



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 9

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

9 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Before calling the first item, I would like, on behalf of all hon. members, to welcome to the gallery the first resident Buddhist monk in the history of Newfoundland, the Reverend Bhente Wimala. All hon. members, I am sure, appreciate the historical nature of this occasion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I would also like to welcome to the gallery, Mayor Harvey Bulgin and his councillors of Summerford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a very brief statement on the SEED programme again because of some fears that the programme is not being administered fairly so that all persons in Newfoundland can access that programme. I just want to give some figures relating to some questions that arose in the House yesterday about, first of all, the total number of communities involved. Recently, a comment was made in the House by one of the members opposite that it was urban communities only that

could apply; yesterday, it was an Upper Canada programme. I just want to inform the House that so far 393 communities in Newfoundland have applied for projects under the SEED programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:  
Now, I am not sure if they are all urban, but I think you would have to stretch the definition of 'urban' to a great degree to find 393 urban communities in Newfoundland. The total applications from communities outside the general St. John's area, which could be considered urban, I guess, is 79 per cent of those. The total applications reviewed by the committee so far is 1,240. Also, for the edification of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I want to tell him that there are nineteen Upper Canada urban communities in his district that have applied for projects under the SEED programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:  
Those Upper Canadian urbanites from the Strait of Belle Isle have asked for \$643,000 and are looking for 330 jobs in that district. Again, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the programme is being administered in such a way that many students in Newfoundland can stay in the communities in which they live so that they can have some extra money when the Fall semester opens, and there are 393 communities in Newfoundland that have applied for projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the numbers of applications. We will be more interested in seeing the numbers of people obtaining jobs in the smaller communities around this Province. Maybe the minister can continue to monitor the situation and ensure that we do see a fair distribution of jobs. And maybe the minister will bring back, at the appropriate time, a report to this House as to how the jobs have been distributed around this Province at the end of the programme. As a matter of fact, we probably would be able to do that within the next month, I would think, before the House closes, because most of the hiring will be done, if it is going to be of any effect, before that time.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the minister to clarify just how many jobs, if any, there will be additional to the numbers of jobs that were provided last year under the Summer Employment Programme. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of money being spent by the Government of Canada with respect to Summer employment is cut back drastically. I think some \$85 million are being cut by the Government of Canada with respect to providing jobs for young people. We would like the minister to indicate how many jobs the minister believes will be created for students in this Province this Summer over and above what was available last Summer. We have seen figures with respect to 6,000 jobs. Now, our

information is there are not 6,000 jobs over and above what was available last year when approximately 4,000 jobs, I think, were available. Representatives of the department concerned indicate that 6,000 is the maximum figure that is likely to be provided. So what we are talking about really is presumably something between 1,000 and 2,000 additional jobs being available to students this year as compared to last year. Would the minister give us some confirmation? Are we right there? Will there in fact be any jobs over and above what there were last year? Because there have been cutbacks in other federal programmes that saw young people employed last Summer which will not see young people employed this year. Will the minister tell this House, at the appropriate time, what the situation will be with respect to the total number of jobs this year as compared to last year, keeping in mind that unemployment amongst young people is much worse this year than it was last year?

#### Oral Questions

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and again it concerns that rape of our offshore fishing stocks that is going on. Last week we learned, for example, that the West Germans had overfished that stock to the tune of \$40 million. Yesterday we learned of alleged bribery for extra fish by

those foreign countries. The minister did not seem to know if that was the case, yet the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) said he knew of it some three or four years ago. Today let me ask the minister if he is aware of overfishing by foreign boats which are in Newfoundland waters before fishery observers get on board? Is he aware that when these observers question foreign captains about fish already on board they are told it was crossing the Atlantic when in actual fact those observers believe that it was caught in Canadian waters before they happened to get on board the boat. Is the minister aware of that fact?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, some of the questions that the hon. gentleman is asking here in trying to intertwine the events that became public knowledge a few weeks ago with the events that only became public knowledge yesterday would perhaps be better directed to other sources. The observers who are on those boats do not report to this department or to this minister. What we have to do, if by the process of consultation with the federal department we are made aware of those problems, or if by reports in the media were made aware of such problems, is we have to start calling for an investigation, for an enquiry and go asking questions, but the information that the hon. gentleman might be looking for may not be readily available in our department. I am not saying that over the last several years there may not have been information come

forth or concerns come forth but, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to keep abreast of this issue on the second front, which only became apparent yesterday, over the last twenty-four hours, and I am having updates prepared by the officials in the department and, as information becomes available and I become conversant with it, then I certainly have no problem relaying it to the House. But to ask me whether this was available or this was known five or six weeks ago or three or four months ago or three or four years ago makes it pretty hard for me to be able to answer those questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point in the minister trying to slough off the seriousness of what we are uncovering here every day by saying he is a new minister. Surely the information is in the department. There is no point in him trying to slough it off either, like he did yesterday, by saying it belongs to a past era, a past government.

Let me ask him another question. The minister said yesterday he is taking action. That action may take months. I am not actually sure exactly what that action is yet, the minister seems to be quite fuzzy on it, but he said that that action may take months. Will the minister now, because that overfishing is undoubtedly still going on, demand in the strongest possible terms that in the interim, while he is waiting,

all of the foreign fishing boats upon entering Canadian waters will come directly to a port in Newfoundland, preferably, for inspection before starting to fish, and will come directly to a port as soon as they have finished fishing, and then have the closest type of surveillance put on them while they are leaving Canadian waters to stop that rape, that plundering of millions and millions of dollars that is going on offshore in this Province and in other provinces in Atlantic Canada? Will he demand that from the federal minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might find out when all of the information on this becomes available that an awful lot of those allegations that he is referring to, which may end up as facts, did in fact take place while there was a previous administration in Ottawa, which he would have been very friendly with at the time. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to jump out on a plank and say that it is not going on now, I do not know, but we have already called for an inquiry and so on. But I mean to say, I do not think the hon. gentleman should try to give the impression that if there now is a problem out there and there has been a problem out there for the last several years, somehow or other only members of this administration and members of the six or seven month old administration in Ottawa are the only ones who have to take any responsibility here. As for his suggestion that the regulations should be amended so that the vessels would have to check into a Canadian port, preferably a

Newfoundland port, as soon as they enter Canadian waters before fishing, and again before leaving for home, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that under advisement. I am prepared to give it proper and due consideration, and if it is deemed to be an appropriate thing to do then I am prepared to recommend it to the federal government. But I certainly will not throw it out with a categorical no. I will give some consideration to it.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested, and neither are Newfoundland fishermen and the Newfoundland people, in hearing this minister tell us that this went on under a former government. As the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) can tell you again, I stood in this House many times and condemned the federal government when it comes to some of their policies on fishery. That is a fact. We do not care to hear it. He is the minister now, the fish are being pillaged now, and he should act now.

Let me ask him this question. Will he make representation to the federal government to take those federal offshore observers, at least that section that is now with a private company, out of the hands of that private company and insist that they become direct officers of the federal government so that those security people, those people we have out there watching that fish, have status and power because they are serving

the government rather than some private company which has a contract with the federal government? Will he agree to do that and make strong representation to his buddy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly care what the hon. gentleman wants to hear or what he does not. The fact of the matter is that when he tries to interpose politics and past history with a question, then he can expect to get some of that back in the answer. I do not know if the hon. gentleman read the transcript of Question Period yesterday or if he listened to the media coverage of Question Period yesterday, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I said publicly yesterday, in front of all here and in front of the media in this Province, that the preferred position of this Province when the observer programme was put in place was that it not be put in place on a contractual basis, that the people who were going to be hired to implement that programme off our shores should be fullfledged, full-time employees of the Federal Department of Fisheries. That was the policy of this government four or five years ago under my friend and colleague here, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), it is the policy of this government today, and we have already communicated, notwithstanding any twenty-four hour late notice from the hon. gentleman, our position on that score to the federal minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the minister this final question. It is basically the same question I asked him yesterday but in another way: Given the seriousness of what we are now uncovering in this House, the minister cannot stand up and try to make political statements about past ministers, and he cannot try to slough it off on the federal government. He has to accept responsibility. Very recent history in this Province with regards to this whole situation has shown that the Prime Minister of this country is not really that interested in what is happening to the Newfoundland fishery. I want to tell him that he cannot trust too much. I want to ask him is he trusting to those kind of complacent assurances from his federal counterpart? I want to ask is he is being led around by Mr. Mulroney, who may be heading off to another international conference? I want to ask him today, for the sake of Newfoundland and for the sake of Newfoundland fish, which his Premier always champions as the resource we need for outport Newfoundland, is he now going to ask for an inquiry, completely independent of any political party, into this rape that is taking place in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, how easy it is to hold yourself up as the defender of motherhood and then try to wrap

every utterance that comes out of your mouth with pure politics, and then the hon. gentleman gets up and chastises us for doing the same thing.

MR. TULK:

Answer the question.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will answer the question in the same way that the question was asked, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this administration has to take a back seat to nobody in terms of little men and women, pansies of somebody else led around by Prime Minister Whoever-Soever. There are other people, Mr. Speaker, who have to wear that tag, there are other parties who have to wear that tag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to standing up for the rights of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, whether they be Newfoundlanders depending for their livelihood on the fishery, offshore, or whatever, this government, Mr. Speaker, will stand up for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. We have done it over the last several years, weeks, and months, and we have done it again in only the last few days. We have called for the enquiries, Mr. Speaker, without any prompting from the Opposition at all because it was right for us so to do.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, my first question as

a private member is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). In light of yesterday's information carried in the Canadian press across the country, and in light of information that I gathered last evening from a most reliable source, a native Newfoundlander formerly employed by the federal Department of Fisheries who served nine years on the patrol vessels off our coast, information to the effect that between 1979 and 1982 five fisheries officers - the gentleman himself will tomorrow go public and give his name - but he named five federal fisheries officers, not observers, who accepted large quantities of booze from foreign vessels, brought aboard large bags of booze and other items - bags was the term he used - in light of all this, I have a request to make of the minister. To elaborate a bit on my question: because that was going on, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred the whole matter to the then minister, the Hon. Romeo LeBlanc, and asked for an investigation, but no investigation was carried out. The matter is serious, Mr. Speaker, because these fisheries officers and fisheries captains, now in higher positions managing the surveillance of our offshore, took the liquor from offshore vessels, landed the liquor in Greenland and sold it for a substantial profit. They accumulated liquor from foreign vessels over a period of months and took a load of liquor to Greenland and sold it for a substantial profit. Because of these kind of charges, and because the information I received I know is reliable, because of all that, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) consider asking immediately for a full-scale police investigation

into this very serious matter?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank my colleague for the question. Again, some very serious allegations flowing out of yesterday's initial press reports are contained in the hon. gentleman's question and his preamble to the question. I understood yesterday, again from the same press reports, that there was perhaps a police enquiry, or a police investigation underway. In attempting to check this matter out with officials today, it does not seem apparent that there is a police investigation underway. In view of what my colleague is saying here, that there are people who are prepared to have their names put forward in a public way, if and when that happens, I would certainly give every consideration; although I have already asked for an enquiry of the matter, for a police enquiry - a police investigation I suppose is the proper wording - because it appears from what we are hearing now that the police investigation we thought was underway does not appear to be underway and, in view of those allegations and questions, perhaps it should be. The question was, I believe, would I consider his suggestion; I certainly will consider his suggestion.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

In light of the statement by the

Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that there is no police investigation underway, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice - where is he sitting now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, boy!

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry. The Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) was symbolic of justice in this Province for some time. My apologies to our new Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice in light of this, when we have allegations of wrongdoing, confessions by individuals that they have engaged in participation in bribery, in participation in the corruption of federal officials, and there are some indications that there have been incidents in corruption, or attempted corruption of federal officials, why is it she has not initiated an investigation or communicated with the RCMP, or the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, whoever might have the appropriate jurisdiction, to immediately commence an investigation into this.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the allegations referred to by my colleagues on this side of the House, and carried in the media report yesterday, just came to light yesterday, or very recently. I will take the information contained in the statements made in the House today as notice and discuss it with the officials of my department, and, if necessary, with the police.



MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in light of these allegations and the comments made by the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I have a question for the Premier. We know overfishing is taking place, and this is not the first time it has come to light. Would the Premier be prepared to recommend, if he has not already done so, to his counterpart in Ottawa that Canada extend its jurisdiction out to the edge of the Continental Shelf? Would he also undertake to say he would support any move on the part of the federal government to ban fishing on the part of foreign nationals who are caught violating the terms of the 200 mile declaration? If these countries were told their licences would be cancelled, this might very well have the effect of curbing some of the activities that are going on there now. Would he undertake to give the minister in Ottawa an assurance that this House, maybe by way of a joint resolution, an all-party resolution, would support such a move?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, all of these things that have come out today and yesterday are very, very serious, and the ministers responsible will take a hard look at it overnight to see just where any action under our jurisdiction can be taken. It is a very, very serious matter.

We have always, as the hon. member

knows, and as all hon. members of this House know, maintained that the fisheries jurisdiction question and our limits should be extended further out. As soon as the new government was elected in Ottawa, we reiterated to them within a month, our ongoing contention that we should extend our jurisdiction as a country. This document that was sent to them in September, 1984, as soon as they got in, indicated again, in no uncertain terms, that we wanted to see Canadian jurisdiction extended out to the Nose and Tail of the Banks. And we will not shirk from that, we strongly believe it.

The former government indicated that these agreements were in place and so on, and that over time it might be possible to get out of them, and this kind of thing. We have reiterated that to the present government in Ottawa and we have no intention of backing down from that position. We have put it in writing to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) in Ottawa, to the Prime Minister and to the External Affairs Minister (Mr. Clark). They all have a copy of this document in Ottawa and so do all the officials. So we have already done that and we are going to continue and we will reiterate it again as a result of these latest things. Now, I do not know, off the top of my head, the nature of the agreements with the other countries on our offshore which are allowed to take certain quotas, surplus and non-surplus and so on. But the whole thing is going to have to be reiterated again in the strongest possible terms. If some of these allegations are true about what has been happening, whether it happened yesterday or it happened

two years ago, whatever, makes no difference. I agree with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), it makes absolutely no difference. The issue is that it is or was being done. I mean, we are going to have to act as a government and as a legislature. Perhaps it might not be a bad idea to get a couple of members from that side and a couple of members from this side to sit down and look at a joint resolution of this House; I would be in favour of that. We cannot stand by any longer. My God, Mr. Speaker, when I think about the times in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and PEI when I argued about the Northern cod stock - Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister of the day, told me fish swim. Yes, they swim from one part of Newfoundland to another part of Newfoundland; it is not like they swim from here to British Columbia - and how fishing the Nose and the Tail of the Bank affects what happens with our inshore fishery and all the rest of it! I mean, it would make every Newfoundlander boil. The same people who ruined our seal fishery are out now overfishing off our shores. Here we are with 25 per cent unemployment, here we are trying to eliminate the glut in some way, here we are guaranteeing loans. This morning we had a Cabinet meeting where we had to deal with three more enterprises in Newfoundland and try to prop them up. Perhaps the time has come for an all-party resolution, with the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) involved in it, from this Legislature. You know, I am sick and tired of seeing what has been going on with our fishery as it relates to our relations with other countries in this world, and how we have to give. What did we do over the few years as it relates to trying to

get into the EEC? They dropped their little tariff a couple of cents and then we gave them another ten or fifteen thousand metric tons, and we never got one more pound of fish sold in Europe as a result. What a stupid, unreasonable agreement. They would never do it for the grain out West, for agriculture. It is crazy. So I would, perhaps, propose that over the next day or so, if I have the agreement of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the member for Menihek, that we charge a couple of our members with the opportunity of getting together tonight or something and coming up with an all party resolution, have a couple of days debate on it, if you want, in the House, and get it off to Ottawa to whoever that we are not going to stand by and watch this thing go on any more and that something is going to have to be done. As a country, we have got to take some pretty tough action with the other countries of this world who are out there on our resource. I will entertain a comment from the Leader of the Opposition, if he wants. We can have five minutes more of Question Period.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, if I might, I would like to suggest to the Premier that we have two things ongoing here now. The Premier raises a valid point, a position which has been taken consistently, I would submit, by all members of this House to my recollection, in terms of going

for the Nose and the Tail of the Banks. I think the Premier may have omitted to give some credit, even though they did not go far enough, to the previous government in Ottawa which did give 200 miles jurisdiction, which was not there before, but they stopped too soon, there is no question about that. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to participate in certain Law of the Sea discussions directly where I had the opportunity of making that point to the External Affairs representatives negotiating with these foreign countries that they should be going for the Nose and they should be going for the Tail of the Banks. We have submissions that were made to the government in Ottawa.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are two issues. One is the general, theoretical matter which is going to take several years to deal with. I support the concept of a joint resolution from this House. But, Mr. Speaker, we will not support that type of resolution as a means of avoiding what is a very real question of incompetence and negligence in terms of not dealing with things when things should be dealt with with the allegations that are being raised now. It is not good enough for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) - it is at least two days if not three days since I first heard that raised in the media out of Halifax - to have let that amount of time pass before the police are directed to commence an investigation. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, for government to hold up a general document and say that representation has been made with respect to jurisdiction when there should be direct representation directly to the Prime Minister asking, 'For heavens sake, what is going on up there?' They have

been in power there now since September, but the Premier -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Hold on! Just one second, now!

MR. BARRY:

I will not go too far! No, not 'Just one second, now!' I will just finish what I am saying.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I was on to the Prime Minister's office yesterday right after I heard about it -

MR. TULK:

That is not the point.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- and last night, too!

MR. BARRY:

You have not done enough.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude my statement on that, the government has not done enough. It has been in power now for a number of years and this has been going on for a number of years. Why has government not been involved with the federal government in finding out what is going on out there?

Mr. Speaker, briefly, we will support getting together with government to deal with an appropriate resolution for jurisdiction, but that has very little to do with dealing with this immediate, serious problem, which is the responsibility of the government in power now in Ottawa, which is a Tory Government, and a government in power now in Newfoundland, Mr. Premier, which is your government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly. I heard about the thing when it came out in the Telegram yesterday at lunch time. That is the first I heard about these allegations. And last night at 8:00 P.M., I had a call back from the Prime Minister's Office, because I wanted to get on to the issue, informing the Prime Minister directly that the Government of Newfoundland was very, very concerned, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) had already taken action with telegrams to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser), the External Affairs Minister (Mr. Clare), and so on. That was number one on the whole question of the overfishing; and, number two, that allegations are now being made. I talked to the Prime Minister's Office last night and they called back again this morning.

Now, as it relates to us taking any action -

MR. BARRY:

Is that why they waited two months before they told you?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I do not have that information here yet.

MR. BARRY:

When is the Premier going to -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All I am saying is the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) has had from yesterday at lunch time until today at 3:00 P.M. Now, as soon as we can take action, if there is

any action we can take, we will take it. We will take whatever action that is necessary, within our power to take, as soon as we can.

MR. BARRY:

It was not good enough for them to wait two months and not communicate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I agree. I agree wholeheartedly. But that is not our fault, and we have been on to that with the Government of Canada. I agree, I have no argument with you. It is not good enough for the Government of Canada, no question, and we have told them that in no uncertain terms, in writing and on the 'phone. So those are two issues on which I agree. Let us deal with the joint, all-party resolution as it relates to jurisdiction, which we put to the federal government last September and will continue to insist upon. Let us do that. Number two, I undertake, as Premier, in consultation with the Minister of Justice and with the other Cabinet people, whatever we can do within our power, we will do it as quickly as possible. If we can do it by 6:00 P.M. or 7:00 P.M., we will do whatever is necessary to do. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), no argument at all.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier give a commitment to this House that he will find out from the Prime Minister of Canada why they waited

two months without consulting with the Government of this Province? And would the Premier report back to this House as to the reason for that lack of consultation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Absolutely! Absolutely! We are in the process of doing that. I want to know. I have already called the Prime Minister's Office two days in a row. I was talking to him last night and again this morning. We will find out how come this information on overfishing especially was not made public, or made known to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, because that is not good enough! I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. We will find out if there is any way to find out, and we will let everybody know why, because I think it happened down in the bowels of the bureaucracy. That is where I think it happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

You know that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know. Let me speculate. I am allowed to speculate without being interfered with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It has been happening over the last few years. This has been going on in 1979 and 1980 and 1981. I do not blame the Prime

Minister of the day or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser), necessarily. Until I have the information, I do not know. We will find out why we were not informed in the last two months about the overfishing, and we will take whatever action we can under our jurisdiction, as it relates to taking judicial action or police investigation or whatever.

MR. MARSHALL:

There are no lapdogs over here.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the Premier aware that at a fisheries conference in Montreal on Sunday - I think it was Sunday; I got this from one of the Newfoundland participants - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) indicated that the cod stocks off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador are not growing as quickly as reports of the Government of Canada only a few months ago indicated that they believed they were? And is it possible that the reason that these fish stocks are not rebuilding to the extent that the most recent, glowing, fisheries reports indicated, which also indicated what the total allowable catch was likely to be over the next few years, is it possible that that slower growth in those fish stocks is because of overfishing by European countries?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It could be. But we have been arguing the point over the last two or three years, the very very same thing. I happened to be in my district one time last year or the year before when that new deal was made and I issued a statement at the time, both in writing and on radio, indicating that I was absolutely amazed that this new agreement was entered into, because what they were going to do was to stop the rate of growth of the Northern cod stocks from where we had thought it was going to be. The member of Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) will remember, in the document Setting a Course when he was Minister of Fisheries, that the rate of growth of the Northern cod stock and other stocks were suppose to be at a certain level. Now there is still a growth rate there, but it is a lower rate of growth than what was projected for it to be. That could very well be. I do not know, I am not a scientist, but it could very well be that one of the contributing factors to the reduction in the rate of growth of the Northern cod stock is this fishing both outside of the 200 mile limit and, in certain places, inside the 200 mile limit where they talk about non-surplus stocks. It is absolutely crazy. And I have said right from day one since I have been in politics that it is crazy. They really do not know.

NORDCO did a report on the fishery called Tis Well We Live off Fish.

MR. TULK:

'Tis Well We Live Only off Fish.'

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I forget the 'only.' In that report they make it clear. This is a scientific report which shows we do not have enough information

about some of the growth rates and some of the migratory patterns of the Northern cod, that more work needs to be done. So I agree; it could possibly be one of the contributing factors for the lesser rate of growth in the Northern cod stock. And all the more reason why we should take over that Nose and the Tail unilaterally, just go ahead and do it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. TULK:

You said you would give five minutes by leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will agree to five more minutes if everybody on my side is agreeable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). The minister will recall that I cautiously and prudently asked a series of questions last week about the labour dispute at Memorial University. I pointed out the uniqueness and unusualness of this particular labour dispute, and the

strike was rendered a futile weapon in this particular case. The minister indicated that things were well in hand. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that things are not well in hand. In view of the statements made by the union's president this morning, I am wondering what steps does the minister plans to take to prevent this labour dispute from manifesting itself into a very volatile and ugly situation?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that I do not think I used the expression 'it was well in hand'. I said at the time that negotiations were ongoing. In fact, they were at the time ongoing. I can inform him that at this very moment representatives of the union are in the offices of the Department of Labour discussing the dispute at Memorial University.

The hon. member will understand that, while I am fully aware of what is being discussed at all times, I am being briefed on it on a daily basis, I know what is being discussed, to state publicly what is being discussed in a labour dispute is just to prolong it and make it worsen. In good time, Mr. Speaker, he will know what is going on.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, again I point out the

unusualness of this particular strike, the circumstances surrounding the very nature of the institution of Memorial University, and agreements with the Medical School, the Health Sciences Complex, and all this kind of thing,, and, also, the students.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are concerned mainly with two groups of people; one, the workers, that their very just demands be met; and, secondly, that the students not be placed in an untenable, awkward position, as it looks like they may. Mr. Speaker, in view of these circumstances, would the minister not admit that his skill, his knowledge and his negotiating expertise is called upon more to bring about a quick and immediate resolution to this strike than to any other strike in the history of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, all labour disputes have certain unusual aspects to them. While this is a serious dispute, I am not sure that this particular dispute has any more unusual aspects to it than any other dispute. The hon. member talks about 'just' demands. He is making that pronouncement. We are not the people who decide whether demands are just or unjust. We try to mediate the dispute and bring about an agreement between the parties. That is precisely what is happening today.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister does not decide if something is just or unjust?

MR. BLANCHARD:

The courts decide that, Sir, whether it is just or unjust. We mediate the disputes, and the hon. member knows that very well, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member refers to the predicament the students are in. The students are innocent third parties here. I would remind the hon. member that this is a totally legal situation. The parties are exercising their rights under the law, and I am certain he would be denouncing my actions if I were to be unduly interfering. The Acting Deputy Minister is the person involved in the talks today, so the best expertise of the Department of Labour is there. Again, I repeat, I am being informed on it as events occur.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the hon. the Premier. Would he explain, for the information and satisfaction of the people of Labrador, the rationale behind his decision not to appoint a minister from Labrador?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
'To the satisfaction of the people of Labrador'. I do not know what it would take to meet that situation. That question is a very, very strange and unusual question to ask. The leader of a party which gains the majority of seats in an election decides upon

how to proceed with the formation of a cabinet. Obviously I am not going to justify my actions to the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) or think that suddenly everybody in Labrador wants to know this because he says so, or he asks the question. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador will judge that when the next election comes.

MR. KELLAND:  
That is absolutely correct, Mr. Premier, they certainly will.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:  
Order 3, Bill No. 14.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) adjourned the debate.

MR. FLIGHT:  
I have been looking forward to making a few words in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to congratulate the minister on his appointment to the ministry. He brings with him a great wealth of experience, eleven years as deputy minister having served five ministers and there is no question that that will auger well for labour relations in this Province.

However, I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the minister's opening remarks in introducing the legislation that he did not give



the credit for this particular piece of legislation where credit was due, which he knows full well is to his predecessor, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) who has since been demoted and relegated to a smaller office. Now the minister knows that during the election campaign the CBC had this minister on talking about the enlightened legislation that he is going to bring in and I am disappointed that the minister did not see fit to give credit where credit was due.

Mr. Speaker, this minister seems to want to take credit for new initiatives in labour, brings in two pieces of legislation that may indeed be enlightened legislation but if he wants to take credit for that, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to take the responsibility, or some of the responsibility, for what has happened to labour relations in this Province for the last eleven years. Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to tell this House, sooner or later, if he was aware, or if he advised the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), to write the Labour Relations Board and try to inflict his will on the Labour Relations Board. Now did the minister advise him to do that or did he advise him not to do it or did he write the letter? You know in the States today they call the president the teflon president, nothing sticks to him. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of most people this minister is fast becoming the teflon minister, nothing sticks. The minister can rest assured that some of the atrocious legislation that has passed through this House under which labour is labouring in this Province today is going to be stuck to the deputy minister, the

present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). Did the minister advise the former Minister of Labour, the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), to inject himself into the labour problems in Labrador City on the side of management? Did the minister in his role as former deputy minister, the top labour representative in this Province, advise the former minister to do that or did he advise him not to do it?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Ask him.

MR. FLIGHT:

I asked that minister when the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) was the deputy minister of Labour and the present minister might not have liked the answers that was given in this House by the then minister, the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn).

MR. PEACH:

Do not get all of that confused now.

MR. FLIGHT:

Do not worry about me getting it confused. I have been sitting here now for two weeks and I have been watching for three years and I have not seen the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) distinguish himself in a confused or unconfused way yet.

I want the minister's attention, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. landslide member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) would leave the Chamber for a moment.

I want to hear the minister's opinion when he gets back into the debate on the situation of management not being consulted.

We had an experience a few days ago that a spokesman for management in this Province was very put out because they were not consulted on this legislation. Now the minister says they were, the spokesman, Mr. Withers, say they were not. We want to know what is going on here, who is right and who is wrong? Mr. Speaker, maybe the new minister made his first slip and showed that some of the arrogance of his government is starting to rub off on him when he referred to Mr. Withers, the spokesman for management, as a Johnny-come-lately. That is going to be a great addition to labour relations in this Province.

MR. BARRY:  
That is bad.

MR. FLIGHT:  
It may be in keeping with the arrogance that is already starting to rub off because whether this minister likes it or not he was the deputy minister of an administration for eleven years that brought in the most atrocious labour relation legislation in this Province. It is this administration that have seen labour relations degenerate to the point it is in this Province and now this deputy minister is hoping that his experience over the years will give the impression of creating a new atmosphere. Well, actions will speak louder than words, Mr. Speaker, and those words a few days ago is not augering well for the new minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister a question which was referred to a few moments ago about the university. I recall a strike in this city with the support workers of vocational schools. This House closed some

time in late May, those helpless people, not very high profile, the lowest on the pay scales, and not very articulate, like the major units of NAPE, were left out to dry from May, when I left here, until November. Nobody cared. Where was the then minister, the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), in that situation, where was the then deputy minister, the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard)?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have shades of a similar situation. Here we have a strike going on at the university, 150 people, the lowest on the scale, not very high profile, picket lines very ineffective and they are forgotten, Mr. Speaker. Now the minister stands up today in Question Period and suggests that there is ongoing talks. I have to presume, if the minister is doing his job, or the former deputy minister is doing his job, he has been on top of that situation since day one and the strike has gone on for months now and I have to presume that there have been talks going on, so where has the minister been? He knows there are going to be ugly incidents on that picket line. Desperate situations cause desperate actions and those people are not getting any attention. What is going to happen is we are going to have students registering for a Spring semester soon and already there have been rumours that there may be problems there. We cannot afford that to happen. So let me ask the minister why he has not used his great skills, why he has not interceded?

Where has the President of Memorial University been in this strike? I get the impression, Mr. Minister, that the President of

the University wants to keep himself above this strike and yet the minister will tell us, I am sure, when he stands up, that the President of Memorial University is a first class arbitrator. He has been used to arbitrate labour situations in this Province, in Labrador. The President of Memorial University is a one man arbitration team. Now if he is so good, if he is so great at arbitrating, why is it that he cannot settle his own problems on the campus? Why? The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) is responsible for what goes on in labour in this Province and he is very aware of the role that the President of Memorial University is playing with regard to arbitration cases in this Province. And a fair question in my mind to put the Minister of Labour is, why is it, if he is such a great arbitrator, if he is valuable enough for the Cabinet of this government or the minister to involve him in settling an arbitration somewhere else in the Province, why is it that he wants to keep himself above his own strikes and his own labour problems?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Why did you not ask me in Question Period so I could answer you.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister will get a chance to answer when he stands up.

MR. J. CARTER:

Why not give him a chance now to answer. You do not care, do you?

MR. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister should start addressing himself to the real labour relations problems in this Province and not just stand up with platitudes. The

minister is in the very unenviable position of coming in and having to smooth out the ruffles that have been created by this administration and all the ministers he has been advising this past eleven years. As a matter of fact, if this minister is capable of walking in, telling that Cabinet what his views are and that he intends to see that those are the views that are carried, if he is capable of doing that, then he is going to effect the greatest conversion since Saul on the road to Damascus, because this is the worst labour related government that this Province has ever had and hopefully, now that there is a new minister, ever will have.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared for him to tell me how he felt as a Deputy Minister, but how does he feel as a minister about scab labour? How does he feel? There was a time, as the minister knows, that scabs were looked down on in this Province by labour management, but now scabs are becoming a profession in this Province. It is becoming fashionable to have scabs. One time, Mr. Speaker, if a man went to work in this Province and took another man's job as a scab, he was looked down on by all walks of life, all members of society. He was blacklisted forever from unions. But there now appears to be developing in this Province, and it comes as a result of the high rate of unemployment in this Province, where it is so difficult to make a living, it is very easy today in this Province to hire scabs. And that approach is wrecking havoc with labour relations, it makes for bad labour relations after a strike and when an agreement is settled, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear what the

minister's position is on some of the things that I raised here. And I want to know how the minister looks at what has been happening in this Province with regard to scab labour.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen strikes in this Province. The most recent strike, the Communications Workers of Canada strike, lasted seven months. People were badly hurt, management brought in their professional people, a very subtle way of bringing in scabs, and it probably cost them more to keep that company going with their professional people, their own management people, that it would have to settle. Millions of dollars spent to maintain those people in hotels all across Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the minister why we have the Rand formula. The minister did not come along finally today, walk in Cabinet and say, we should have the Rand formula. He had eleven years to ask his minister to bring in the Rand formula but he did not, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you what caused the Rand formula, Mr. Speaker, it was an issue in the communication workers' strike. And Dennis McDermott got on TV one night and, I suppose the minister shivered when he made the Newfoundland Department of Labour look sick, that after forty years, after his being Deputy Minister for eleven, after every labour group in the Province recommended over and over again that we have the Rand formula, after having used five ministers, and suddenly he was now the minister and no Rand formula. He rushed down, Mr. Speaker, and he made a call and said we will bring in the Rand formula, great enlightened legislation, after Dennis McDermott made him realize just

how slack and how loose and how uncaring the Department of Labour have been in this Province. Scab labour is scab labour, Mr. Speaker. It can be very subtle, but when worker's jobs are done by other people, it makes the situation difficult. The Department of Public Works - the minister is sitting there - loaned boiler operators to the university. It had to be. There were certain circumstances. Those boiler operators were brought into the city, brought in from other parts to St. John's, put up in hotels, but it had the effect, Mr. Speaker - a very subtle form of scab labour - it had the effect of making the lot easier for management. Why, instead of providing that kind of solution, why instead of providing boiler operators from outside of St. John's, paid for out of the public treasury, why did the minister not use his negotiating skills to say to the people who are making that request, 'No, the boilers will be kept and maintained but you people are going to negotiate.'

MR. YOUNG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

I think it should be clear, for the record, that these people who are supplying the services to the university are not being paid out of the public treasury. They are being paid by the university. Indirectly it may be out of the Public Treasury, but they are not employees with the Department of Public Works and Services after hours.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, anyone who believes that any money paid out of Memorial University is not being paid out of the public treasury should not be holding down a Cabinet position in this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) has the responsibility of providing boiler operators there. I am not saying that there is anything wrong with it, I am saying it was a step taken when instead you could have been negotiating.

MR. YOUNG:

Address the Chair, do not go pointing at me, address the Chair.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is fine. The minister can talk to the Chair when he is standing up on points of order.

MR. YOUNG:

I did, I would not look at you anyway.

MR. BARRY:

Ignore him, 'Graham'.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the communications strike. There were people in this Province, well-meaning people and understanding people who are saying, 'Look, Bell Canada, the great Bell, is directing traffic in this strike.' Of course, we heard the President of the Newfoundland Telephone Company saying, 'No, this is an indigenous strike, this is simply a strike again Newfoundland Telephone.' And he kept that up for seven months. But there are a lot of people saying, Mr. Speaker, that Bell Canada was indeed directing

traffic because their intentions were to break this union in Newfoundland. If they could have broke it, they would set a precedent for the negotiations upcoming in Ontario and Quebec. Now, the minister in answering a question a few minutes ago talked about just and unjust. Is it not the minister's position in this Province, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), to determine whether undue pressure, undue outside forces, is being brought to bear on workers in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, it is significant, if it can be proven, that Bell Canada did, indeed, have that alternative motive. It is very coincidental that within a month after the settlement of that seven month strike that they settled with their workers in Ontario and Quebec with no strike. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour or the Deputy Minister of Labour would have recognized that kind of outside pressure and made his feelings known.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister his opinion on the unionizing of oil rigs. What is the minister's position? Should the workers on our offshore oil rigs, and there are going to be more and more, be given the right to unionize? Are they not entitled to collective bargaining? I want the minister to address these issues because he knows full well, based on his experience as Deputy Minister, what has been going on with regards to labour relations in the offshore this past three or four years.

The one argument I would make for having those oil rigs unionized,

Mr. Speaker, is safety. The minister knows, in all his long years of being in labour relations, that the safety of the workers is one of the prime concerns of a union. Our underground mines in Newfoundland today - Buchans and Bell Island are long closed, but Labrador City - the safety standards that we see in those mines is not a result of management saying that we have to do this. It is a result of the unions. It is a result of their labour spokesmen. It is a result of being organized. It is a result of demanding safe and fair working conditions on the job site. I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that most people see that as the biggest benefit that would come if the offshore workers had a right to unionize and organize themselves. As a matter of fact, referring to that, in front of the Ocean Ranger inquiry a professional from Norway, I think it was, made that recommendation. He said that one of the benefits that would come from allowing our offshore workers to unionize is a greater emphasis on safety. The minister should know, based on our immediate past history, we cannot leave the safety of our offshore workers in the hands of management or, indeed, in the hands of any of the agencies set up and now taking responsibility for that area. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the minister, when he stands up, tell this House and thereby give a signal to the people who are working and will be working on our offshore rigs, where he stands on unionizing, particularly for the reasons I have given him, and for other reasons.

Mr. Speaker, we have another strike ongoing in this Province, the brewery workers. I am told, from very good sources, that the

brewery workers intended to come to Confederation Building to demonstrate, which they are entitled to do, to draw some public attention to their predicament. And I am told that they received a phone call from a very high place person in government that they should not do that, it was not in their best interest. Who made the call? Did the minister make the call.

MR. BLANCHARD:

No.

MR. FLIGHT:

Did the Deputy Minister make the call? Did the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), who looks after the Confederation Building, make the call? Why was the call made? What purpose would it have served if members of a union wanted to come up to Confederation Building and have a demonstration?

MR. BARRY:

What is wrong with it?

MR. FLIGHT:

What is wrong with it? What was to be gained? I have not heard the minister address himself to that strike yet. He has had ample opportunity. This is what I am doing, I am raising concerns and issues that I want to see him address himself to. I presume he will tell the House why the rights of members of a union, who simply thought they might come up and demonstrate and thereby draw public attention to their plight, why they were denied access to the Confederation Building, why they were threatened and told they should not do that, do not do that. What purpose did it serve? Who called? That is the question too, Mr. Speaker. Who took it upon himself? That is the

minister's responsibility. Who took it upon himself to make a call to tell the representatives of those workers that they could not come to the Confederation Building to do what they saw was in their best interest to focus attention on their position?

MR. BLANCHARD:

You have it out of context.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, we will get it in context when the minister gets into debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT:

I would hoped that the minister had not ever been aware that that call was made, but he was aware. He apparently condoned it. A union in this Province was told not to come to Confederation Building. Why? What was the motive? The minister will put it all in context.

MR. BUTT:

You are making a fool of yourself again.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, the minister of weather, who got appointed to the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier put him in a backbench, in the seat that the Whip sits in, that tells you how that minister is seen in the eyes of the Premier.

MR. TULK:

He just did not want somebody else crossing the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister is the person who is making a fool of himself by even drawing attention to himself.

MR. TULK:

That is right. He should hide underneath his seat.

MR. FLIGHT:

He should not even draw attention to himself.

MR. TULK:

You should hide underneath your seat.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go on, you are cracked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

The teachers situation in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the NTA. You know it is a favourite old trick of the Premier and the Department of Labour and The Ministry to try to - when you get a group in like the teachers who articulate and can present their own views on things - isolate them. I do not know if the minister was party to what happened during the election and prior to the election where the teachers were put out there and it was said it is us against them and that kind of thing. We cannot afford them. Mr. Speaker, the minister should know this. The problem with the Newfoundland teachers is not the money they are being paid, it is not the wages, that is not the issue. They do not feel like they are being treated professionally. They do not want the atmosphere that has been set up in this Province by this particular administration.

MR. REID:

They did not act professionally.

MR. TULK:

Did you hear that?

MR. FLIGHT:

They have been treated arrogantly. They have been treated without dignity.

MR. TULK:

Did you hear old conflict of interest?

MR. FLIGHT:

They are professional and they have not been recognized, they have been ignored. Mr. Speaker, it is criminal the atmosphere that has been set up between the teachers, the NTA, and this administration. And the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) looks on, and I say to him that his problem with the teachers will not be because the Treasury cannot afford to pay them any extra wages. His problem with the teachers will be proving to them that his administration respects them, that there is even a shred of respect for their profession.

MR. TULK:

Treat them with human dignity.

MR. FLIGHT:

Try to treat them with human dignity. That is what his problem is going to be. Well, he will be another minister who will create a conversion in this Province.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have notice that my time is gone, which is acceptable. But we will look forward now to hearing the hon. minister. What is his name over there?

MR. TULK:

What is his name? Conflict of interest.

MR. FLIGHT:

No. What is his district?

MR. TULK:

Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am sure now, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), who did his best to distract me and get my attention, I am sure he will be up now in a few minutes giving us his versions of what is wrong with labour relations in this Province. What can be done, or where the minister stands. I am sure he will.

MR. TULK:

No, he will not get out of his seat.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will listen in silence. If he had any dignity or decency that is what he should do. Obviously, he has neither dignity nor decency or he would not be interrupting the way he is. But I will sit and listen in silence to him the first time I hear him on the floor.

MR. REID:

Why do you not stay quiet once in a while?

MR. TULK:

He will not get up. You will not get him out of his seat, it is impossible.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would only wish, Mr. Speaker, that that the member's constituency could see him here.

MR. TULK:

A blob on the chair.

MR. REID:

They see me out in the district that is just as good. They see me quite often over the year.



MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DINN:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) speaks up, because I want to tell the Minister of Mines and Energy something. There was a feeling around this Province that this is a part of a grand design. That the present minister wanted his job, the Minister of Mines and Energy's job. And how did he get it? Feed them the worst legislation that could ever be brought into this House and put them into positions that were untenable where the Premier would have no choice but to flick him out. And, Mr. Speaker, there are some people who think, maybe in a light-hearted way, that the deputy minister was setting the minister up, and we would not expect him to recognize it. He would have not recognized if he was getting set up, Mr. Speaker, and the world unfolds, the deputy minister is sitting there. My Lord, if the minister only knew how bad that man made him look over the two or three years with labour.

Mr. Speaker, I will look forward to the minister's participation in this debate. I look forward to him closing it. And with that, Sir, I thank the Speaker for my chance to participate in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Greening):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a remarkable piece of

legislation. It is going to be even more remarkable that on this occasion I will be able to support all four clauses of the bill, both in principle and in detail. That is probably a long time coming in terms of a piece of labour legislation. But I think we owe a certain responsibility to the people of the Province to be truthful when we speak, and quite frankly if the devil does do good works, I think you have to give the devil his due, and I would certainly have to in this piece of legislation, because I think that all four sections of the bill are appropriate, useful, and will help considerably in terms of organizing the disorganized in this Province. It will in the long run, I think, be in the best interest to the people of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

I would also like to thank the former minister, primarily, who is responsible. I do not mean to take too much credit away from the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), but after all these things were announced, I think, three days before the election or four days before the election. I think there may be some coincidence between the time they were announced and when the election was held. But they were announced then and it was obvious that the previous minister was involved in it, although, since the present minister was the deputy minister at that time, I think we can see his fine hand in the initial stages as well.

I am extremely pleased to hear that there is a proposal to change the section on the vote in order

to get certification to the 70 per cent quorum. I have some specific suggestions about that, because I am still not quite clear on it, but I will get to that a little later.

Going over the ones that I do not think there is any disagreement on, because, as I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) agree with all, I think, except clause 1, which is the one on the right of the Labour Relations Board to hold its own hearings. Just going over them quickly, I do not think anything else could be added to the excellent lecture we got from the Leader of the Opposition on the Rnad formula, its origins, and its history. I think we all now know it is over forty years old and that it is a long-established method of having justice in the bargaining unit, while, at the same time, not forcing people to join a union which they may not wish to join.

I think it should be pointed out, though, that it is not the strongest form of union security. It is a good form, but it is not the strongest, and it is far away from what exists in a lot of other collective agreements in this Province today.

The first contract provision, I think, is important. As a matter of fact, the more I looked at the bill the more I was reminded of the telephone strike that was held last year. And I must echo some of the sentiments expressed by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) in that I think we have learned some lessons from that strike, and I think that labour dispute has taught us a number of things, which are probably quite helpful. The first contract provisions, of course, would allow

an arbitrated settlement when there does not seem to be any possibility of a settlement occurring. I would like to point out, however, that this is a two-edged sword, cutting both for the bargaining agent and the employer. I think in the case of the telephone workers' strike it is quite possible that if this had been invoked after, say, two months they might not have accomplished everything they did in that strike. So let us not look on it as an unalloyed gain for the labour movement. In some instances, a weak employer, for example, may be helped by this particular provision as well. So it does cut both ways and I think we should be careful about that.

The specific question on the 70 per cent quorum, and I have not seen the amendment, is really the 69 per cent question, and that is, if only 69 per cent of the bargaining unit vote in a certification vote, and if every single of them vote for it, does that mean that vote does not count? That it is thrown out? I just throw that out to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) because I think he should be careful that if the previous rule of 'a majority of the bargaining unit' were to be beneficial, then in the case of a less than 70 per cent vote, that should apply.

Getting back to the part that is in dispute. I was reading through Hansard, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and, if I recall correctly, he said, talking about the provision of the Labour Relations Boards to be able to hold its own hearings, 'It is not unnecessary in terms of the party who is asking for the hearing because when they make the request for the hearing, the party

believes it is necessary or they would not be making the request.' Later on in Hansard he is reported to have said, 'But I am not satisfied, from what I have heard yet, that we should go along with this first clause.' So I am taking it there is initial opposition from the Leader of the Opposition but that he is willing to listen to argument, and this is the argument I would like to put forward. I hope he can read it in Hansard, since he does not appear to be in his seat. He might be in the lounge, or whatever.

I decided, having seen that was the issue in dispute, that perhaps some research should be done on it. I was fortunate enough to talk to two organizations which have been directly connected with this particular section, the idea that the Labour Relations Board is in a position where it can decide to hold a hearing or not hold a hearing. The first people I talked to were the bargaining agents for the telephone workers' employees, the Communication Workers of Canada, and they informed me that this would have been somewhat helpful to them since, in the two big bargaining units that they signed up, the telephone operators and the trades group, they applied for certification for that group in February, 1983, and only got it in August, 1983, a delay of six months. As over 90 per cent of the members of that bargaining unit signed up at the time, the application should have gone through very quickly. Unfortunately, over six months elapsed, and a lot of that was in unnecessary hearings called by the employer in order to delay, and delay and delay. We point out that perhaps the poor level of trust that existed during the

bargaining may be a direct fact that the bargaining agent had to go through this inordinately difficult process in order to get certified.

I am reminded, by the way, that back in 1957-58, when the IWA started signing up loggers, it also took something like sixteen or eighteen months to get certified. I think it is generally a bad sign in labour relations when it takes a long time for a bargaining agent to be signed up, even when an overwhelming number of the employees in the bargaining unit have signified it.

The clerical group was even worse. The application went in in April, 1983, and it was January of 1984, a full eight months, before the certification came back. Again, hearings called by the employer, in most cases unnecessary, dragged it out, and dragged it out. If the Labour Relations Board could have told them no, you do not have a hearing, this is what the ruling is, then we might have gotten that started much earlier and we may not have had all the misery we had as a result of it.

The other source was the Labour Relations Board itself. I talked to unnamed officials there who were quite helpful. They indicated that prior to the ruling that was made four years ago, anybody who demanded a hearing could get one, that the Board used to meet about two days a month, and that two days a month was enough to hear the contentious issues that were brought before it. When the court case came and gave all litigants, or all parties to the dispute, the right to call a board hearing, or to demand a

board hearing, the amount of work by the board went up and up and up. As a matter of fact, this May they expect to have twelve days of hearings scheduled - this is a sixfold increase over what it was four years ago - and most of the cases are brought by the employer, indeed, almost all the cases are brought by the employer, not because they have any substantive grounds to argue on, but because they wish to delay the process by which the union is certified, and they want to delay the process by which collective bargaining will start.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Full-time boards.

MR. FENWICK:

I stand to be corrected on this, but I believe Ontario, and maybe Quebec, are the only Provinces which do have a full-time board. All the rest of the provinces seem to see that a part-time is sufficient as long as you have proper legislation.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That will solve that problem.

MR. FENWICK:

According to the Labour Relations Board, the way in which the cases are decided, and the things that are in dispute, are not really whether they should be the agent or not, usually that is not part of the argument. The argument usually is, is this a confidential secretary, and should she be included? If this is a management person, should he be included, and so on. And there are an infinite number or precedents for the board to work on, and, indeed, they try to be consistent in what they are doing. In most cases the decision is almost automatic, bang, bang, bang, these people are in, bang,

bang, bang, these people are out, and there is really no cause for all these hearings that take place.

As a matter of fact, my informant at the Labour Relations Board told me that in the last four year there have been 100 hearings or more that should not have been held because there was no substantive grounds for them, but, unfortunately, the Labour Relations Board was unable to refuse to hear them because of that particular court case.

The minimum delay is six weeks when a bargaining agent goes and applies for it. Sometimes it is a full two months before they get a chance to have their hearing, before they get a change to their certification order, and in the case of the communication workers, it was six or eight months before they got their order. Originally, two or three weeks, four weeks at the maximum, would be required before the certification order would be returned.

By the way, there has been some suggestion here that while some of these are very important cases, like unfair labour practices. In the the unfair labour cases, and I agree they are extremely important because that is an attempt to break down the entire system, by either the employer or the members of the bargaining group, virtually all those cases went to hearings. So we are not talking about important cases being denied, all we are talking about are a few minor instances where there is an argument about one or two people involved in the bargaining unit.

I hope what I have had to say will be listened to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and I hope he will change his opposition

to that particular clause, or his tentative opposition, because I did not hear it being a permanent opposition. I hope he will realize that this is a progressive piece of legislation. It is needed, there is cause for it, and it will allow bargaining units to be set up earlier.

Before I finish what I have to say on the bill, I do not have a huge lot more, what I would like to do is point out what I think should be added to the Labour Relations Act as well. Although I agree with the four pieces here, we are not going to create a labour heaven as a result of it. There are still major holes, shall we say, in our Labour Relations Act that will have to be plugged, or major provisions that will have to be strengthened. I am going to suggest a couple of them here.

I suggest to the Minister of Labour, and I am sure he has already had representation from individuals as a result of it, but I want to suggest it again in this public forum, the one I want to see is some strengthening of the successor rights clause in the Labour Relations Act and the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. What I mean by that is that we have, unfortunately, a tendency for this provincial government, and for other employers, to enter into a new era of labour negotiations by contracting out some of the work or the services that apply to their particular companies - the government has an onerous habit of contracting out its cleaning services, in a lot of cases - and because we do not have the appropriate successor rights legislation, in most cases those jobs cannot be unionized because of the extreme difficulty of

following the succession of employers that these cleaners, for example, would have year after year after year. I do not know what the status of the cleaners is at Confederation Building, I have not really asked them. I think I should, but I would probably suggest that they, too, work for contractors who have had the work contracted out. I hope not, because I think contracting out is one of the most despicable practices that can possibly be done; it destroys the strength of the labour movement and it allows people to be working at minimum wage for almost indefinite periods of time.

By the way, it also, I think, leads up to the kind of thing we have seen with the fisheries observers. If you contract the work out, and you do not know who is going to get the contract from year to year, there is a tendency to not have as professional a staff as there would be if they were directly employed by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

I challenge this provincial government to put some sort of provisions into the Labour Relations Act and into the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, so that their own cleaners, who clean the provincial buildings across the Province, who clean all the vocational schools, can eventually join a union and enjoy union security as well. What happens now, as the successor right clause says, is if you do not sell the pots and the pails and the mops and so on, from one employer to another, it is not considered to be a successor under the Labour Relations Act and, as a result, the certification is no longer valid and the union would have to sign all the members up

again and have to apply to the Labour Relations Board again. And, as a result, it has become impossible for the cleaners who do the cleaning of all the government buildings in this Province to become unionized and to avail of the benefits that are there. So, as a result, they end up at minimum wage with no benefits, no pensions and very few of the things that we take for granted and we think the public employees and all employees in our Province should enjoy.

The other area - and I suggest it also to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) - is some way must be found to bring into collective bargaining very small bargaining units. I am talking three or four people who work at the corner store. One of the problems we have is that they can be signed up now, a certification order can be gone for, they can negotiate a collective agreement, there is no real structural impediment there. The only problem is in practice it will not work. For a bargaining agent to try to negotiate on behalf of three corner store employees is an untenable situation. It costs so much for the wages, and so on, and the contract has to be renewed every three years, or whatever the lapse of it is, and it becomes very expensive. No bargaining agent, no union that we know of, has the resources in order to go ahead and do that. What I am suggesting - and I know there are some provisions that are close to it - but I am suggesting that we should have some way of grouping them together, so if all the retail clerks in St. John's, for example, were to join a union piecemeal, one store at a time, when they were all joined up in a reasonable group by the bargaining agent,

then they could enter into collective bargaining with a federation of employers. And the federation of employers would have to enter into negotiations, not voluntarily, as I understand the labour law now calls for once they were picked up. I think this is the only way we are going to get away from the idea that people in groups like that continue to work at the minimum wage, continue to receive few benefits, and so on.

So I suggest those two things: one, the strengthening of the successor rights legislation, so that we do not end up forcing all government employees who work for contractors within buildings, for example, to work for the minimum wage for the rest of their lives, and some way, to bring in that other half of the work force in our Province who are not unionized and, as a result, are working at much lower wages and conditions than the unionized half. I think that most trade unionists that I have talked to also feel very badly about that.

The only thing wrong, in my opinion, with trade unions is the fact that they do not cover 100 per cent of the work force. If they did, then the lowest in our society would be able to have their voices heard and their situation would be improved as a result. So I am suggesting those as the two other improvements that I think should be coming through, as well.

I look forward to discussing with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) in the future, how maybe these very progressive pieces of legislation can be amended, as well.

I do not want to go over the past

sources of difficulty with the government opposite but I think I should at least mention them, just to say that even though I think they are good improvements, I must echo, to a certain extent, although I do not want to do it too loudly, the official Opposition's contention that there has been a series of bad pieces of labour legislation, most notably, Bill 59, Bill 111 before that, and Bill 37 that we saw last Fall, all of which I think were pretty unfortunate pieces of legislation; they indicated a bias against labour that I hope is being changed with this particular piece of legislation. I did not really feel that I could give all flowers without a few thorns thrown in at the same time and, quite frankly, those were thorns.

The last comment I want to make before I sit down - quite frankly, I was hoping to make this speech last Thursday, right after the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made his speech on it. I was at that point, quite frankly, boiling, listening to what I consider to be some of the most anti-union comments that I have ever heard in my life in this Legislative Chamber, where he started calling into question the integrity of labour union leaders in this entire Province. I was willing to get up and jump all up and down him and call him the most right wing Liberal leader that I have ever heard - not to malign that party, for which I have some admiration, and I decided that that was not good enough, that he deserved a much worse fate than that. So all I did was I took off the copy of Hansard, I xeroxed it and sent it to every labour union in the Province, and I think you will discover what they think of it later on.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on this bill. As the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) said, as he sat down, it is a bit of progressive legislation which I believe is very much a measure of progressive legislation.

The Throne Speech stated that we wanted to improve the climate of labour relations in this Province. I would hope that the rapidity with which we introduced this bill in the House of Assembly is an indication of this and our desire to accomplish it, and I think it most certainly will.

I think it should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that it comes, to speak quite frankly, on the heels of an election when a large element of the labour movement in this Province, I suppose as is to be expected, very vigorously supported the party to which the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) belongs. There was a certain climate in that particular election which, quite frankly, I think we would all hope we would not have occasion to see again. It was an election, as I think back on it, in which the leader of the Province, the Premier, and I would say the same would apply to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), to any member in the House, indeed, to anybody wishing to hold a meeting anywhere in this Province of Newfoundland, ought to be able to hold it without the harassment which we, regrettably,

saw in that last election. And I am not casting the blame specifically to people, but I think it resulted out of the large amount of acrimony that had been created. We saw a situation where, in one part of this Province, the Premier was assaulted. In another part of the Province he was denied the right to speak, and in most other places, heckled and jabbed with signs and what have you. By the way, I want to say we got in that last election a terrific majority when you consider all of the circumstances. We have a twenty seat majority in a fifty-two seat House, we have the second largest majority that has been attained in the six Progressive Conservative administrations, and that was a considerable feat when one considers the circumstances in which we had to operate, where you had, regrettably, wage freezes for causes beyond our concern and other measures that we had to take which were deemed to be unpopular. We achieved and attained throughout the Province a popular vote of close to 50 per cent - it was 48 per cent. A 50 per cent popular vote was quite sufficient throughout Canada to grant Mr. Mulroney a landslide. So, after a very difficult election campaign, and let there be no mistake about it, we govern this Province with a large, large endorsement from the people of this Province and we will react accordingly.

Now, one of the things that we wish to do is to improve the climate of labour relations in this Province. We have moved very rapidly with respect to it in this bill and the other bill that is on the Order Paper, the one to be considered immediately after this, that is in the name of the

Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, we have to improve the labour climate in this Province if we are to attain what has to be attained in this Province. Within the next two or three years, it could very well be in contemporary times, we are going to find out whether or not this Province can really work, whether it is in fact going to be able to work at all. In order to do this one of the main things that has to be achieved is a partnership between labour and capital, and there really has to be that partnership which is going to work together for the development of this Province, with the federal and the provincial governments working alongside all of the various interests to achieve this as well. The function of any government at any particular time - this government, a Liberal government, an NDP government or whatever you have - must always be to balance interests. Balance the interests, in this case, between business and labour or between capital and labour, to balance social interests and economic interests and cultural issues and that is what we are attempting to do. It has not been too easy, Mr. Speaker, and it will not be easy to do in the future because of the adverse economic conditions which we are experiencing. It has been extremely difficult to hold and maintain this balance with the economic conditions that we have had. We have had to take measures from time to time, and when we take measures you get polarized positions of one side on the other. When we bring in a measure such as this, which we weighed out very carefully - the previous Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the Cabinet and this government - it is a measure



of this government itself that we -

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) or down the road  
(inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not mind interjections, but I do not like to speak over jackasses.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, when we took a measure like that, the immediate rejoinder which we got was one where industry, the so-called representatives of industry, made what I consider to be regrettable comments in the paper, because all that does is polarizes certain situations about lack of consultations, which there was not. There was full and complete consultation with industry and there will be in the future, and there was and will be full and complete consultation with the labour movement. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of balancing interests in the government, it is not a matter of taking sides. On the one hand you can never please everybody. The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), even though he supported the bill and was complimentary had to throw a few thorns, which you would expect. One of the thorns that he injected into it was Bill 37. If we had it to do again, Mr. Speaker, the choice between enacting Bill 37, preserving the jobs in Bowater and the whole West Coast of this Province, we would introduce Bill 37 all over again because what Bill 37 did, amongst other measures which we took, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentleman wishes to admit it or not, was preserve the whole West

Coast of this Province.

As I say, the next few years in this Province are going to be critical ones and they are going to be ones where we are going to have to be competitive when it comes to wages with respect to labour vis-a-vis ours and wages in other areas. We are going to have to be competitive in industry. We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, now with the new developments that are hopefully on the threshold, and confidently we are on the threshold of a new development in the offshore, and in order to capture the optimum benefits for the people of this Province we have to be competitive. The other day I was reading about an instance - it is almost deja vu in some respects - in a brochure Government House put out on the building of Government House in the 1700s. At that the particular time our own Government House had to be built by people from Scotland because apparently they could not get the competitive work force here and they did not have the expertise here to build it. I would hope that with the new industry which is coming into this Province that we will be able to see a much different situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, within the next week or so - before I get further into the bill because I do not want to speak too long on it - but next Wednesday there will be filed with the Environmental Review Panel an Environmental Impact Statement from the Mobil Corporation with respect to the development of Hibernia. When it is put before the panel, the panel is going to deal with it in accordance with the rules, regulations and guidelines that have been set down, and I will not get into at the present time. The

fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that that will be the first demonstrable step by the operator moving towards the development of Hibernia. I think all members of this House would agree upon reflection that one of the main things that we have to achieve in this Province, insofar as it possibly can be, as we approach that development is a degree of harmony, harmony in labour relations, harmony with industry, and working as hard as we can to preserve the benefits which we have attained through the Atlantic Accord and seeing these benefits translated into reality for the people of this Province.

As far as the bill goes itself, I do not think there is much that I can add to it, it would just be repetition of what has already been said.

You talk about balancing interests. I thought that this was rather regrettable. In my opinion I do not think the Rand formula should ever have had to be legislated in this Province. It should have been recognized really as a basic right. The problem and the reason why it finds itself in the presence of legislation was in the telephone company dispute where the telephone company, I thought very obstinately without really any forethought, refused to recognize it for one of the units.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why could you not say that during the strike?

MR. MARSHALL:

Because you cannot say that, neither can a Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, make those points during a strike because if you do that you are going to have utter

chaos. You make your points as you observe what happens, as happened in that particular case and the then Minister of Labour and the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the government of this Province determined that that situation should not prevail again, there should not be an opportunity for it again; consequently, we have enacted the Rand formula into legislation. It is the same way with the provision that a first agreement would be imposed because it is very difficult in the first instances, and we have found this from practice and from experience, that there are some cases where, unjustifiably, it is very difficult for a union to obtain a first collective agreement. We have provided for it here.

We have also provided for the matter of the 70 per cent quorum in the event of a vote. It is my understanding of the situation that the rule applies which normally would have to apply anyway, and that is that in order for a union or any group to purport to represent any unit or any group of people they have to represent the majority in the unit and this is determined by procedures under the Labour Relations Act. But when it comes to the matter of the actual vote, when an actual vote is called, one is not always called but when it has to be called, companies operate in a certain way with respect to their organization, which is known under law, that if you call a special meeting for a special purpose you do not have to get 100 per cent of the members voting for a particular change, a constitutional change or a new arrangement. You have to get what is called a special resolution, which is 75 per cent. So in this

particular case, where there is a meeting the quorum is 70 per cent for it to go through. It is a reasonable one, it is one brought in by the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), it is one that he has had brought very forcibly to our attention. I can say right here and now that the executive council of government, the Cabinet of government, has been greatly strengthened by the presence of the present Minister of Labour who is able to give us a perspective on these situations as we try to balance the interests of labour and industry and we try to improve the climate of labour relations in this Province. He brings to this a number of years of experience, a great deal of respect from the labour unions in the Province, the labour movement generally, and he also, of course, has a great deal of respect from his colleagues in the Cabinet. So I am very glad to see that the first piece of legislation of this government, which governs today by a very substantial majority after a very tremendous, significant win, if you consider all of the circumstances, with a twenty seat majority in a fifty-two seat House, with only one or one and a half percentage points less than the landslide victory enjoyed by the Prime Minister of Canada, I am very happy to see that the first measure brought in by this government has been a measure to improve the climate of labour relations in this Province, brought in by a person who is very well respected in the labour movement, by a person who is going to strengthen the front benches of this government very much as we move in the weeks, months and years ahead to realize the full promise of Confederation that has been denied to us over the past thirty-six years, but which has

been attained by this government in one respect and only in one area at the present time, we are working on others, in the situation with respect to the offshore. We have made significant inroads in that direction and in the fishing industry. There are more to be made and we will make more inroads with respect to our other resource on the Upper Churchill, but at the present time we have, we are facing, we are on the threshold of a real development in this Province in Hibernia. We have attained this from the rights under the Atlantic Accord. Rights are one thing, but to exercise them and enjoy them is something else. And that is what we are moving into now, the implementation of the Atlantic Accord. What we are doing with respect to that is we have taken steps to set up the board, that is ongoing. We have taken steps with respect to the legislation, that is ongoing. We have taken steps to enter into negotiations with Mobil with respect to the fiscal regime and the mode of development which we and only we are going to be able to decide from a governmental point of view. All these things are ongoing and all these things will be reported in due time, and most of them in near time, to this House. Last but not least, one of the major hurdles that we have to surmount for the sake of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as we approach this development is to have a situation and to have an atmosphere in this Province where there are good labour relations, where labour and capital, or labour and industry, whichever way you describe it, are working in true partnership for the mutual benefit of everybody in this Province. And the government of this Province is fully

committed to this. As I say, any government in order to be able to govern properly, and particularly as we approach these critical areas of time, has to be well aware of the necessity of the very delicate balance that must be maintained in these areas. And I think it is very, very unfortunate that we have found ourselves in the situation we even have to talk about improving the climate of labour relations. I do not want to get into the past, the near term or the far term, but I want to say that the difficulties that have been caused, and obviously there have been difficulties, be it with the teachers, the labour movement, or whatever, it has been caused by one reason and one reason only, and that is because of the fact that we lack the resources and we lack the money to be able to respond to the legitimate demands of labour, in the public service sector particularly and more particularly in the lower echelons of the public service. It comes down to a matter of money and it has been aggravated completely. The fact of the matter is, and I would also like in this, my first speech of this session to the Assembly, to note as well that the government, and particularly the Premier has been tarred as being arrogant. When you get down to it and ask people why they think he is arrogant, the bottom line usually, whether it be teachers or the labour movement, the bottom line comes down to the fact that this government has had to turn around and say, we just have not got the money. We do not deny the fact that there should be more pay for these various groups. We do not deny the fact that they are getting paid, in many cases, less than their counterparts in other parts of Canada, but the resources

of this Province just does not permit more. And when you try to deal with these problems, and the person's individual problem is very acute, and it is particularly acute if you happen to be a public servant in a middle management area with skyrocketing inflation, frozen wages, low wages comparable to anyone else. We know and we can appreciate that particular situation that they find themselves in. The reason for it is that we do not have the resources. It is not that this government has ever been unsympathetic to labour and to the labour movement.

So I am, as I say, very happy to see a bill of this nature which goes to improve industrial relations. Next week as we move into the business of the Environmental Impact Statement being presented to the panel. By the way, as part of the exhibition the rights we negotiated under the Atlantic Accord, people should not expect to see the report come down on one side or the other as far as the developer is concerned as between concrete platforms and floating platforms. I have not seen the report, but they have been directed to come in with both modes so that there can be full information given to the general public. In August, Mobil will come in with its preferred course. In the meantime we will be talking with them and negotiating with them.

So I would hope that the labour movement and all interest groups in this Province will put their positions before this panel. But I think the big thing is that we have to sit down and we have to reflect soberly on the fact that this is the legitimate government of this Province, it is a

government that has a tremendous majority of twenty seats. A twenty seat majority in a fifty-two seat House is a pretty substantial majority. Even if it were forty-six per cent, it happened to be forty-eight, but even if it were forty-six that would only be four percentage points behind Mr. Mulroney's 50 per cent in all of Canada which gave him a landslide. A few percentage points one way or the other would have meant more seats one way or the other. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to realize it or not, we have a substantial majority and what we are using this majority for, our first step, is to turn around and say, 'Look, the Province of Newfoundland in the next two or three years is going to find out whether it is going to work or not, whether it is going to work on the basis of the development of its resources or whether or not we are going to be condemned forever and a day to the type of government that that the hon. gentlemen there opposite love; which is one of welfare and handouts from Ottawa. But in order to achieve that and to achieve it on the basis of our resources, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the old Newfoundland saying is, 'We all have to pull together.' And now, moreso that ever before, it is important in the interests of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, not just of the labour movement, that we be able to have an improved labour relations climate, that there be a partnership between capitalism and labour, and that we all bend our will towards seeing whether the resources which we have obtained the rights to and those which I am confident we will obtain even

further rights to apart from the offshore, can be employed in such a way that we can preserve jobs and have a bigger labour movement in this Province, to preserve jobs and prevent the leakage of people, as in forefathers' time, to the Boston States and to Toronto and to Fort McMurray in recent years.

So I look forward to this session of the House, Mr. Speaker. I want to, in conclusion, congratulate the minister for bringing in this bill, and his predecessor on my immediate right for bringing the bill before the government in the first instance. I want to compliment the present minister and just point out that he is newly elected, he is a new minister, he has very much enhanced this government and I think that this particular bill, and particularly the amendment that he intends to lead in Committee, shows it moreso than anything else. I feel that under his leadership, with the confidence that labour has in him, we can get down to the business at hand, which is development, in the only type of climate that can see true and proper development and that is a climate not of acrimony but of all sectors and segments of this Province working together and showing that we can really do it and, now for the first time, we have a chance to do it from our own resources.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Before recognizing the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) I would like to inform the House that I have received three notices for debate at 5:30

p.m. when the motion for adjournment will be deemed before the House.

The first question is to the Premier on the Chetwynd gold deposit and it is by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Warren). The second question is to the Premier about the UIC benefits expiring on May 15 and it is by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). And the third question is to the Premier by the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and it is about the appointment of a minister for Labrador.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to wish the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) good luck in his new position. I sincerely wish him good luck because he certainly has enough problems to handle and I hope, Sir, you solve most of them.

I was glad to hear the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) say he wanted to see a new climate created because right now the climate out there, and for the past number of years, has not been very good. I worked in that climate, as we all have probably, and it has been deteriorating for a long time. Now whoever's fault that is, I mean, a combination of whatever. Out there, you have to have respect when you are negotiating with people. I think a lot of people out there feel, whatever ways are taken to negotiate with them, for example, teachers and any union in the public service, that maybe, instead of imposing something on

them, you negotiate with them. I hope that this government is going to negotiate instead of impose. That is what I am hoping they are going to do. From the comments of the hon. Government House Leader I am hopeful they are going to do that because when you bring in a restraint programme or you bring in new legislation, it concerns those people. We are here elected by them and, you know, if we are going to try to do something for them we should listen to them and consult with them if we are going to do it. When a restraint programme is brought in - it is fine, I know the Province is in a financial predicament - but we are governing those people and they have put us here and we should be consulting with them saying, 'Look, here is our balance sheet. We are having a lot of problems, it is going to be very difficult for us to do anything. Can you offer us some suggestions as to how we can negotiate with you, maybe we can get around that right now?' You have to talk to these people and I do not think that has been done as well as it could be done. That is the problem that you now have. I think the problem you know have is one spectrum over here and one spectrum over there and you have to try to get them closer and that is going to be a very difficult thing to do.

I like some of the new legislation. It is going to be good but as a start, and that is what it is, a start, but there is going to have to be a big change around from the previous attitude, I would think, that has been prevailing with the negotiations that have been ongoing in the past number of years. I am aware now that there is over 50 per cent or almost three-quarters of the unions in the public service do

not have contracts and they are going to have to be decided in the near future. I am hoping that this new attitude that is supposedly going to come about is going to go ahead and maybe solve some of these very, very important problems.

Labour relation problems in this Province are people's problems actually and some of our economic problems can be related to those labour relation problems, labour strikes and so on, people not working because of the labour relation problems that we have been having. So I am hoping that the new minister is going to be able to do something about that and correcting it. Any suggestion that I have I will certainly throw his way. Any suggestions we all have here we are certainly going to throw your way and I am hoping that you will consider them, Sir.

The problem is, I hope it is not all talk. I am sure you have been there a number of years and I am sure you are going to try to do something with it. But there has to be more than talk, there has to be some action. I am hoping that the other side is very serious about negotiating with the public service because my perception is that it has not been and that is the perception of a lot of people out there. You do not impose, you negotiate. The mandate is to negotiate or to govern in that sense. So I am hoping that the government here will do that instead of imposing.

The problems that have existed, I think, have come about over a number of years and the attitude has built up so you have to start and say, 'Look, you know, sit down and let us talk about it.' I think, hopefully, that is what is

going to be done. I would just like to suggest that maybe in the near future with the EIS or the Environmental Impact Statement coming out and so on we are looking for a pact or whatever from labour groups and so on, maybe an idea would be to get labour in the same room with management and government and sit down and chat about what is coming up and try to get an improvement in the climate. I would love to see an improvement in climate. It makes for better overall economic activity in this Province and that is what we are all looking for. I think the labour relations climate has not been good for a number of reasons but I think attitude has to improve. I am hoping that the other side is going to do that.

The suggestion I had of getting everyone in a room, I think, is a realistic one. The Prime Minister of Canada just did that recently, getting people in from various groups and sitting them down and saying, 'Look, we have a problem, let us do something about it.' I think this is a suggestion for you to use. I hope you take it and use it or do something along those lines. Some movement has to be made. I sincerely hope that there is no more lambasting of certain sections of the labour movement. Let us start talking to them in the proper manner, start negotiating with them in the proper manner. If we cannot give them so much money then negotiate in some other way. There are all kinds of other ways you can negotiate. Negotiations are talking to people and trying to get them to understand your position. You are not doing that by imposing. So I am imploring your side and I direct my thoughts to the minister, and I hope he is going to take them and consider

them and do something with it. We have to do something. It is a very big problem. It is gigantic. And it is going to be even worse if we do not soon turn around. So it has been created. It is a perception that it is an anti-labour attitude. Let us get rid of it, try to do something with it, so we can get this place on the go and create a lot more productivity than we have had in the past. These are my suggestions. I hope you will heed it, if they are not I will be after you.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of points I would like to make. First, some misunderstanding, I think, has arisen on the other side of the House to suggest that we over here do not know anything about labour. I think I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) that before any Labour Bill be passed that the Opposition be required to do some manual labour. I think they probably think manual labour is a Mexican.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hard labour.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to invite hon. members up to our farm to pick a few rocks and then come down and debate, and I think the debate would have more meaning for them.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister when he does get up to close the debate, if there is any point

considering labour courts or whether or not the Labour Relations Board, as it is presently constituted, successfully fulfils that role. For instance, if I should have an accident with my car I do not need to - and should a dispute ensue - I do not need to picket the person I collided with. I can rely on the courts to settle it. In the meantime, if my car is able to be driven I can continue to drive it and continue to go about my daily business. But it seems to me that if I have a labour dispute, the only way I can settle it, if it becomes at all contentious is to march around with a placard. I wonder if it would not be better if a labour dispute involving a small number of people, if application could not be made to a quasi sort of labour court, in much the same way as we do now for other disputes. And I would like for the minister to comment on that when he does get up to speak, because, I think, it is very important.

The problem with strikes is not that you cannot settle things by strike, but the amount of bad feeling that exists afterwards.

MR. TULK:

You better write it down Carter. Remember that later.

MR. J. CARTER:

You know we would gladly give hon. members on the other side extra time to speak, if we could be sure that they would speak politely and use the time to some affect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!



MR. J. CARTER:

All we get is abuse and inaccuracies from the opposite side, so there is no point in giving them anything.

So I would like the minister to comment on these. As I say, the problem with labour disputes and strikes is not the strikes themselves so much, but the bad feeling that exists and must exist for months and perhaps years afterwards. And, in fact, perhaps the bad feeling that is engendered by a strike may never entirely go away. So I think strikes are things to be avoided or the last thing to be considered. I just hope that we can devise some methods in our labour laws in this Province so as to minimize the number of strikes. So when the time comes to close the debate I will be very interested in what the minister says.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this bill I said it contained primarily four clauses. I did indicate, in going through the various clauses of the bill, Sir, that I would lead into an amendment to the bill which would change the whole formula with respect to votes. I do not have a written copy of the amendment in front of me, but the gist of the amendment, Sir, will be that for votes for certification, decertification, termination of bargaining rights or for whatever reason, coming before the Labour

Relations Board, there will be a provision for a quorum of those in the bargaining unit. Where there is a quorum of those in the bargaining unit voting, then a simple majority of those voting will bring about certification of a trade union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked a couple of questions about that outside and on the side, and I think there are a couple of people on the other side are wondering - and I think the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) said it this afternoon - he asked the question - what about if only 68 per cent or 69 per cent of the bargaining unit votes and they all voted in favour of the union? Well, Sir, obviously that would result in certification. In any case, regardless of how many people vote, if more than 50 per cent, if 50 per cent plus 1 votes in favour of the union, then certification would ensue under the amendment which I am proposing. But the quorum will allow a union to become certified where, to use the example I think that we gave, if seventy people vote and 36 of them vote for a union, then technically speaking, with no other bars, the union could be certified.

Now the other question that has been answered and for clarification purposes, Sir, I would like to say that the voting procedure is not intended in any way to change the procedure for routine applications to board, routine certifications where votes are not called. The procedure for voting will not impact where an application is made by a trade union, that they will be required to organize the unit in such a manner that they have a majority of employees as members of their

union in the bargaining unit in order for certification to flow without a vote being called.

Now, Sir, I was somewhat disappointed to hear the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) criticize clause 1 in the bill, which provides for the Labour Relations Board to be able to decide whether or not to hold a vote, and perhaps I should talk about that.

I said, in introducing the bill, that for years, up until about three or four years ago, the Labour Relations Board was under the impression that they could, in any case, decide whether or not to have a hearing whether one was requested or not. That still pertains. Well, it does not pertain now, since the court decision against the Labour Relations Board about three or four years ago - I am not exactly sure of the time - they have been conducting a hearing in every case in which it has been requested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) referred to the fact that I said that that resulted in delays and unnecessary expense to the government, and he is right, I did say it. But I want to clarify now, it is not just unnecessary expense to government, Sir, but it is unnecessary delay, unnecessary expense to trade unions and to everybody concerned.

MR. BARRY:

Who said it is unnecessary? Obviously, the person applying for a hearing must not think it is unnecessary.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, we heard in the House this afternoon, Sir, that officials of

the board consider that there have been at least 100 frivolous hearings held, where the board went ahead and conducted a hearing simply because they were requested to do so.

MR. BARRY:

You can impose costs or sanctions in such a case and penalize the person applying for a frivolous hearing.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, whatever you think about it, still, the board will decide now whether to hold a hearing under this piece of legislation. I am sure, and I said in introducing it, insofar as it is possible to do so, it will enable the board to make that decision. I am quite sure if somebody feels that there has been a denial of natural justice - I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will be interested in this - I am sure that if the board should be unwise enough to decide not to have a hearing where there are good grounds, where a hearing ought to be held, then there are provisions, of course, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is a lawyer and he would know more about this, I am sure, than I do.

MR. BARRY:

If that clause stands up, there will be no chance for appeal.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, I understand they are still being tested in courts, where somebody can make a case that there is a denial of natural justice.

MR. BARRY:

Removing the hearing, itself, is a denial of natural justice, because one of the principles of natural

justice is that every person has a right to be heard.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, Sir, the courts will decide that, Mr. Speaker. There is provision, as you know, for writs of certiorari, writs of mandamus, where a higher court can direct the Labour Relations Board to do something that it has failed to do under certain circumstances, or to direct them to cease and desist from doing something, or for exercising jurisdiction where they-

MR. BARRY:

That is what is happening now, and that is what this clause is trying to do away with. You are trying to bar writs of certiorari, you are trying to bar writs of mandamus, by that clause.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

I do not think it is going to stand up anyhow. Whether this House passes it or not, I do not think the courts are going to uphold it.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we hope it is going to stand up, Sir, because we have a Labour Relations Board, as the hon. gentleman knows; he was chairman of the board for at least two years, I think, and he has appeared before the board, I think, on legal cases.

In any event, the board is comprised of five regular members. There are two members on that board who are representative of labour, two who are representative of management and an independent chairman. Ever since its inception, the board has had a lawyer as its head, as the

chairman. And I am sure that both labour and management, Sir, are wise enough to suggest representatives. And we normally do go along with suggestions and recommendations where we feel that they are qualified to do the job, from both factions, from labour and management. We take recommendations from them as to who will represent them on the board. They are well qualified to advance the cause of labour and management with respect to hearings. I think the very fact that we have a Labour Relations Board, that it is a quasi-court which deals with labour cases, separates labour cases from the average court. If we were not going to separate them and we were not going to clothe the board with that authority to decide whether a hearing is necessary to adjudicate a case, then why have a board? Then, why not let matters go to the courts in any event?

MR. BARRY:

Could you deal with the need for a full-time board? Would not the problem be less if you had a board that was sitting more often than the present board?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I think I already said, in introducing the bill, or it has been brought out, that we do not see the need for a full-time board, the work is not there. Our Labour Relations Board meets an average of about fifteen times a year, a little more than a meeting a month. They meet an average, I think, of two days a month. They never have a big backlog of cases. They have additional meetings. It has been that way over the years, ever since the inception of the board in 1950.

MR. BARRY:

That is the reason there has been a delays.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, we are also blocking that loophole, Sir. We are appointing additional alternate members. Sometimes a regular member, for some reason or other, illness or being out of the Province, or for whatever reason, may not be able to attend. We have found that that has caused delays sometimes in board meetings or postponements in meetings, but we are going to do something about that. We are going to ensure that there are alternate members who can sit and have a quorum of the board, and allow the board to deal with its business during meetings when the full-time members cannot attend.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first collective agreements, I have heard only that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said in his remarks on the day that the bill was introduced on 2 May, he thought that we were 'taking away', I believe were his words, from the rights of management here by imposing a collective agreement. I would like to assure the hon. member that collective agreements will be settled, or imposed, if he wants to use that word; the terminology of the act will be that the Labour Relations Board will be empowered to settle the terms of a collective agreement. It will merely, Sir, be a process whereby, if a union has gone and organized a unit of employees into its membership, has gone through all of the conditions precedent, has bargained collectively, and failed to conclude a collective agreement within a reasonable time, and the whole thing seems to be falling apart, then either of the parties

will be able to request the Minister of Labour to direct the Labour Relations Board. Again, I would say, the initial request would be to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour will have a discretionary measure, be able to look at what has gone on, and to eventually direct the Board, if necessary, to settle the terms of the agreement.

Again, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite ought to be happy, I think, that we are doing something to relieve this kind of strife that takes place quite frequently during the negotiations of a first collective agreement. They would do well to remember, also, that this is not an autocratic process. Again, I repeat, there are two representatives of labour, two representatives of management, and an independent chairman.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister indicate whether the employers agreed to the removal of the right to a hearing?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I firmly do not believe they do agree with it, but if we have to wait to get unanimity among labour and management before we make a necessary change to a piece of labour legislation, then I do not think we will ever have any good -

MR. TULK:

The Johnny-Come-Lately syndrome.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

You fellows are afraid that this going to do some good, it is going to create a good climate of labour relations in the Province and you

will not have anything to shout and bellow about. Like the kinds of questions we get from across there when we are trying to settle a dispute; you expect us to do it in public.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said in the House this afternoon, Sir, that we would have preferred to have seen a provision like the Rand formula being capable of being negotiated into collective agreements. As I stated when I introduced the bill, in 90 per cent of all collective agreements on file in the Department of Labour, there is a union security provision at least as good as the Rand formula, and in some cases better. In other words, 90 per cent of the employers who negotiate with trade unions in this Province feel that there is nothing wrong with putting in a protection in a collective agreement to give the union an element of protection against invasion from outside, or against the loss of a majority. I do not think we have to be ashamed of introducing a Rand formula. It has been said in the House this afternoon, and I said it when I introduced the bill, that I am quite sure, having been in the department at the time, having been very close to the dispute, that we have seen the dispute between Newfoundland Telephone Company and the Communications Workers of Canada go on for at least two or three weeks longer than it ought to have gone. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is muttering again. He was misinformed this afternoon, and he asked all kinds of questions. He asked me if I thought the offshore workers should be organized. I am not going to give you an opinion on that.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why?

MR. BLANCHARD:

They have a right to be organized. We have good laws, we have provisions that they can go and organize if need be.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why do not you let it happen and give them access to the rigs?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well that this is a very progressive, very timely piece of legislation. He is concerned that he is not going to have very many things to talk about now, because this legislation will do a lot of good. Granted it is not a Utopian situation. We have already made public statements to the effect that we will be reviewing legislation from time to time, we will be talking to both labour and management from time to time on matters relating to the Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered the bill for a second time, and I would like, Sir, to move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No.14).

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could call it 5:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Is it agreed to it 5:30 p.m.?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Debate on the Adjournment

[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

It being 5:30 p.m. a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter for debate has to do with the Chetwynd gold deposit and it is directed to the Premier by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I simply put this matter on the Late Show not so much to inform the Premier as to the situation in Buchans, because I do not think there has been a Premier, or can be a Premier who is any more well versed with conditions in a given town than the present Premier is. He is well aware of the sense of insecurity, the sense of frustration. He is well aware that there is 100 per cent unemployment in Buchans today. He is well aware that the majority of those people unemployed are first class miners or people who worked in jobs related to mines. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has had over the past seven or eight years access to the Buchans Task Force Report that this government funded \$120,000 or \$130,000, alleged to have went to almost \$200,000. There have been action committees in place that he has dealt personally with, Mr. Speaker, over the years. I have spent seven years, from 1975 to 1982, trying to impress upon this hon. House and on the Premier the plight and

the crisis and the disastrous situation that the people of Buchans would one day find themselves in.

In the past three years, Mr. Speaker, Buchans has been represented by a man on the government side so has had access, he was the Chairman of the Caucus, he has had the Premier's personal ear and, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to lecture the Premier nor do I intend to in this particular five minutes on the crying need to do something, to hold out a ray of hope to the people of Buchans that somebody cares. In situations like this the somebody is always the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have come into a situation where the people of Buchans are looking for options. They do not have many options, Mr. Speaker. They are located 67 miles drive from the Trans Canada. The Premier has already indicated that it is going to be hard to integrate them into the logging industry in this Province, I do not really understand that and that is grounds for another debate one day.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I told you why.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, suddenly there is a ray of hope in this sense. It is obvious that people living in Buchans who have worked in the mines all the years of their life if a chance came to work in another mine would look at it and say maybe we will get a crack at that and, Mr. Speaker, as a result the miners in Buchans, and the people representing them, wonder if the Buchans miners and the people who work in jobs related to

mines will get the first crack, will get priority, for jobs in any mine that is established within a certain radius of Buchans. The Premier himself indicated prior to the election to the people of Buchans that if the gold mine in LaPoile area, now identified as the Chetwynd deposit, if the exploration went on and ore was delineated and a mine was started, the Buchans people would get priority on those jobs. I have to believe, Mr. Speaker, that in order to guarantee priority to Buchans miners on that site you would have to be looking at the concept of a fly-in/fly-out operation. I do not know what the company's attitude is to that concept, it is up to the Premier and it is up to this government. I will do my part to convince that company that that is the way to go. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, maybe we could do that in light of the experiences we have had in one industry towns, in the Faros of the world, and in the Buchans situation. We are going to have it in Labrador City and Wabush whether we like it not. There is a line of thought now that says we should not create town sites around mines that are only going to have a ten, twelve or fifteen year life expectancy. If we do at the end of that fifteen years we will have a social and economic catastrophe on our hands. Maybe we should be looking at the concept of creating a mine site, creating accommodations and flying people in and out to do those jobs and then at least when the mine is over, the Province will have gained economically, the areas these workers come from will have gained from the wages earned and we will not be left with the responsibility of a town that has got no reason to exist. So, Mr.

Speaker, it was in that light that I raised that question.

I want to hold the Premier to his commitment to the people of Buchans. I do not believe that BP - Selco would consider that concept unless they were advised to and unless the Government of Newfoundland said this is the way we want to see it happen. I think they may want to go in with a town site built around the mine with no real concern.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you talked to them?

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, Mr. Minister, I have talked to them. I have tried to be civil in these few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I want to tell the Premier that I recognize his concern for Buchans. There was an incident happened a few days ago. There were certain requests made over the years by the people of Buchans, one was that they would get an industrial relations officer. They have got their industrial relations officer and I wish the man well and I hope he does a good job. He did not do a fantastic job in the capacity that he had before he became the Buchans industrial relations officer, if he had he probably would not have been available to take the job he is now holding down. I wish him well, he has got my cooperation and it is the first indication that I have seen in the short-term that the Premier is very concerned about Buchans. I wish the new industrial relations officer for Buchans well. I hope he has got the Premier's cooperation and I hope that if this industrial relations officer that the Premier has just appointed -

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just for clarification's sake, I think at twenty-five after four or twenty-five after five we called it five-thirty. So I assume there is five minutes for each person, we are not going onto six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. FLIGHT:

Well I would only ask the Premier to meet his commitment to the people of Buchans.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I mean there are either rules in this House or there is not. Now if the hon. member has six or seven minutes to speak, well then I am entitled to have six or seven minutes to speak too.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well go ahead.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, number one, I knew about mine closings long before Buchans started to wind down its operation. I lived in the great historic district of Green Bay in the middle 1960s when Tilt Cove -

MR. FLIGHT:

Now a townsite.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no townsite. I beg your pardon? Yes, Tilt Cove, Little Bay, Gullbridge, that is three -

MR. FLIGHT:

They can fish in Little Bay. They have another base for their economy.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No fishing, some fish in Little Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, can I be allowed to talk? Tilt Cove, Little Bay, Atlantic Coast Copper, Whalesback, and Gullbridge, there were four copper mines in that area, all of them employing 200 to 300 jobs each.

MR. FLIGHT:

For five or ten years.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, not for five or ten years. Tilt Cove was opened in 1912. What is wrong with you? Wake up, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the problems associated with communities that have as their main industry a mine, which by definition is finite and therefore



is going to close down. And I know what happened in Gullbridge and in South Brook and in Robert's Arm and in Springdale, and Little Bay and Beachside. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this very day, this very moment most of the miners in South Brook are in Cluff Lake, Saskatchewan. My best friend is today working in Cluff Lake, Saskatchewan, and has been for the last two or three months, plus three or four other people. It just so happens that some of the best miners in the Province happen to reside in the district of Green Bay, and they have no trouble getting jobs. As a matter of fact, three or four of my friends from South Brook right now have three or four jobs that they could go to.

MR. FLIGHT:

Three or four of my friends are all over Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Cluff Lake happens to be somewhere all over Canada, you know, and there are a few more out in Northern B.C., there are a few more in Alberta, some up in Baffin Island, there are some in the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon. No problem.

So, number one, I do not need a lecture from the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to know the problems associated with one industry towns, especially when that one industry is a mine. I have gone through it myself in the district of Green Bay. We know what the former Liberal Government did for the people of Tilt Cove, and Round Harbour and Snook's Arm and area. We know what they did for Little Bay. We

know what they did for Gullbridge. Zero. Absolutely Zero. There was no consideration. The mine closed down in twenty-four hours in Gullbridge, and the former Liberal Government of the day did absolutely zero. Zilch. Mr. Speaker, zilch, like they did for Bell Island, Cambridge, Ontario, is Bell Island now. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not need any lecture from the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

Secondly, we have tried to put our best foot forward in Buchans over the last number of years. We have indicated in the last several months, whilst the hospital is no longer really needed in Buchans, we are going to convert it to a chronic care facility to maintain those jobs that are presently there. That is a fairly hefty subsidy each year, you know, to put in place. We have also committed to have a development officer in place for at least a year to assist the Action Committee there in coming up with new opportunities.

Now we have a number of new possibilities on the horizon as it relates to gold and so on. And by the way those possibilities would not be there only for this administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- because we were the ones who took the land back. Those gold discoveries happen to be on land that BRINCO owned that we took back from BRINCO that was given to BRINCO by the Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was the PC Government of this Province which has been very instrumental in having those gold discoveries discovered in the beginning, because we took the rights back from BRINCO which had been given away by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland when they were the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the gold there. I do not know the mode of development whether it will be a fly-in or a fly-out, or whether it will be a townsite. The final decision on that has not yet been made. Assessments are going on on the economics of the ore deposit. Then they will be sitting down with the government and we will be going through it. We are insistent with the companies to come in here to Newfoundland that those people who have been involved in mining in Newfoundland should have the first crack at the jobs that are going to be created if that gold discovery becomes a commercial operation. We are going to insist on that as we have before. We have not only done it in Buchans, I mean, look what we have done in Baie Verte, look what we have done in St. Lawrence. We have assisted the people in both those communities. We are going to do the same thing for the people of Buchans and for the people all around the Province. The miners in my district who are now out West would love to be home working the mines somewhere in Newfoundland. So we are going to insist that a lot of the unemployed miners in Newfoundland get the first preference for the jobs at that site. The hon. member does not understand why the miners in Buchans or the miners in

Newfoundland cannot get jobs in the woods industry. Now, what a ridiculous thing to say.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will debate that some other day.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Some other day he is going to debate this, he says. The hon. member lives out in Windsor-Buchans and he does not know any more about the woods industry than that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was the hon. member who wanted us to spend \$20 or \$30 million to build a road from Buchans across to Hinds Lake for temporary jobs. It was good for nothing and it would have seen electrical rates go higher at the time if we had done it, if we had gone along with the member for Windsor-Buchans. He is all over the place.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are going to do all we can, like we have done in St. Lawrence, like we have done in Baie Verte, like we have done all over the Province. This government is the government that has allowed these discoveries to occur because we took back land that the Liberals gave away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The second question is by the hon. member for Twillingate. It is to the Premier and it is about the question of UI benefits expiring on 15 May.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question yesterday to the Premier, of course, was prompted by the fact that on 15 May, which is a week from now, UIC benefits to fishermen will discontinue.

In his reply the Premier mentioned that a letter was sent to Ottawa, I believe two months ago, or a telex. I will be interested in learning from the Premier now, if there has been a reply to that letter and, if not, if there has been any follow-up to it by the minister concerned? Because, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and a very serious matter. I would strongly recommend to the Premier that he make representation to the federal government. If an all party resolution to the House is necessary, well, then, maybe that is the way to go. But certainly, I think, strong representation should be made to Ottawa to have the system that is now in existence, with respect to unemployment insurance benefits to fishermen, changed. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why a fisherman should be treated differently from a fish plant worker, a carpenter, a labourer, or in fact any other person who finds himself unemployed for certain periods in the year.

The irony of it is that a fisherman who fishes and supplies fish to keep the fish plant workers working is denied benefits while a fish plant worker can apply for benefits the moment he is out of work, and can qualify for those benefits until he gets another job. But a fisherman, of course, is different. He can only

receive benefits, I believe, at the last of November and automatically, come 15 May, the benefits discontinue. So surely there must be a system, or at least there should be a system worked out where a fisherman, irrespective of what happens, once it becomes impossible to fish, then he should be able to qualify for benefits. And by the same token, he should qualify until he is able to get back fishing. I would strongly urge the government to make that kind of a recommendation to the federal government.

I had the privilege, during the election campaign, of having a meeting in a hall in Herring Neck where it was brought to my attention that it was in that hall that the idea of unemployment insurance benefits to fishermen was conceived.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Was it the Orange Hall and was it Coaker?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, the Orange Hall in Herring Neck but it was Pickersgill, a former minister in the Pearson government. It was also the same hall that Coaker, I think, started the old FPU as well. So it is a rather historic hall. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no real or legitimate reason why the system could not be changed. All over Newfoundland today we have federal fisheries officers capable of deciding when the fishing season ends, when it becomes impossible, say, for a fisherman in the Twillingate district to fish. That person is certainly qualified to be able to advise his superiors the date on which fishing can continue.

MR. TULK:

By the way, Bully-Boy Crosbie said, when he was in Opposition, that he was going to do something about it.

MR. W. CARTER:

Well, Bully-Boy obviously has not done too much about it, because today, you have in this Province approximately 12,000 fishermen who face the uncertainty of not knowing how they are going to pay their light bills or their telephone bills or their grocery bills after May 15th.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly recommend to the government that they get on the ball now and contact the federal government, the Prime Minister or the minister responsible, to ensure, first of all, that the benefits will be extended this year.

MR. TULK:

And Crosbie.

MR. W. CARTER:

And Crosbie. Because it is obvious that the fishermen, certainly in my district, and I believe the same can be said for the whole Northeast Coast, will not be able to start fishing on the 15th of May. In fact, it will probably be closer to the 15th or the last of June before fishing can start.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:

So they have had a month without any kind of income.

I would strongly urge the government to again contact the federal government to have the present season extended until the fishery starts and then to press

for a complete change in the whole system so that in future years the uncertainty will be removed, that if it becomes impossible to fish after a certain date in the Fall, like any other worker, that person, having waited whatever the prescribed period is, will then qualify for benefits.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member has spoken for five minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely astounded that this is not already taken care of, because the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was chairman of the Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board, a very powerful position within the federal government, before he came back into politics. I cannot understand why this was not changed, that while he had all that power within the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and with the federal government, all this was not changed. I mean, why are we talking about this today, Mr. Speaker? All these hon. members over there, these good Liberals over there, when they had the Liberal Government in Ottawa right up to last September, with the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) chairman of the Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board, you would

think, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age over the last year and a half or so, all these hon. members over there would have all of their lobbying done, making strong representation: 'Has the Premier made strong representation?' Yes, did the hon. the member for Twillingate make strong representation when he was Chairman of the Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Did the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) make strong representation when his colleagues were in the government in Ottawa? I mean, what is all this business about making strong representation? We have been around here now for long enough to know the story about U.I.C., and we get these people over there on the other side of the House, now that there is another political party in Ottawa and now, every single thing that their government did not do, which they supported that they should not do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
- now they want it all done, Mr. Speaker. Strong representation! 'Will you make strong representation on this! 'Will you make strong representation on that! I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely hilarious!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Every single item that they could not get their own colleagues to change, up to last September, now they want the Tories to change. They could not get their own people to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Come on over! Mr. Speaker, tell them to come on over here and help us give that strong representation. My, oh, my, oh, my! I tell you right now, it is unbelievable when you hear the hon. members on the opposite side, the way they get on! And they are over there, Mr. Speaker, for the last number of years when we put Private Members' Resolutions and other resolutions before this House on the Northern cod, on getting jurisdiction over the Nose and Tail of the Bank, on U.I.C. for fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
And they went quiet and they would maw their way around, get on the 'phone to the Prime Minister's Office, hide away -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Not true! Not true!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Then they would accuse us. 'All the Premier is interested in is confrontation. That is all. He is a separatist, he is just out to attack the federal government.'

And there we were, trying to protect the fishermen of Newfoundland, trying to protect the workers of Newfoundland. It makes me sick, Mr. Speaker, when I look across and see hon. members now wanting us to make strong representation! And how long was the House open before they even asked the question?

This government, on March 12th, made strong representation to the federal government to help the fishermen beyond May 15th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
On March 12th, and every day since, Mr. Speaker. Any day we are going to bring the cameras in, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Newfoundland should have the benefit of hearing this excellent speech.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

The final question is from the member for Naskaupi district. It is regarding the failure of the Premier to appoint a minister from Labrador.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I can make a little comment, Mr. Speaker, to start.

I really did not know what to expect when I came to the House of Assembly first. I am a little more than shocked, I guess, that the Leader of our Province sees fit to act in such an immature manner and that he treats the questions of the Opposition in such a light fashion. And I did not put my earlier question lightly. The people of Labrador are concerned about the Premier's decision not to appoint a Cabinet minister from that particular region of our Province. Now I am sure that concern has to be shared by all members representing Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:  
Gentlemen, I do not involve myself in catcalling, jeering, and so on, and I would ask hon. members to do the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
I am speaking at the moment on behalf of Naskaupi district, Mr. Speaker, and that is what my question emanated from, the concerns of Labrador. I would like to say that I believe my colleagues from Labrador, the other representatives, are as concerned as I am. They want to know why we do not have a minister from Labrador? Even the representative from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and pardon that small chuckle. There is a possibility, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, that his reasons may be a little different than ours, but I am sure he is equally concerned

that we do not have a minister.

Now, all I asked the Premier was, if he could explain the rationale behind his decision not to appoint one? And he chuckled, as he is doing now, or giggled, whichever you prefer, and in response to the phrase 'to the satisfaction of the people of Labrador' he said, he did not know how he could do that. Well, he is the Premier, why would he not know how to do that, to address the concerns and to answer a question to the satisfaction of the people of Labrador? And to the satisfaction of all the people of the Province, as far as that goes.

We have a lot of concerns in Labrador, a lot of diverse problems. We feel out of the mainstream of provincial life, an attitude that seems to be fostered by the Premier and his party. They must realize that our sister Province, Quebec, has an implied, if not a very overt position on a claim to sovereignty over Labrador. Do we deserve less than the City of St. John's, which has eight ministers? Or the community of Conception Bay South which has a couple of ministers, one of which was a former resident of Labrador? I am sure he shares my concern over the fact that we do not have a minister from the region.

If our colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) had not done his little walk, the Premier would not have any representation up there. He has not got a Tory in Labrador. Let us face it. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains had his reasons for going across the floor. I am sure he is as distressed as we are that he is not a minister. Again, I say, perhaps for different reasons than

I might have.

So here we are with a Premier who has no quantity of representation in his party from Labrador, and now he is telling us by implication that he has no quality of representation either in his party from Labrador. Is he not insulting the intelligence, insulting the rights, and denying the rights of the Labrador region of this Province to give them representation in the Cabinet, direct representation? Or is he perhaps saying, Mr. Speaker, that due to the lack of experience of our colleague for Torngat Mountains he could not appoint him to that position? But he has enough precedents to know that the first day you gain experience as a minister is the first day you serve as minister. It is a sad, sad thing, Mr. Speaker, to see the Premier, the touted, fighting Newfoundlander reduced to the pathetic role of a heckler when somebody else is speaking and asks him a question?

That is the end of my question, Mr. Speaker. We have enough time for him to answer it. And I would be more than happy to give him extra time any other time he wants to answer it. Thank you.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go through the process, and I am sure the hon. member is aware of it. This is just a matter, I suppose, for him to get a headline in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in the next newspaper that comes out, that he fought for cabinet representation in the House of Assembly and therefore he is doing his job as a member.

The representation from any area in a jurisdiction, as everybody knows, is not qualified or quantified, necessarily, by how many people are in the Cabinet or how many people are not in the Cabinet. There are very effective members who perform their role as representing their districts without every region being represented in the Cabinet. That is number one.

Look at what has happened in Labrador over the last number of years. Labrador West did not have Cabinet representation in the last couple of years. While there was a member from this side who served as a parliamentary secretary, they did not have cabinet representation and we built an arts and culture centre up there. We put a constabulary building and the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary up there and we have spent money on recreation. Look at the Trans-Labrador Highway. We have allocated tens of millions of dollars for the Trans-Labrador Highway. We have been working hard with the Defence Department for a NATO base up there. Throughout all of Northern Labrador, all the fish plants get \$800, to \$1,000, to \$1 million a year subsidy.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is now the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward), with special responsibilities for the Northern Development Branch. The Northern Development Branch, where is it? In St. John's? No, it is headquartered in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the member for Torngat Mountains will be working out of there. How many personnel are up there working just for

Labrador? There are forty-five to sixty people working full time in the Northern branch of that department, out of Labrador, Happy Valley - Goose Bay. So it is a question that really does not deserve an answer, in one sense.

MR. FLIGHT:  
It hurts.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That member over there for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), is he not something else? Perhaps we can get him a job underground in the new mine.

So, on the question of cabinet representation, the hon. member knows better, but I suppose he wants a headline. All I can say is that we consider Labrador a very integral part of the Province. We do not want to stir up divisions between one part of the Province and another, peninsulas or a separate part of the Province, and we are going to do for Labrador as much as we do for any other part of the Province, and we will continue to do it. Part of our roads programme is to continue the Trans-Labrador Highway. We are sitting down negotiating with people on the Happy Valley - Goose Bay development projects and the Labrador transportation and development plan, we are talking to the Defence Department, we are working on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation for the coast of Labrador. The amount of money that has gone into Labrador in the last number of years is very substantial. Even into the Eastern part of Labrador, leaving out the Western part of Labrador and the iron ore section and the Churchill section, there has been just as much money per capita go into that area as has gone into any



other area of the Province.

As a matter of fact, I would say, if you put together all the funds together, provincial and federal, spent on the Labrador coast, from Cartwright North, the per capita amount that has gone in there is far, far greater than has gone into many parts of this Province, and for good reason. There have been social and economic reasons for that which are quite legitimate, which have nothing to do with cabinet representation or whatever.

Look at the landing strip programme of the federal and provincial governments that has gone in there that we have to operate now into infinity. Look at the transportation system as it relates to air and how that has been improved; our own government stores and how we have improved the management of those, and the fish plants which we are trying to improve for quality and marketing and so on. Then there are the air subsidies that are on for Labrador. I mean, we have done a lot. The question going to come down now, Mr. Speaker, over the next few years, is will this level of support to all of Labrador continue? And that will depend on how effective the members in the House of Assembly from Labradaor are over the next three or four year. I hope that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) will be just as effective in seeing that all these things that I have just related continue and are improved over the next three or four years. If they are not, Mr. Speaker, it may cost because the hon. member for Naskaupi, presently, is not as effective a member as the former hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) was in the past, and the member for

Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and so on.

The hon. member has a great responsibility. I can see what the member for Naskaupi is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, he is already getting to either cross over, or getting ready to be able to shift the blame: The reason why Labrador is not getting its share two years from now will not be because he was not an effective member, it will be because 'we do not have cabinet representation.' He can slough the responsibility over here to cover his ineffective representation on behalf of the people of Naskaupi. Now, that is perhaps what the hon. member is up to. But in any case, notwithstanding the effective or ineffective representation of the member for Naskaupi, we are going to continue to do for Labrador what we have been doing in the past, and we will improve upon it. The whole question of Cabinet rests in the hands of the Premier, or the leader of the party with the majority of seats in the House. I will use my discretion from time to time as to how that Cabinet is going to be formed, and I really do not need any suggestions from the member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Before you put the adjournment motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon. members that tomorrow we will be doing Interim Supply, and I would hope, because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated that the budget will

be brought down next Thursday,  
that we can deal with Interim  
Supply expeditiously.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The motion before the House is  
that we do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising  
adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,  
May 10, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.