going to see disputes, you are going to see problems, you are going to see slow-downs, you are going to see work stoppages, whether legal or illegal. And nobody condones illegal work stoppages, but resentments have a way of boiling over, grievances have a way of causing members to get up in arms for a real or imaginary, sometimes, slight on the part of the employer if they feel that they are being kept constrained by an agreement which is not fair to them. So this is going to be a very careful, a very important process we go through with respect to the working out of a project agreement or agreements with respect to offshore development. It is something that the minister is going to, I am sure, in the course of his estimates, be prepared to reveal his philosophy on in some detail.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude.

MR. FLIGHT:

I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The debate has been adjourned by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Thursday, there are three questions allocated for the Late Show. The first one is the question asked by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)

to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) regarding the Come By Chance Oil Refinery. The second one is by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) having to do with the South Coast coastal boat service. The third one is by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) to the Premier having to do with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) two or three questions regarding the Come By Chance oil refinery and the extension to the time period for the submission of bids to reactivate the refinery. The minister, Mr. Speaker, in his responses did not give very much information. He never does, actually. Perhaps this afternoon in his five minutes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance will give us some new information, some indepth information. What are the chances of the Come By Chance oil refinery coming to something in the near future? We know that there are at least two bids in. Are there others? Are there five? We have heard figures. We have heard five and we have heard two. Are all of these bids to reactivate the refinery? Is any one of these bids to scrap the refinery? If so, will the minister go on record now, today, as saying that that bid will not be accepted by this government, that they will not be satisfied to see the refinery at Come By Chance scrapped, that what they want to see done with the refinery, after seeing it closed for nine long years, is to see it reactivated? The offshore oil will be coming ashore soon, in four or five years

at least, Mr. Speaker, or we hope it will, and I am sure that the minister if he is reasonable and fair, and if he cares about Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, will make sure that the Come By Chance oil refinery is reactivated.

And if Clause 54 of the Atlantic Accord needs to be amended, this government will have ample opportunity to amend Clause 54. There is a lot of confusion about that. I was in a public forum during the recent election, in a crowded building in Come By Chance, where the PC candidate, quoting from papers from Pat Kearney in Ottawa, said that there was nothing wrong with Clause 54, there was no need for an amendment. Then, after he had said all that and quoted from his excerpts from Hansard in Ottawa, he said, 'But if there is anything wrong with it, of course we will amend it.' So there is some confusion there, Mr. Speaker, about whether or not Clause 54 needs to be amended so that the first oil comes from the Grand Banks in four or five years time, or whenever it is, it will come to an existing and operating refinery in this Province and not go to other refineries on the East Coast of Canada. Perhaps the minister, Mr. Speaker, will tell us that.

If there is a necessity to have Clause 54 amended, will it be done? Will this government through Petro Canada and with the help of the federal government and people like John Crosbie, who was on the air a few days ago - I heard him on his open line show talking about poor Callan. Well, we will talk about poor Crosbie one of these days when I have more time to deal with him.

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, he will determine when my time is up.

Perhaps the minister will answer these questions: Is Petro Canada holding back on making a decision regarding the refinery and the bids? Are they holding back to see what is going to be in the federal budget to see if the feds intend to scrap Petro Canada completely, do away with it? Is that what the feds plan to do in their budget of this month, scrap Petro Canada, do away with the Crown corporation? There is a cloud of confusion around the bids and the extension period. The bidding period has been extended until the 21st, will there be another extension? Perhaps the minister will tell us. And perhaps the minister will assure this House, and through this House will assure the people in the general Come By Chance area, that this government, at long last, will look on that facility at Come By Chance in a positive light and not look at it the way they have been looking at it for the last nine years, letting it go and letting it go and not caring anything about it, and, of course, finally selling it to Petro Canada for a paltry \$15 million.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

I hope that the minister will give us some answers, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member would do if there was not a Come By Chance. He has spoken about it so often, so frequently. He has asked so many questions, he has brought up the topic so often.

I do not object to that, as a matter of fact, I only mention that. I do not mention it with any note of criticism because I am sure the hon. member feels that if the refinery got going it would be very helpful to his district. I can assure him that we on this side, it does not matter what district in the Province you are considering, if there is anything to be done for any district we will do it. We do it for districts which regularly vote PC, for districts which previously used to vote Liberal but are now voting PC, as so many of them are, and even for districts which, in a moment of aberration, voted for some third party. Any project that is on the go that we can help with we will help with.

Now, in regard to Come By Chance, when the PC Party came into power, there were a certain number of things hanging fire, a certain number of projects that were started by Liberal administrations that were hanging around. They were a tremendous drag on the economy and we were faced with them and tried to do something about them. An example is the Linerboard mill in Stephenville. That was a tremendous drag on the Province, on the economy, and we had to work hard at it. We finally got it under control and now, in Stephenville, it is a viable, ongoing project which is

rendering tremendous amounts of employment and helping out the general industrial activity in the Province. I just mention that as an example.

Another example is the Come By Chance refinery. That, also, was a very, very difficult situation. It is unfortunate that it ran into so much difficulty. I think it was not all the fault of those who promoted it. There was some fault there, they did get into contracts they should not have gotten into in terms of tanker capability for the proposed operation of the refinery and that type of thing, they cut corners when they constructed the thing so the thing never did work up to its full potential, and there was a number of items like that. But despite all that it was most unfortunate, because the oil situation changed very radically. Just as the thing came into operation the whole world's oil operation or activity changed and they were very exposed, because it was a refinery that was not based on an existing resource. It was not a refinery based on markets that were very close to it, it was a refinery that had to get oil from a far distance, refine the stuff and then shoot it off to another far distance. It was a strange operation in the first place and it was very exposed when circumstances went against it.

Now, we were faced with that when we came to power and we knew we would have a difficult job of doing much with it. What we finally ended up doing was we got the largest oil operation in Canada at the time, which has since become larger still, interested in Come By Chance. Now, no one thought we would ever reach that stage. Because when we

came in there were a few fly-by-night operations around that were interested in the refinery but they had very little chance of doing anything with the thing. But we succeeded in getting the most reputable, the most well-organized, the most well-funded oil company of a Canadian type interested in the refinery. Now, when they took it over they did not promise that they would rehabilitate it no matter what, what they said was, "We will look at circumstances as they unfold and if there is any possible way we can in a viable way, in a financially responsible way renovate and reactivate this refinery, we will do it. But that is the proviso, it has to be sensible to do it.

Now, as time went on they did numbers of studies and so on and so forth, but they finally concluded that in their hands the refinery could not be made viable in terms of their overall operation. Now they did not say that in anyone else's hands it could not be made viable, or, perhaps, in some other type of corporate entity, they did not say that, they said, 'we cannot do it.' So they lived up to their agreement and they put it on the block.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! The hon. ministers time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:

We can get back to it some other day. I am sure it will be an ongoing subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Transportation

(Mr. Dawe) regarding the South Coast coastal boat service..

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to once again listen to the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins). I have heard him and seen him deliver responses to questions, I have seen him deliver budgets, and, of course, I saw him deliver babies, at least one. I always like to remind him that he delivered my oldest son. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he delivers responses to questions, and budgets, and babies, and he delivers babies well.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is the cutbacks in the South Coast coastal boat service. Five communities, Hermitage, English Harbour West, Pool's Cove, Belleoram and English Harbour East, as of yesterday, are not on that CN coastal run. Now, they are all connected by roads of sorts. But without getting into what sort of roads, the kindest thing we can say, and I think the minister will agree, is that at times those roads, and I am thinking particularly of the road that connects English Harbour East and the road that connects Pool's Cove and Belleoram and English Harbour West, are often impassable, not just occasionally but often. Several times during the Winter those roads are impassable, they are just not able to be kept clear of snow because of the condition of the roads and the state of the weather down there, so it is not really accurate to represent those communities as being fully accessible to the road system of

the Province. But that is only one reason why these communities ought to be connected to the coastal boat service. The larger reason, it seems to me, and the reason my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) was on the issue earlier the week, is that their not being connected has an impact on other communities; for example, McCallum in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, and Rencontre East in Fortune-Hermitage. It is pointless having Rencontre East on a boat run if the boat run goes nowhere. Or, to put it differently, if the boat run goes from Rencontre East 'way, 'way up the coast before it puts them on the road system, in the case of Rencontre East, in Harbour Breton. So the impact of the cutbacks, Mr. Speaker, should not be underestimated. Indeed, it was for that kind of reason, realizing the seriousness of the impact, that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), in his wisdom, two years ago very vehemently and admirably opposed those cutbacks and played a role in seeing that the cutbacks did not go ahead at that time. He and I, and many other people who saw the injustice of what was being proposed by CN Marine, were able to convince the federal government of the day that the cutbacks ought not to go ahead. Now, two years later, we see the cutbacks being implemented and all that has changed is that we are two years later in time and we have a different government of a different political stripe in Ottawa.

The minister mentions that with a different stripe government in Ottawa, with two governments of the same stripe, we are going to have a different approach. Of course you are, Mr. Speaker.

There is no need of beating your gums on the airwaves if you can get results behind the scenes. That is almost axiomatic, and I do not question that, I do not argue with it. A person in the minister's position would be unwise if he did not change his tactics to suit the occasion. What I am saying to him today is that now he must realize that it is time for plan two because his behind-the-scenes tactic has not worked. He realizes that the tactic he used two years ago did work, the cutbacks did not go ahead. Now I am saying to him, since his first tactic, his behind-the-scenes tactic has not worked, it is time to move to plan two. It is time to go public on this, give the member of parliament down there, Mr. Price - he has been going around saying that he is not getting support from the provincial government - the support he deserves, give the people of those communities the support they deserve, because those communities, once cut out, are going to be doubly difficult to have restored to the coastal service. It is a matter, from the CN standpoint, of dollars and cents. From Mr. Crosbie's and the federal government's standpoint it is a matter of upping the subsidy just a little more. And I ask the minister now to put partisan politics aside and put ahead of his loyalties to the federal Tory government his loyalties to the people of Rencontre East, Pool's Cove, Belleoram, English Harbour East, English Harbour West and Hermitage. That is what I am asking him to do.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. Minister of
Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to compliment the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) on his presentation and the way he presented his question today. It was much more in line with the comments from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on the opening day of this hon. House when he said that the party was going to try and maintain a statesman-like attitude. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition has not been able to live up to that from time to time since that point, but I am glad to see that the member for Fortune-Hermitage, at least today, presented his question very well.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago when we were faced with a situation where, right out of the blue, a great number of ports of call all around this Province, some twenty or thirty of them, were removed arbitrarily by the federal government through their agency, CN Marine at that time, various groups lobbied. The member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and myself attended meetings in South East Bight, Petit Forte, and Paradise, where the flags were flying half-mast to show what they thought of their MP, who is now the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), and the representation he had put forward at that point was doing for them, and it was just non-existent. And they felt the same way about the federal government.

We were able through a number of means, not the least of which at that time was a public pronouncement of the inadequacies of the decision, and including meetings with the people of the various communities involved,

which we visited to see how they were affected, to have the decision changed. We have had discussions as recently as today with representatives from the communities affected by these particular changes in marine transportation and we are going to continue to do that to try and evaluate just what the impacts will be and what the solutions will be to try and correct some of these deficiencies that have occurred because of the change in the marine service. There have been changes over the past couple of years, as I indicated, and these changes will continue, hopefully through the improvement of ground transportation, through improvements of road conditions. I agree with the member that the road conditions in his constituency, particularly in that area, are not the best. He represents an area which has a large portion of the 3,800 kilometers of dirt road in the Province and it is this administration's aim, and it has always been its aim, to try to correct some of these road problems over time, but obviously, Mr. Speaker, the cost of doing that is great. We have other parts of the Province equally deserving and we are trying to address the concerns of all of Newfoundland and Labrador in transportation. We are looking very seriously at the situation. We will be having other meetings with the communities affected on the South Coast to try to improve things and we will have discussions with CN Marine, Transport Canada, our own ferry operations. The other day the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) talked about integrating McCallum into our own provincial system, as we have done with Grey River from the Burgeo -

Ramea service, and that is not beyond the realm of possibility. So we are looking very seriously at that situation. We are dealing with an external agency here. I am sure the member realizes, since he was MP for that area, that CN Marine has not always been nor is to this day the easiest Crown corporation to deal with, and although CN Marine is a side issue in this situation it has to be dealt with in the context of its relationship with the federal government. So it is in all those contexts that we are looking at it and hopefully we will be able to resolve the situation in due course.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's answer to my question today was anything but satisfactory. Most of us, Mr. Speaker, who represent fishing communities in this Province realize the seriousness of the glut situation. We realize that soon, within a few weeks, during the height of the trap fishery thousands, maybe millions of pounds of fish will have to be dumped because the fish plants operating in the Province are incapable of handling the amount of fish landed during that period. Now my question to the Premier and my question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) on Tuesday was prompted,

Mr. Speaker, by that fact, that we, certainly in my case, want to see a solution to the problem, and I think other hon. members, especially those representing the rural parts of the Province feel likewise. The Premier's reply today proves one thing to me, that I do not think the Premier is fully aware of the role of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation or exactly how it came about in this Province. He mentioned to one of his colleagues about it being a federal corporation. Well, of course it is, we all know that, but I would like to inform the Premier and other members opposite that the Saltfish Corporation operates in this Province by leave and by a licence of this Province. In other words, this Province had an option when the Canadian Saltfish Corporation was established back in 1969 whether they wanted to accept, to take it or to leave it. Most of the provinces, Mr. Speaker, elected not to opt for this Canadian Saltfish Corporation. In fact, it was only Newfoundland and the North shore of Quebec, I think, opted for the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

The point I want to make is this, that the Government of Newfoundland must share responsibility for what happens in the salt fish industry with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. Therefore, if that corporation is not doing what it should be doing, if they are getting flabby or fat or indifferent or passive, then the government must assume its part of that responsibility. The Premier today in his reply mentioned the fact that I supported the Saltfish Corporation when I sat on the other side as Minister of Fisheries. Of course, I agree I did support the efforts

of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation but that was five years or six years ago and I believe that something has happened in the interim. In fact, I can take the Premier back to 1969 when I and my colleagues from this Province were constantly badgering the then government in Ottawa to introduce legislation creating the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. I supported the Corporation back in 1969, I supported it in 1975 and maybe, Mr. Speaker, if somebody can convince me that the corporation is now doing that for which it was set up, and that is to aggressively and effectively market salt fish, I would support it today. But the question that I want answered, and the question I posed to the minister and to the Premier, was: Are we as Newfoundlanders satisfied that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is now acting in the best interest of the salt fish industry and the fishermen of Newfoundland?

I, for one, am not satisfied. I want somebody to examine the Saltfish Corporation to find out if they have any real marketing expertise, if in fact they are becoming too passive, if they are not being aggressive enough. There is a market for saltfish. In fact, I will repeat the figure I quoted today, 250,000 tons of salt fish. Our contribution to filling that need is less than 8 per cent. We have a potential of maybe upping that to 25 per cent or 30 per cent, which would be a very substantial increase in fish production and certainly would put dollars into the pockets of Newfoundlanders. It is far better, Mr. Speaker, than dumping cod fish to be able to put it in salt and let it go into the markets of the world. That is all

I am asking. Let us satisfy ourselves that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is fulfilling the mandate that it was given in 1969 and a few months later the government accepted it into this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I think there are a number of us in this House who recognize that the glut problem, as we refer to it locally, is a very, very serious problem facing fishermen all over this Province, but particularly, I suppose, many of those who live and work along the Northeast Coast in my own constituency, just as in the constituency represented by the hon. gentleman. And it is a problem that this government and previous governments have tried to address in terms as best they could over the last several years.

Now let me say to the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), Mr. Speaker, that when he first raised this question a day or two ago in Question Period, I did not close the door on his suggestion that we have a look at the viability of attaching conditions to licences that we control in the processing sector. I did not close the door on that. I indicated to him that we would investigate it, that we would look at it, we would look at the practicality of it and, depending upon what the results of that

investigation would be, we would make a decision at the time. I gave him my word on that and we will do that. I would say to the hon. gentleman that if I tell him we will do something, then I will ensure that it is done.

On the matter of the Saltfish Corporation, let me say to him, as well, that I am not concerned whether there are some people who might think the Saltfish Corporation is a sacred cow. Nothing is a sacred cow as far as I am concerned. There may very well be some validity to the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman that the Corporation might have, for some reason or other, lost its zest or lost its determination to market aggressively in all parts of the world. That may be. On the other hand, it may not be. But I am not, as Minister responsible for Fisheries in Newfoundland, beyond finding out. I have only had four or five days in the portfolio, but I will attempt, as best I can with the resources available to me - and my deputy minister serves on the Corporation, as the hon. gentleman, I am sure, is aware - to find some answers to the allegations that the hon. gentleman has made. Perhaps there is some truth to them, perhaps it is just a lot of political puffery, perhaps it is true. We will look at it. I will take it seriously, as minister, and we will look at it. But let me say this to the hon. gentleman, as well. He quotes statistics from the market available in Portugal. I am very much aware, from the Saltfish Corporation point of view, that because of currency devaluations in Portugal it is becoming more and more expensive every day to market salt fish from Canada into Portugal. That is a

real problem that has been nagging the Saltfish Corporation over the last couple of years and the hon. gentleman knows from public statements made recently that the Saltfish Corporation, for the first time in its history, has started losing money.

I am also aware that in Puerto Rico, where about 40 per cent of the Canadian-produced salt fish goes, for example, that because of the protectionist countervailing measures introduced by the United States, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation now has to post bonding of between 25 and 30 per cent to get our fish into Puerto Rico. And if the U.S. finally decides that this corporation, because it is government-operated - not government-subsidized but government operated - if the U.S. finally decides that they are going to put importation limits on that market, then there is another market in trouble.

So there are a couple of big problems that have been facing the Saltfish Corporation and they may be part of the answer. But I will undertake, as I said to the hon. gentleman, to use whatever means is available to me as minister to try to find out whether or not there is, in fact, any validity to the questions that he has raised and if there is, then we will use whatever means is available to us to do whatever we have to do to try to correct it.

The Premier and I did not close any doors in our answers to any of the suggestions he made. We are open to any of those suggestions, we will investigate them, and if there is anything to them, we will try to act on them. If there is nothing to them and there are good reasons for what is happening in

the marketplace, then we will let him know the true side of the story from our perspective, as well.

Thank you, Sir.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 6, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.