



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 42

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Thursday, 8 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. House Leader, President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity to advise the official Opposition of this statement beforehand, for which I apologize but I know that they, as well as all members of the House, would wish to be associated with the government in extending best wishes to the new member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who was elected in the recent by-election there and ensure the hon. gentleman of the complete co-operation of the Government of the Province and the Party on this side of the House, and, I know, of the official Opposition. We will do everything we possibly can to co-operate with him as we try to do at all times with all members of the Opposition.

My purpose in getting up at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, is to welcome the hon. member to the House on behalf of the government and I am sure associated with me in these remarks will be all members of the hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the welcome which the hon. minister has extended to the new member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I look forward to working with him and I must say that we on this

side of the House were very pleased to see that the people of Menihek were prepared to send a message to the government in the recent by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
We hope that the minister's protestations of co-operation, Mr. Speaker, will be there when we come to consider the new Elections Bill which everybody expects will come forth in this session of the House. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, there is concern by the member and his Party that they are not being treated fairly in that bill and we would ask government to consider this when it is raised before this House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Oral questions.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Is it agreed to revert to Ministerial Statements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House. I was talking to the Clerk at the time.

Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for housing I would like to take this opportunity to advise members of the House of Assembly of further initiatives of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in the area of land development. Commencing on November 19, the corporation will

be offering for sale an additional seventy-nine lots in the Cowan Heights development. This component forms part of a new phase consisting of 105 lots with the remaining lots to be placed in a sales position as servicing is completed. Cowan Heights is 100 per cent provincially funded and represents a continuing commitment on behalf of government to ensure a ready and adequate supply of reasonably priced serviced building lots in the St. John's area. This land assembly combines with the corporation's development in Mount Pearl, Newtown, to form an effective and complimentary alternative to private sector development throughout the region.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to provide some background information on the Cowan Heights development which consists of some 290 gross acres offering potential for some 1,700 units of residential construction. The first phase of the development consisted of 208 building lots, with the first lots being placed on sale during the Spring of 1981. In view of the slow sales activity experienced at that time, primarily because of high interest rates, you may recall government initiated a lot subsidy programme in June of 1982 involving a price reduction of 20 per cent for the first 50 lot offering. I am most pleased that the success of this programme provided the impetus for the sustained sales activity which has since been experienced with regard to the remaining lots to the extent that 95 per cent of the lots previously offered for sale have now been sold. I should also point out that the servicing of this initial phase is now completed with the installation of pavement and sidewalks as well as infrastructure services being provided by way of school

construction and plans for recreation facilities next Summer. In conclusion despite the fact that housing starts in the Province and indeed throughout the country are down in excess of 25 per cent to date in 1984 over the number registered for the same period last year I am encouraged by the ongoing demand for serviced building lots in the corporations Cowan Heights and Mount Pearl, Newtown developments. Looking ahead to the coming months I am hopeful of a continuing period of stabilized interest rates and a favourable construction climate to promote sales activity and related home ownership opportunity in these areas.

Thank You, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, one would have thought, after the House being shut down now for six months, that we would have had a litany of Ministerial Statements today in the House starting with the Premier on the horrible state of the Newfoundland economy, record unemployment, layoffs, business closures, and so on.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The gentleman has forgotten the fact that he is cast in a new role in the House. The hon. gentleman is responding to a Ministerial Statement. The Ministerial Statement related to housing, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman surely has to confine himself to the statement and the substance

that the hon. minister was speaking of.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, it does appear, at least to the Chair, that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was wavering somewhat from the rule of relevancy with regards to the Ministerial Statement on Housing.

MR. NEARY:

Purely a preamble, Mr. Speaker. So I suppose in one sense we should be thankful for small blessings. The administration must have been scraping around the bottom of the barrel today to come up with a Ministerial Statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Ministerial Statement tells us that there is going to be some more building lots put up for sale in the Cowan Heights area and that may or may not be a good thing. The statement also indicates that housing starts in the Province are down this year by 25 per cent. Even though in other provinces of Canada housing starts are on the upswing, on the increase, in Newfoundland we decreased by 25 per cent over what housing starts were in this Province last year, and that is a clear indication, I believe, to all and sundry of the horrible state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy.

I noticed that the minister did not in his statement take the usual flick that the administration take at Ottawa about the high interest rates. Now that their buddies are installed, their pals are installed up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, you do not hear the hon. Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) getting up and saying it is all Ottawa's fault that these lots are not being bought and development is not taking place.

MR. SIMMS:

Interest rates are going down now.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, they are not down far enough yet for people to start building houses.

MR. SIMMS:

Give them time.

MR. NEARY:

But, Mr. Speaker, the significant thing today - and we will see a lot of this now, I imagine, in this Session of the House - backing away from things they demanded from Ottawa and from the Liberal administration. They will be backing away now and there will be no more flicks about the interest rates.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I would like to ask the Premier whether in light of the September unemployment statistics showing 21.2 per cent of the labour force out of work, or 22.9 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis, and in light of the more than 100 soon to be laid off in Labrador City, and in light of the several hundred soon to be laid off in Corner Brook, and in light of the thousands of plant workers and fishermen unemployed as a result of the trawlermen's strike, and in

light of the willingness of government to delay steps necessary to ensure additional employment from Hibernia development, does the Premier have immediate initiatives available to reduce the level of unemployment and the suffering presently experienced by the thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and what are those initiatives?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are as concerned about the unemployment rate in Newfoundland as is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and other members of the House no doubt, on this side and on that side of the House, and it is an ongoing concern. Now I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition has been over the last few months, but I guess he must recognize that over the last few months this government signed seven agreements with the federal government in a rush of agreement signing when the Liberals in Ottawa thought that they might be able to cling on and therefore were going to change their approach and stop talking about co-operative federalism being dead and try to resurrect it in time to get re-elected, so we signed agreements, Mr. Speaker, to lead to job creation as it related to mineral developments. It is not a well known fact that the reactivation of the St. Lawrence mine, and the building of a mill there for the first time in the history of St. Lawrence to actually process that ore, was as a direct result of promotional activities initiated by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We will be creating 200 or 300 permanent jobs for the people of St. Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is known a bit better to everybody that it was the initiatives of this government that led to the reactivation of the Baie Verte Asbestos mine on the Baie Verte Peninsula, which has created and sustained 200 or 300 or 400 permanent jobs in that area. I think it is starting to become well known, and it will over the next month, that it was solely as a result of the thirteen month effort of this government that we are going to see a modern permanent paper mill in Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is because of the initiatives of the last Budget to reduce the sales tax on capital equipment that led Abitibi-Price to commit \$33 million for the modernization of the mill in Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
So these are some of the initiatives we have taken. The Mineral Development agreement, Mr. Speaker, which sees more promotional activity done so that we can find more ore, it is as a result of an amendment that was brought into this House by yours truly, Mr. Speaker, when I was Minister of Mines and Energy, and led to the new gold discovery on the South Coast, which will see a gold mine in a couple of years. So there is gold in them there hills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, Mr. Speaker, on the mineral side of things, and in pulp and paper modernization agreements, talking about the new government in Ottawa and job creation, Mr. Speaker, since we had the amendment to the pulp and paper modernization agreement giving a few million dollars extra to Corner Brook for three years, in seven days we are able to negotiate \$7 million and another four years to the agreement to up the amount of money for Corner Brook from \$33 million to \$40 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is performance as it relates to trying to ensue that job creation continues in this Province.

In rural development, Mr. Speaker, we signed an agreement for \$18 million just recently to create jobs in this Province. I would commend to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) attention the following brochure which has been issued detailing this, which obviously he did not see. And we have the Planning agreement, \$4 million, the Minerals agreement, \$22 million, the Burin Peninsula Development fund, Mr. Speaker, which has led to the Cow Head oil rig servicing facility, which is going to create over 100 permanent jobs and which is under construction at this very moment. The road is just about completed. There was a major dynamite blast down there yesterday to complete the causeway. There are 602 people now working at the Marystown Shipyard, a record number.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Bow Drill I is in Marystown, the Bow Drill II is in Marystown, and we can work on both oil rigs at the same time as a result of our transferring the Green Bay ferry down there to make it a second boat so that both drill rigs can be worked on at the same time. Before the Green Bay ferry was transferred down there for that kind of a boat we could only work on one oil rig at a time. The Fogo Island ferry is being built down there in this Province, to service the people of Fogo Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Under the Ocean Industries agreement, Mr. Speaker, \$28 million is going into ocean industries. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) announced the other day support to another local industry that is established creating permanent jobs. There is an Incentive programme, there is a Tourism programme here to provide grants and low-interest loans to entrepreneurs out there who want to enlarge their motels, build parks, provide promotional activity to ensure that we get more of the tourist dollar in Canada than we are getting. The pulp and paper modernization I already mentioned, the St. Lawrence mine and the Cow Head development. Through this \$165 million of government money we are going to stimulate a total of \$400 million of activity over the next three to four years in this Province. Mr. Speaker, that is performance.

May I also point out to the Leader

of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), another job creation activity that we got involved in in the past year is that we provided \$90,000 of assistance to Aqua Fisheries, we provided to Atlantic Fisheries a total of over a half million dollars, to Bay Bulls Seafoods, \$250,000, to the Bay St. George Fisheries, \$74,000, to Belle Island Seafoods, \$400,000, and on the list goes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

What about Triton?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Triton is \$1 million, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

One million dollars to Triton. The total comes to \$29,490,470 that we have provided this present year in order to stimulate job opportunities in the fishery in rural Newfoundland. These are some of the ways in which this government is trying to address our malaise, our unemployment problem, and others will be announced in due course, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is amazing how the Premier can refer, for example, to modernization of the Bowaters mill, and now the Kruger mill at Corner Brook, and omit to make any reference to the 300 to 500 men and women who will see jobs lost as a result of what is taking place in Corner Brook.

I wonder is the Premier aware - and these are in September, Mr. Speaker, before the worst part of the season is upon us - is the Premier aware, has he looked at the statistics which indicate that on the Avalon Peninsula we have 18.8 per cent jobless, 20,000 men and women, Mr. Speaker? On the East Coast and the Burin Peninsula, 34 per cent for 7,000 men and women jobless. On the West Coast and Labrador, 21.2 per cent for 11,000 jobless. Central and Northeastern Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, 22.5 per cent for 12,000 jobless. The youth unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker, is 35.5 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Sometimes in an original question there is a little bit of time allocated for some kind of a preamble, but certainly the Chair recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on a supplementary question, and really there should not be any need of a preamble for a supplementary question and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am sure, is aware of that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I started off my supplementary with the words, "Is the Premier aware," a question, Mr. Speaker. Of these statistics, including the youth unemployment rate of 35.5 per cent, the highest in Canada, a shameful record on the part of the government opposite, and, Mr. Speaker, in light of this, and in light of the fact that we have so many plant workers and fishermen suffering as a result of the trawler strike, would the Premier indicate whether he has given directions to the directors of FPI concerning the approach to be taken in attempting to resolve the trawlermen's strike

and what are these directions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition wants me to bargain in public. If I had to give the directions, if any, that the government had made to the directors of FPI, obviously I would be negotiating in public. I would be saying here in this House, to the public of Newfoundland, what tenor and form the negotiations are going to take at the table. It would be completely inappropriate and irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, for the leader of the government to do that kind of thing. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the offshore fishery as it relates to Fishery Products International, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the officials of his department and the government generally have been successful over the last few days in getting both sides back to the table. I think that is a significant move given the length that this strike has gone on in the last while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You know, we will do our part, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to that. Obviously the question that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked, am I aware, it goes without saying that everybody in Newfoundland has been aware from time immemorial that we have one of the highest unemployment rates not only in Canada but in the Western World and that it is not an easy problem to solve. Some of the problem of the unemployment relates to the seasonality of some of our work, some of it right now

relates to the fact that there are a number of labour disputes ongoing. The government is doing, it believes, all it can to try to alleviate that but we do need additional economic impetus and incentive in order to do it and the \$400 million referred to, which has not flowed into the economy yet and will not start flowing until 1985, will go a long way to try to alleviate that.

As it relates to Corner Brook, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) seems to want to emphasize the jobs that are lost. How about the jobs that have been saved, Mr. Speaker, in this Province as a result of this government's efforts?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You know, it is the same as happened in Stephenville. The linerboard mill in Stephenville had a lot more people working than are working there now, there is not question about that, but they ran the place into the hole and the Government of Newfoundland and the taxpayers of Newfoundland had to pick up close to \$500 million as a result of that. But we still have a stable, commercially viable industry out in Stephenville. That is what we have to have in Corner Brook. Today in Corner Brook, contrary to popular opinion in Corner Brook and on the West Coast, that mill is losing money. The Bowater company had been selling paper at \$150 a ton when Kruger Incorporated out of Quebec was selling it for \$357 a ton. They had to close down the sulphite mill because to leave the sulphite mill open and feed that into the production of paper means an inferior paper. You have to expand the thermo-mechanical pulp

operation, which will take a few months to do, and in order to do that you have to close down one machine, otherwise you would still be selling inferior paper if you left the sulphite mill open. But the whole substance and thrust of this government, and why Kruger was picked in the beginning, was to ensure that we had not only a substantial company, but a company that would put up front from the money they obtained from the banks of this country to ensure that we would have a viable industry in Corner Brook. It is no good to have 2,000 people working in the mill and losing \$200 a ton every day. It is a lot better to have 1,000 or 1,200, or whatever the number would be, working in the mill and have a company that is making money, Mr. Speaker. Surely, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not asking for us to have every industry in this Province go in the hole by keeping everybody on when the reality of the situation is that we have to compete in world markets and therefore we have to produce a quality product. That goes for forestry, that goes for the fishery, that goes for mining, that goes for every other occupation or industry in this Province: We must be competitive. I think that the people of Corner Brook and the people of Newfoundland are relieved, not only relieved but overjoyed that we were able to bring off the kind of deal that we did in Corner Brook. There are a lot of people around who are saying a number of years ago and last year that it could not be done, that Corner Brook was doomed, that there would be nobody come on the scene that could put up the money that was needed. We understand there is a serious unemployment rate, but it is not going to be solved, Mr. Speaker, by keeping people on in industries

that are losing money but by creating new industry. It is to be solved by signing agreements like the \$400 million one I just talked about and by getting a sensible and sane deal with on the offshore which will see the spinoff industries come to Newfoundland, and by having extra money coming in that we can use that money to put back into industries. That is the way we have to go. We just cannot keep having bankrupt industries along the line that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) insists that we must have.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think we might have gotten some indication in the Premier's last remarks as to what he meant by his statement about the new fish company being run as a company in the private sector. I hope the good people of Grand Bank are listening to what the Premier just said with respect to not permitting plants to operate that are losing money. And at the appropriate time we will be asking the Premier to clarify his remarks on this.

But, Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary, I refer to the statements made by the ministers of energy, both federal (Ms. Carney) and provincial (Mr. Marshall), and ask the Premier would he not agree that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador should have had its work done, should have had its plans ready for alternative modes of development, and, forgetting the associated benefits relating to Hibernia, that it should not be necessary to have this delay with respect to the filing of Mobil's development plan and environmental

impact study and that it should not be necessary to see the probable delay in Hibernia development which will result from this, and that it should not be necessary to inflict this additional suffering upon the thousands of men and women who will go unemployed that much longer while this delay is in effect?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on two points, first of all the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) well knows that it was his Liberal cohorts in Ottawa who wanted Grand Bank closed down and put a piece of paper on the table to that effect and we forced them to keep it opened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I can produce the documentation on it. It was the Liberal government in Ottawa that said, 'Close down Gaultois we are not going to keep it open.' We forced them to back away from that. 'Close down Harbour Breton, close down Gaultois.'

MR. NEARY:

They wanted it open and you want to close it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no. They wanted it closed down. Gaultois had to be closed down, Ramea had to be closed down, Harbour Breton had to be closed down, Grand Bank had to be closed down and Burin had to be closed down and they were not going to agree to keep them open.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They do not like the truth, Mr. Speaker. When you start hitting them with the truth then you hear them speak, then they will not keep quite and let me answer, Mr. Speaker. I was quite when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked the question, now let him be quite while I am answering it, Mr. Speaker. That is fair ball. The Leader of the Opposition says he is going to be fair in this Session of the House. Well, that is one way now he just broke that promise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a proposal put on the table to close down those plants and it was this government that forced the Liberals to keep it open, the Liberals now kicked out of Ottawa, perhaps for that reason among others, because they were so contemptuous of the Canadian people. We would not let them do it. Futhermore, let the Leader of the Opposition read the agreement, and if he reads the agreement he will see that what we have said there is that these plants have to be kept open for the foreseeable future, that they have to be made to work, that there is a resource utilization task force that has to report upon the amount of resource that is available to see that they are kept open. At the same time we are not going to - and this is what I am getting at when I am talking about working like a business - we are not going to be like the former Liberal government which stopped and inhibited this company from working by insisting that they were going to have a day to day say in the management of Fishery Products International and it was Mr. Bell and Mr. Lumley and Senator Austin and the rest of them that inhibited this company

from working. One could almost say they had something in the back of their minds about not wanting this company to work. There was no way that we could get an agreement because Mr. Bell and other people who wanted to operate Fishery Products International and wanted to be able to say how the company was going to be run on a day to day, week by week basis. I say that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to have political interference daily and weekly in a company that you establish, you have just scored the death knell of that company and therefore we were opposed to it. So when I talk about private enterprise, I am talking about the board of directors and the management of the company being able to operate it on a day to day, week by week basis. There are provisions in the agreement which means they have to consult with the shareholders from time to time and give reports. And if there are going to be any layoffs over 100 jobs, then it has to come back to governments first and then governments will have the responsibility to work that out. So we are covered under that agreement, Mr. Speaker. And I am ready to debate this in the House with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) any day of the week because the facts of the matter, when they are put on the table, show that this government is more compassionate towards the people of the areas we are talking about than the Liberal government in Ottawa and at the same time the Liberal opposition were supporting them, acquiescing to every wish and whim that that Liberal government wanted.

MR. DINN:
Exactly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
As it relates to the second part of the Leader of the Opposition's

(Mr. Barry) question, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows that there is still a significant number of studies being done as to the mode that has to be used for the development of Hibernia, of the first hydrocarbon resource off our shores which is declared commercial. There is a lot of complex technological work being done to determine which is the proper mode, which is an economic mode, and so on. And those studies are still being done by the oil companies, as by COGLA, as by the Petroleum Directorate. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to see that we now have a Federal government in Ottawa which is willing to listen to Newfoundland's concerns and they have agreed with us that we should delay for six months the filing of that environmental impact statement which will also contain a lot of information about the mode of development or the development plan until the Province and the Federal government are convinced that there is enough evidence and enough studies complete to ensure that we are going to be able to do good comparisons. It is to this government's interest to ensure not a quick fix to the Newfoundland economy, not to suddenly try to blow the Newfoundland economy up in expectation, without having all of our studies done. We want to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that when decisions are made on the mode of development for Hibernia, all the information is in. We think that when all the information is in that we will be able to make a very, very strong case to increase the number of job opportunities and the amount of work that is done in Newfoundland over and above what the companies might have wanted to do in Newfoundland and Labrador and, for the first time, we have a federal government

that is sensitive to this very, very important point. A lot of studies have been done but there are more that need to be done, and there are more studies going on immediately. So we are taking the cautious approach to ensure that we have, the federal government has, and everybody has a good handle on what is an appropriate mode and to try to make as strong a case as we can that that appropriate mode, after there is a reasonable return to the companies, will be a mode which will enhance job opportunities for the people of this Province, and try to solve some of the questions that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked earlier in the Question Period when he talked about unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, just one further short question. I realize under the regulations there may be certain time periods which would come into play once the environmental impact statement is filed, but I can assure the Premier that we on this side of the House, and I am sure the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), would be prepared to consider this as well if it meant employment that much earlier for men and women in the Province, but would not the Premier be prepared to request Mobil to go ahead and file its environmental impact statement and make that available to the members of this hon. House and to the men and women of Newfoundland so that, while the Premier and his federal counterparts, and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) are looking at these alternative modes of development and carrying on their studies, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would have an opportunity to study at

least the first suggestion by Mobil, and have the opportunity of making their own minds up as to whether or not this was environmentally sound and for the maximum benefit of the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PRMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should know that, when this is developed, as part of our regulations and as part of the thing that I am sure that the federal government is going to agree to, there is going to be lots of time for public input and public hearings as it relates to the development plan in any case. There is going to be lots of time for that. We wish to have additional time ourselves as governments to fully assess the various modes. There are a lot, as I say, of studies on the go by all three parties involved in this and there needs to be more work done. And if you put out something now which was preliminary, a lot of the stuff where Mobil might be saying 'maybe', you might be creating the wrong impression. But I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that, when the environment impact study is tabled and when the development plan is done, this government, under the new agreement that will be signed in the not too distant future between the minister responsible for Energy in Newfoundland (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Energy (Ms. Carney) in Ottawa, we will have the major say in the mode and in the way the development goes. And there will be in that agreement and within those regulations ample time for the Leader of the Opposition, and anybody else in Newfoundland who is going to be affected, to

comment upon in a public way that mode of development and that plan. That is there, Mr. Speaker, and that is our undertaking, that there will be sufficient, plenty of time for everybody to have a say on the mode of development.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. MORGAN:

Be fair to the new member for Menihek. Give him a chance to ask a question.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the hon. gentleman if he wants to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

It looks like one of the problems of being to the right of the Liberals is that you get no recognition at all. I am going to have to jump up a little faster, I am afraid.

I was pleased to hear the questions that were just brought out on unemployment, because the question I have is a very particular one and it has to do with a number of people who are facing that prospect approximately a week before Christmas. My question is to the Premier. The Premier has, I think, belatedly learned that the Iron Ore Company of Canada is laying off 118 men just a week before Christmas begins. The Premier is also aware that being laid off in a one-industry town, isolated from the rest of the Province by hundreds of miles of wilderness,

makes it extremely difficult to locate to a new job without the expenditure of thousands of dollars. In most cases the laid off workers cannot sell even their homes for enough to cover their mortgages let alone leave anything to move with.

Last year the government implemented a mobility programme to provide some financial assistance to help those affected move closer to their relatives into areas with better job prospects.

My question to the Premier is this: Will you extend the deadline in the mobility programme for another year and allow those workers who are being laid off this Christmas to avail of the same programme?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we did. We did not get all that much credit for it last year when it was done. We established a Task Force in Labrador West and as a result of that instituted a programme that helped a lot of the people in Labrador West, because it was a massive layoff at that time, hundreds and hundreds of workers. We went ahead and did it while the federal Liberal Government sat on their hands and did nothing and then, very late in the day, they decided to come in and do what was their responsibility from the beginning because we should not have needed to have a programme at all. They were supposed to have the money allocated under their department for this and they had done it in other parts of Canada.

I do not know whether we are going to be able to continue to extend that programme. We have other

parts of the Province which, while not as isolated perhaps as Labrador West, where similar circumstances could exist and, knowing our financial means, I do not know if we can extend that programme. Mr. Speaker, there could be layoffs again next year in Labrador West, in either Wabush or Labrador City, and I do not know whether we have the fiscal capability and financial means to continue to extend that kind of programme. It was brought in at that time to deal with a fairly significant situation when we are talking about hundreds and hundreds of layoffs. We did not bring it in earlier when there were fifty layoffs or 100 layoffs in Labrador West a few years ago. But when the degree of the layoff was as great as it was, the magnitude of the pain was as high as it was, we did institute this problem but I do not know if we can continue the programme given our present financial situation. I think it is being reviewed right now, but whether we can continue it or not I can not give a definitive answer on. But I would say off the top of my head it is going to be very difficult, knowing our financial situation, to continue to do that for one area of the Province.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a couple of questions to the Premier too that have to do with unemployment. I ask this of the Premier in all seriousness because apparently the companies have been ignoring the hon. gentleman and the administration and not advising the administration when they are going

to cut back or close down or lay off workers and we saw that in the district of Menihek. Could the hon. tell us the House if he has been advised that the BTM station in Port aux Basques will be phased out and by the end of March sixteen or seventeen men will lose their jobs? Has the gentlemen been advised that TerraTransport is shutting down the truck-to-truck operations in Port aux Basques and laying off six employees of TerraTransport in Port aux Basques? If the hon. gentleman has been advised of these matters, would he tell the House what action his administration have taken to stave off these layoffs? By the way, I would also like to toss this one in; has the hon. gentleman been advised that the BTM Station in Argenticia will also be closed down? Is the hon. gentleman now prepared to lay back and let Ottawa ride roughshod over this Province, lay back and do nothing?

There are three questions there for the hon. gentleman; the BTM Station in Port aux Basques, six to be laid off immediately, seventeen or eighteen before the end of March; truck-to-truck, which was the saviour of Port aux Basques, being shut down, six more laid off; and I do not know how many will be laid off in Argenticia. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House what the administration intends to do about this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman what we intend to about that. After talks with the federal government the federal government, has agreed and announced that they are going to go ahead with the political

announcement made by the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) confrere who got defeated in the previous election by going ahead with a \$6 million or \$7 million water system in Channel - Port aux Basques, which will also mean a few million dollars by the provincial government in a new road network in Channel - Port aux Basques. I can also inform the hon. gentleman that we are going to go ahead and award a tender in the next few days for the first phase of the industrial park for Channel - Port aux Basques. So those are two things that we are doing and are going to do.

MR. NEARY:

These were all Liberal projects.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is \$6 million there and we will be putting in \$4 million, plus the industrial parks, so there will be, over the next couple of years, close to \$10 million spent in Channel - Port aux Basques, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this.

MR. NEARY:

That has nothing to do with you. That is all federal.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, it has a lot to do with us, Mr. Speaker, a lot. We have to operate that industrial park and it is going to cost us ten times as much as the capital cost of it after it is built and the road network that is being put in is going to have to be put in by us. So there are two things that we are doing in Channel - Port aux Basques, Mr. Speaker, to alleviate what the hon. gentleman is talking about. As it relates to Argentinia, the hon. gentleman is not aware, I do not think - or is he aware -? that the provincial government is in the final stages of concluding an agreement with the United

States Government and the Canadian Government for the release of a fair amount of land at Argentinia to allow for industrial development at Argentinia as it relates to the offshore, and there are already several companies interested in investing in that area of the Province. So that is what we are going to do as it relates to Argentinia to offset the announcements that supposedly the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is privy to. So every time there is a little bit of a downturn in a certain area there are millions of dollars going in in another way to offset it and to create permanent jobs. So, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to inform the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that at Channel-Port aux Basques, yes, there is close to \$10 million over the next few years which will alleviate some of the problems that he just mentioned; yes, there are negotiations underway to take some land away from the lease that the Americans now have to allow private sector interests to go in and create jobs in the Argentinia area. So I hope that tomorrow the member for LaPoile will again have a few more questions like that so that I can respond again to show him not only how we are mitigating the problem but even alleviating it or eliminating it completely. Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier

Act." "An Act to Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law."

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The Hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act Respecting The Department Of Labour." and "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act."

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The Hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mrs Newhook), I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Consumer Affairs And Communications." and "An Act Respecting Collection Agencies And Collectors." And on behalf of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act Respecting The Department Of Career Development And Advanced Studies." "An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Education Institutions." and "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries Marine Technology."

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Public Works

and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Provide For The Calling Of Tenders For The Execution Of Public Works And The Acquisition Of Goods And Services By Government Funded Bodies".

"An Act To Provide For The Calculation And Consideration Of Provincial Content Factor In Awarding Tenders By Government Funded Bodies."

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution.

WHEREAS

the trawlermen of this Province have been out on strike since July 1984; and

WHEREAS

the telephone workers have also been out on strike since July 1984; and

WHEREAS

the teachers and public employees of the Province are being frustrated in their attempts to bargain with government; and

WHEREAS

the attitude of the present Progressive Conservative administration is one that is no longer fairly balanced between business and labour; and

WHEREAS

the government of this Province is

attempting to take away rights and privileges trade unions have achieved over the years; and

WHEREAS

female workers in this Province do not receive equal pay for work of equal value;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this honourable House

strongly condemns the attitude towards labour relations which is presently prevalent in government and calls on government to immediately call a conference of business, labour and government to obtain a harmonious consensus for labour peace and economic development in the Province.

If a seconder is needed it is the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 5, Bill No. 18.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order 5, Bill No. 18.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act." (Bill No. 18).

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognize the hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is aware of it or not but Bill No. 18 has not yet been distributed. We tried to get a copy today and we were told that

the bill could not be released until the minister gave permission to release the bill. We have not had an opportunity to look at it. It is very unfair to call an order, Mr. Speaker, when the legislation has not been circulated. We have no idea what is in the legislation, we have not had time to study it. How can we be in a position to debate a law that has been made, a statute that will become a statute of this Province if we do not have the bill in front of us, Mr. Speaker? I would submit that the hon. gentleman should reconsider calling that order and postpone debate on that bill for another day, say tomorrow, because, Mr. Speaker, it is very unfair. We do not know what the bill is all about. The first indication we will have of what is in that bill is when the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) introduces second reading and that is very unfair, Mr. Speaker, and no way to treat this House.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, that is no point of order. I had information that the bill had been distributed, but, in any event, first reading of the bill has taken place, it is in second reading. The purpose of the bill is for the minister to explain the bill in detail, which is what the hon. minister will be doing, and if the hon. gentleman has not got a copy yet, I am sure there will be a copy on his desk in a minute's time. But it is certainly in accordance with the rules of the House. It has been properly called.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, technically or legally the hon. minister may be correct that the government is within its rights to push through and force debate upon a bill which has not been presented to the Opposition for study. But, Mr. Speaker, whatever the technicalities and the legal rights of the government the Opposition would submit that that is not the way to ensure proper and productive debate on any piece of legislation going through this House; it shows contempt for the Opposition, it shows contempt for the House, it shows contempt for the democratic process and we would ask the hon. minister to reconsider that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of this government to show contempt for this House. If this government has done anything it is to make this House a more democratic institution than it has ever been in the history of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, just to show the hon. gentlemen if the hon. gentlemen wish it, I suggest what we will do is the hon. minister will now get up and introduce the bill and explain it, then we will move the adjournment of the debate to give the hon. gentlemen time to consider not just the text of the bill itself but the explanation that the hon. minister has given

and then we will go on to other business.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman, I think that is fair enough. The hon. the Premier intervened there and advised the hon. gentleman that what he was doing was not right, that it was wrong, it was not fair. I think it is fair now, Mr. Speaker, so in that case I do not see any need for any further debate on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order was raised and indeed from the Chair's viewpoint, of course, it appeared not to be a point of order but certainly a difference of opinion between the Opposition and government as to how to proceed in introducing a piece of legislation. So in reality it is not a valid point of order as such.

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank hon. members for their patience. I believe the bill is being distributed now. It is a bill on Occupational Health and Safety and I am sure all hon. members are interested in some of the things that we are attempting to do with respect to Occupational Health and Safety.

The brief explanation of what the three main points of the bill are goes like this: Number one, for example, provides the authority for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to appoint sub-committees

of the Occupational Health and Safety Council. Now as all hon. members know we have an Occupational Health and Safety Advisory Council that does considerable work for the department and provides considerable advice to the minister with respect to changes to legislation and, for example, codes of practices in mining operations, etc. But what happens at certain times is that the Board requires specific information and needs some expertise in certain areas on different problems as, for example, with respect to different trades. They may not have a representative on the Advisory Council to advise them with respect to issues as they relate to gaseous substances, with respect to mining diseases, with respect to boiler and pressure vessel and compressed gas legislation and operations. So what they are attempting to do here is since the Advisory Council itself does not have the expertise in order to discuss it fully, they would like to appoint a group who do have the expertise - they will make recommendations to the minister who will have the Lieutenant-Governor in Council approve these people - so that they can get expert advice in different areas, which is very important, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the operation of the Advisory Council on Occupational Health and Safety.

Number two: The authority to make regulations respecting health and safety of workers in mines is transferred from the Regulation of Mines Act to the Occupational Health and Safety Act. As hon. members may or may not know, we do have these regulations in the Regulations of Mines Act, etc., but they need to be under the auspices of the Occupational Health and Safety Act so that the

Advisory Council can deal with the problems associated with the mines area. That is one that is important but it is not one that I think hon. members opposite may be overly concerned about.

And number three, which I consider a most important amendment, would permit changes to the funding arrangement between the Workers' Compensation Commission and the Occupational Health and Safety Division. As hon. members may or may not know the function right now with respect to payment for occupational health and safety is one whereby those functions that the Occupational Health and Safety Department perform for or on behalf of Workers' Compensation is basically paid for by Workers' Compensation. I give hon. members an example. Several years ago we had a dust study done in Western Labrador. The dust study itself cost \$2.4 million. That dust study basically was supposed to be paid for by government, the companies, and it was to have a small input, a nominal small amount by the unions so that throughout the whole process the three parties responsible or involved in some way could have total capability of knowing not only what was going on, what the parameters of the study would be, but also guide the study as it went along. So you had a kind of executive committee that was composed of myself as minister responsible for Occupational Health and Safety, you had the presidents of the companies, and you had the presidents of the union that were totally involved in the study as it progressed along. And then below that executive committee we had a working committee made up of the experts put forward by the different groups. For example the union put forward a gentleman by the name of Lorne Herd, I believe,

who is a member of the International Steelworkers of America.

MR. SIMMS:

Who was that, Herd?

MR. DINN:

Herd, who provided very valuable input to that committee.

MR. SIMMS:

What was his title?

MR. DINN:

Well, he was a member who worked with the Steelworkers of America, and he was their expert, we will say, on Occupational Health and Safety. When all these groups got together, they basically picked out a team of individuals who had the expertise required in order to carry out this study. Dr. Irving Silikoff for example, although he did not participate himself had a representative who participated. And these experts, who are renowned in their field, produced the dust study in Western Labrador, but it cost \$2.4 million.

Now part of that study was environmental, and part of the study was community related. Of the \$2.4 million, that amounted to something like \$670,000. Well, what happened there was that the government itself paid that because it was not something that we attributed to the mine itself, although the mine caused, or presumably caused some of the problems. But the government, through the Department of Health, and the Department of Labour and Manpower, paid that six hundred and seventy-odd thousand dollars for that study. The remainder of that study was paid for, on a fifty/fifty basis by the companies involved, and we prorated that, it was a formula that we came up with through discussion. Of the two companies involved, the Iron Ore

Company of Canada because they had a bigger work force etc., paid more, the Wabush Mines people paid a certain amount, but they paid half and the government, through Occupational Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation paid the rest.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you mean to say the unions did not pay any of it?

MR. DINN:

Well, the unions participated all the way through, but they did not participate with respect to the dollars. It was a nominal amount anyway, it was not something that we got overly excited about. But we thought it was a good thing for them to do it initially, and they had agreed to a nominal amount, but they could not get it from the international nor could they get it from their locals up there, so we did not - in the final analysis, you know, it was something like \$5,000 so we did not push it. So the study then was paid for environment-wise and community health-wise. It was paid for by government through the Departments of Health and Environment, by Occupational Health and Safety, and the remainder of the study, which involved the mine sites themselves and the workers in those mines was paid for, half and half, by Workers' Compensation and the employers.

So what we are doing here is, it clears the way for that sort of funding arrangement. We had the power under Occupational Health and Safety, the authority under the bill, but now this clears the way so that what we are attempting to do now is more or less set aside a percentage, a ceiling, we will put it in by regulation, but we will set a ceiling for so much money to be provided or set aside

by Workers' Compensation for studies and, you know, we are talking about something like 2 per cent of the revenue per year, but something like that, so that we can put that aside. It can come under the auspices or the authority of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, so that in the event that we require studies, for example, in Baie Verte or a follow up with respect to the Iron Ore Company of Canada or Wabush Mines in Western Labrador then we will have some funding set aside so that it will not come out of or it will not be something that you will hit Workers' Compensation with and they not have provided for that capability.

So these are things that we are attempting to do with this piece of legislation, and I think hon. members will agree that they are very important things. I will just to give hon. members a rundown of basically what is happening in Occupational Health and Safety while I have an opportunity in running this bill through second reading.

Hon. members may know that occupational health and safety in the Province really was kind of non-existent from the point of view of having an act and having a piece of legislation and having people responsible for occupational health and safety up to 1979.

Now it started back in 1976 when the department convened a major conference in St. John's on Occupational Health and Safety to obtain the views of management, labour and health professionals on proposed changes to the structure. And this is basically how occupational health and safety in this Province evolved. The conference recommended that Health and Safety services be

consolidated, new legislation be drafted and that we get on with the job of bringing the different inspection services together in one area, at the time the Department of Labour and Manpower, so that we would have that occupational health and safety capability and we would have the professionals that we required all in one area under an Assistant Deputy Minister and give it more emphasis and also have legislation installed which had some teeth in it. And as a result of that, of course, the Occupational Health And Safety Act was passed in the House of Assembly in June 1978 and, of course, when I came in in 1979, when I was appointed under this administration, when the Premier asked me to take over the Department of Labour and Manpower, it was my first responsibility to take these inspection services and put them all together in one department with health and hygiene. We now have a training section. By the way, just another point in passing. Some of the training that we provide in the Province is provided by, for example. St. John Ambulance and the Newfoundland Safety Council. And what we do is we set aside an amount of funding based on, in the case of the Safety Council, the number of students they put through their system. The courses, of course have to be approved by the Occupational Health and Safety section of the department, and then we pay on the basis of the number of students they put through. But it amounts to, to those two organizations something like \$100,000 a year or more for training with respect to some areas that St. John Ambulance and the Newfoundland Safety Council provide. -

MR. NEARY:

You do not have mines, do you?

MR. DINN:

Yes. The inspection of mines now is over in the department under Occupational Health and Safety. So we have two acts now. When we made up the Occupational Health And Safety Act, we brought most of the regulations with respect to safety of mines into Occupational Health and Safety, and what we are doing here is attempting to bring the remainder over so that we have the capability under the Occupational Health and Safety legislation for the regulation of mines as it pertains to safety and health.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we attempted to get the different groups together to bring them under the Department of Labour and Manpower we had to bring in the Industrial Safety Division that was part of Workers' Compensation. And that is one of the reasons why employers in the Province who pay the assessments to Workers' Compensation, pay for the industrial safety component of Occupational Health and Safety which is now in the department. We have mines inspection that came from the Department of Health so you can see that we had all these different inspectorates spread out through government and we attempted to bring them under one head in the Department of Labour and Manpower under Occupational Health and Safety. Industrial health in the Department of Health also came over, electrical inspection from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro became part of the Department, the boiler and elevator inspections became part of the Department of Labour and Manpower under Occupational Health and Safety. Radiation inspection, which was a newly established programme at that time that we brought it in, was spread out through the departments, the Department of Health did some of those inspections but now that is

consolidated in the Division of Occupational Health and Safety in the Department of Labour and Manpower.

So the Division of Occupational Health and Safety then became responsible for the administration of different pieces of legislation as it pertained to Occupational Health and Safety. It was not only the Occupational Health and Safety Act, and regulations themselves, but the Radiation Health and Safety Act, as it deals with X-ray machines, etc., in hospitals, X-ray machines in dentist offices, etc., all come under this inspectorate. The Regulation of Mines Act as it relates to health and safety, the Safety of Workmen Act, Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act and regulations, the Elevators Act and regulations, Amusement Rides Act and regulations, and the Building Accessibility Act, which was brought in, I believe, about a year and a half ago and put through the House of Assembly, also come under the Division of Occupational Health and Safety in the Department of Labour and Manpower.

Some of the major provisions that may be of interest to members of the House as it relates to Occupational Health and Safety are as follows: it provides a worker with the right, for example, to refuse to do any work that he has reasonable grounds to believe that is unsafe or dangerous to his person or to someone else. He can refuse to do the work. It provides for the establishment of health and safety committees at all work places where there are ten or more employees engaged. It provides for a worker health and safety representative in work places where there are less than ten workers employed. It places specific obligations on the Crown,

on the employees, on workers, on the employers, on self-employed persons. It established, as I said, an advisory council to advise the Minister of Labour and Manpower on the administration of the act and for the first time all workers in the Province are covered by health and safety legislation, excluding those employed under federal jurisdiction.

So whilst we do not have any authority with respect to federal employees, all other employees in the Province come under the auspices of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the different acts that I outlined.

Just to give hon. member an example of how the division has grown over the past couple of years, the division has a total of 102 permanent employees, which is an increase from 84 positions which constituted the new division in 1979, and the 102 positions are assigned as follows: We have in the Electrical Inspection Branch 42; the Mines Safety Branch 14; we have in the General Health and Safety Inspection and Education Branch 18; the Engineering and Technical Services Division have 21; and the Medical and Hygiene Services have 7 for a total of I believe 102 people.

Also hon. members may want to know that, for example, since the Occupational Health and Safety Act was passed in this House, and became a responsibility of the Department of Labour and Manpower, over 800 joint work place committees have been established in work places where ten or more persons are employed, as required under Section 35 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. This also includes, for example, as hon. members may be interested to know, all offshore

rigs operating off the coast of Newfoundland. All of these rigs have health and safety committees that on a regular basis send their minutes into the Division of the Occupational Health and Safety. These minutes are gone through and where the gentleman for looking after this sees that there may be a problem with respect to Health and Safety and the direction that the committees are taking, this gentleman goes out and sits down with the committees on the rigs - he has done it several times over the past year or so - and sets them on the right path.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you have branch offices of Occupational Health and Safety throughout the Province or just here in St. John's?

MR. DINN:

Yes, we have branch offices, not just offices here in St. John's. That is absolutely correct.

And the fact of the matter is that we are the only place in the world where these Health and Safety Committees operate and operate as effectively as they do. And any problems that come up with respect to these Health and Safety Committees are generally recorded in the minutes. The person responsible in Occupational Health and Safety immediately gets in touch with the two Co-Chairmen of those committees and attempts to help them out and straighten them out with respect to the rights of workers, etc. So I think this may be of some importance because we sometimes hear in the media and around different places that there is no protection. There is absolutely the same protection for rig workers as there are for miners, as there are for people in industrial areas in the Province, at Bowater, Abitibi-Price and so on. They all have the same sort

of deal and I was very pleased about that.

MR. WARREN:

But you do not have anything to do with the safety of shipping, do you?.

MR. DINN:

That is right. Shipping and everything like that is outside of my territory. I think it is a big enough responsibility to look after Occupational Health and Safety in this Province and attempt to keep a finger on the pulse to make sure that the inspections are carried out without spreading it to shipping and all the rest of the areas that are involved. That is not part of Occupational Health and Safety.

Reports of committee meetings are received and monitored by staff, and, as I said, through this monitoring any necessary follow-up that needs to be done is done. Work place inspections are conducted on a regular basis throughout the Province in areas such as mines, construction projects, logging operations, fish plants, electrical installations, boilers and elevators, radiators and all other types of equipment, and inspections are done on rigs on a regular basis. Regular inspections are also carried out in the offshore, as I said, at three week intervals, every three weeks. Each rig is visited and inspected and when a problem appears in the minutes of committee meetings, the inspector when he goes out sits down with the committee and talks to them about it and finds out what the story is and so on and reports back.

So we have education courses and seminars for workers and these have been greatly increased under the Occupational Health and Safety

Act through the combined efforts of staff in the Division of Occupational Health and Safety and under formal training agreements, as I said, with the Newfoundland Safety Council and the St. John Ambulance. Last year over 10,000 workers received various training programmes in such areas as first aid, health and safety, committee organization, accident investigation, back injuries, defensive driving, etc. A major study into health effects of dust exposure, as I said, in the mining operation in Western Labrador was conducted during 1979 through to 1981. As a result of that study, by the way, with respect to threshold limit values, TLVs they call them, have been changed with respect to the operations of the mines in Western Labrador in the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines operations. As a matter of fact, as a result of that \$2.4 million study, people who are concerned with occupational health and safety in mines are currently looking at its results with a view to the possibility of implementing the changes that we are contemplating making in the mines in Western Labrador, using that information and using the different methods that we used for measuring dust levels, etc., in the mines in Western Labrador, taking that and making a kind of almost North American standard. So, Mr. Speaker, we in Newfoundland are leading in some respects with respect to occupational health and safety. Certainly I do not think there is anybody in the House of Assembly who can say that our occupation health and safety legislation is not a good piece of legislation. I think you can talk to companies, unions, labour groups, employees -

MR. SIMMS:

Even Opposition members agree.

MR. DINN:

The Opposition obviously would say that that piece of legislation is a fantastic piece of legislation. It was introduced, by the way, by the former Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. Mr. House, who sits here in the House of Assembly today. It is a tribute to his capability when he not only held the portfolio of the Department of Education but he also had the responsibility of the Department of Labour and Manpower and introduced the first piece, a very comprehensive piece of legislation, The Occupational Health And Safety Act and as a result of that it became my responsibility to bring it together and it is together and functioning as a very efficient unit. As a matter of fact, lately I have gone through an exercise of finding out how much we are spending with respect to occupational health and safety in this Province. I have not got all the information compiled yet but I am doing that investigation. I have some assistance in that from a source with respect to the costs of occupational health and safety in this Province. And I think we are bit modest with respect to taking some credit for some of the things that we are doing in occupational health and safety.

MR. SIMMS:

You are too modest. You should brag a bit more.

MR. DINN:

I already outlined the lead we took in the dust study in Western Labrador, but I do believe at times that this government is a bit modest as it relates to some of the things we are doing in occupational health and safety. The preliminary information that I have, for example, with respect to occupational health and safety - and as I say I do not have the

information from all the provinces of Canada and the territories - but the preliminary information indicates that we are spending more on a per capita basis in this Province as it relates to occupational health and safety than the provinces that I have gotten the information back on to this point in time; for example, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. We have information from these provinces and it indicates to me that we here in the Province of Newfoundland, where we are number ten on the totem pole in Canada as it relates to just about everything - per capita income, earned per capita income, unemployment the highest, employment levels the lowest, the highest taxes in Canada, etc. - with all of this going on here we seem to be able to get enough money to put in there. It is because we believe that not only by bringing in legislation because that is only part of it, anybody can bring in legislation - but making sure that companies follow that legislation, that workers have their rights, that workers have their rights and workers are looked after in this Province. We in this Province, based on the study that I have to date, and I do not have all of the provinces, as I said, but I do have some of the major ones, and I can tell you that Ontario does not spend on a per capita basis as much as the Province of Newfoundland does in the area of occupational health and safety, that we are leaders with respect to dust related diseases in mines. The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) may or may not be aware of the study we completed. As a matter of fact, if he wants me to I can get him a copy of the complete detail of that study.

MR. SIMMS:

Careful now!

MR. DINN:

It is a public document. There are no secrets in this government.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not be too confident.

MR. DINN:

There are volumes and volumes of information related to the dust study in Western Labrador. Towards the end of this month, I believe the 24th or the 25th or 26th the experts from Canada and North America who conducted that dust study, some of the best experts in the world, are going to be getting together in the hon. member's district in Western Labrador to sit down with the companies and the unions and complete the code of practice for the mining operations in Western Labrador. The hon. member will be happy to hear that because I know he is very concerned about dust related diseases in his area. I saw a programme on TV - well, part of a programme because I was busy at many other things, about the Baie Verte mine. And, Mr. Speaker, I was a bit concerned. I did not get the full detail since I did not see the whole programme.

MR. WARREN:

You did not want to.

MR. DINN:

I was very interested in it, but I did not get to see the whole programme, and I was very disappointed that I did not see it because I would have liked to. But some of the attitudes that I perceived coming out of that programme as it related to Baie Verte seem to indicate that the government was not doing enough or something like that.

MR. TULK:

That is true.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through a little bit of the history of the Baie Verte operation as it relates to occupational health and safety. Most of this information hon. members know, but I think it bears repeating. I think it bears putting on the record of this House basically what happened as it relates to Baie Verte.

MR. SIMMS:

Some of us are interested.

MR. DINN:

Some people in this House are interested, says my hon. colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms).

MR. SIMMS:

The crowd opposite might not be interested.

MR. DINN:

Hon. members know there was a study done in Baie Verte, I do not think that is a secret, I do not think that is a surprise to anybody here in this House. But I happened to get a bit of information together the other night as it related to the Baie Verte operation, and it seems to me that the information that I have was a little contradictory to what I saw or what I perceived was happening on CBC television. I saw them on TV talking about Baie Verte mines and everything like that, and things were not being done. Well -

MR. NEARY:

You have all the information.?

MR. DINN:

Oh, yes. I thank the hon. member. He knows that when I get up to speak I have the information.

MR. NEARY:

That is what I am looking for.

MR. DINN:

I may not have it in order all of the time, but I always have it. And I can heave it out of me the odd time. But the background as it relates to Baie Verte, I think it is interesting just to go through chronologically basically what happened in Baie Verte. In Baie Verte there was a problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows a report was done entitled **A Clinical Survey**,:- now I am not sure of the pronunciation of this word, but we will have a go at it- **Chrysopile Asbestos Miners and Millers in Baie Verte, Newfoundland.** As hon. members know, that was done and submitted to government by Dr. Irving Silikoff in 1976, the result of a study conducted by Dr. Silikoff at the request of the union.

Now here is something was initiated by the workers themselves, and something that I was very appreciative of at the time when I got in Cabinet, because it hangs over a member's head when you hear about mines and asbestosis and pneumoconiosis and all this kind of thing. You hear these words and they frighten the life out of you, you cannot sleep sometimes, but this study was done and I understand it was a pretty good study. Not all the information that was available to Dr. Silikoff was made available to government, but the main information was made available. In the report Dr. Silikoff stated that fifty or approximately 10 per cent of the 500 or 550 in the work force at Baie Verte at the time had one or more radiographic anomalies present of the type commonly associated with asbestos exposure. Now if anybody has read anything about asbestos or asbestosis. People get visions of lungs gone, cancer and all this kind of thing setting in, and it is frightening at times. So Dr.

Silikoff did this study and made it available to government, and I think we paid a fair share. The hon. the Minister of Health made equipment available to Dr. Silikoff and, of course, we participated with respect to some funding. Well, subsequent to the Silikoff report, the Baie Verte medical examiners initiated studies to try to identify some high risk patients in the work force at Advocate Mines. Now I ask hon. members just to listen because this is basically what happened with respect to Advocate Mines. When I saw the Silikoff report initially, it frightened me to death. There were hundreds of miles of roads paved on the Baie Vert Peninsula and we got a few dollars out of the Federal government. We went up and we waved the Silikoff report at them and told them about the problems we were having down on the Baie Vert Peninsula and we had to have all the roads paved so we got something like 80 per cent. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not here now, but I think we got an 80/20 deal on the main roads on the Baie Vert Peninsula. And, so, Mr. Speaker, the medical examiners, the people in the Department of Health got involved and said, 'Okay, let us see what is going on here. If we have people in trouble we have to do something about it. We cannot just sit and do nothing.' So we got a report that said fifty or more people had something related to a dust disease, they had anomalies with respect to their lungs, with respect to their X-rays. So they got into it and all the employees were examined through this surveillance programme and if any evidence of health effects showed they were advised to file a complaint with the Workers' Compensation Board. Because filing a claim with the Workers' Compensation Board

brought a whole new group of professionals in and the Workers' Compensation Board then paid for some of the operation that was going on there. So in 1980 the President of the Union, and people will know this gentleman because he is a very active, very intelligent and articulate gentleman, Mr. Martin Saunders of Baie Verte, wrote the Executive Director of the Occupational Health and Safety Division enclosing a list of sixteen names of employees who medical examinations revealed that they has some problem with their lungs or air passages and requested an investigation. Additionally the Baie Verte medical examiner referred a further seven to the Workers' Compensation Commission during 1981. These were employees who had questionable early changes on their chest X-rays. I venture to guess if anybody ever took an X-ray of my lungs I would have anomalies -

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know about you lungs.

MR. DINN:

-because I have not been able to cure that dreaded smoking habit that I have.

MR. TULK:

It is time for you to

MR. DINN:

Yes. I have tried many times, as the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) knows, to cure it, but I have not been able to, so I would have anomalies. I guarantee you, if somebody took a chest X-ray of my chest, I would have anomalies with respect to lung-related conditions.

MR. TULK:

Do you do any jogging?

MR. DINN:

Well, the hon. member might be interested. I have lost twenty-six pounds, I am going away to nothing. I have to get a couple of new suits.

MR. TULK:

How much do you do?

MR. DINN:

I do about eighteen miles a week.

MR. TULK:

Do you?

MR. DINN:

Yes, I do about eighteen miles a week. That is not heavy, by the way. Go around my block four times and you have a mile and a half done, so there is no problem there. You can sneak out the odd time and get this done or you can do it in the morning. You can get up at six o'clock in the morning and run down to the Janeway Hospital and back and I count that as two and one-half miles.

So I do about eighteen miles a week. I am not in the best shape and I come a-huffin' and a-puffin' when I come back up over the hill from the Janeway. I do not run all the way. I run for a couple of hundred yards and then I try to get my breath back.

Anyway, all workers at Baie Verte who were designated as working in a dust exposure -

MR. TULK:

Jogging is supposed to stimulate your brain.

MR. DINN:

It does that too.

MR. NEARY:

What motivates you?

MR. DINN:

Well, I tell the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), it is no trouble to get motivated in this

Province when you are working in a government like this. I know the hon. the member for LaPoile did not get motivated very often when he was Minister of Social Services, but in this government you have to get motivated. If you do not get the job done, the boss will just run you off your feet, so you have to get up in the morning early, you have to get your work done. You know, you have Labour and Manpower responsibilities, you have to run over to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, whip down to the Workers' Compensation, check out Occupational Health and Safety, go to Cabinet, go to Social Policy. Well, you have to be in shape, so that is what is happening with me. That stimulates the brain, you see. Once you get a little oxygen running through the brain cells you start regenerating brain cells and you get to thinking and you get moving. Anyway, that is what we are all doing in government, we are all on the move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Anyway, just to get back to this because this is very important. I mean, we are on a very important subject and I do not want to get sidetracked by hon. members opposite because I think it is important that we relate basically what is going on in Occupational Health and Safety and we want to relate what has happened with respect to the Baie Verte mines. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is sitting there in his chair and he is listening with bated breath although he has heard the information several times and he knows on a day-to-day basis, I bet you almost on an hourly basis, what is going on down in the Baie

Verte operation.

But, anyway, where we have arrived now is we have had the Silikoff report, we have had reports of lung-related diseases and we have heard from the medical examiners in Baie Verte and the Department of Health, and the people in Workers' Compensation, and some of the workers were referred to the experts in the Health Sciences Complex and we have gone through the process and we have found out a few things: All the workers at Baie Verte who are designated as working in a dust exposure occupation under Section 51 (1), (a), (i), (b) and (c) of Occupational Health and Safety regulations receive an annual medical examination as prescribed under Section 51 (1) and (g) of the regulations. That is done all the time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

All the time.

MR. DINN:

Yes. That is done on a yearly basis. These examinations, which include pulmonary function tests, X-rays as necessary, are performed by medical examiners appointed by the Minister of Health under the authority of the above regulations. The X-rays are assessed by radiologists in St. John's retained for that purpose by the Division. Three, prior to the Occupational Health and Safety regulations (1979), these examinations and X-rays, less the pulmonary function testing - which was not done then, so less that - 'were performed under the Mines Safety Workmen's regulations' - That is what we are trying to do now, we are trying to get these regulations under the Occupational Health and Safety Act - 'and were performed since the asbestos mine commenced its operations in 1963.' So we had some of it going

on. We did not have the pulmonary function test, but we had some of it going on. But now we are doing more comprehensive studies.

Now listen to this, I think this is important, 'To our knowledge the Medical Advisory Committee of the Worker's Compensation Commission have not as yet identified a case of pneumoconiosis asbestosis amongst the Baie Verte work force' although a number of workers are under the Worker's Compensation Commission Surveillance Programme.' They have a programme and they are regularly monitored. In order to determine what future action might be undertaken with respect to medical surveillance of the Baie Verte miners, discussions were held this Summer with Dr. Henry Anderson.' Now we heard about the Silikoff report, how it came through, and the fifty cases and the different tests that we have gone through. As a follow-up, the Assistant Deputy Minister and some of the officials in Occupational Health and Safety got in touch with Dr. Henry Anderson, who is an associate of Dr. Silikoff. Dr. Silikoff, whom we would have gone to because he is one of the greatest experts in the world was not available. Now Dr. Anderson -

MR. NEARY:

What about Dr. Silikoff?

MR. DINN:

Dr. Silikoff was not available but we have to make sure that what we are doing is right.

MR. NEARY:

He was not available for what?

MR. DINN:

He was not available for our consultations. I mean, he is a busy man. So his protege, the next guy, I would say number two

in the world, Dr. Henry Anderson, who was an associate of Dr. Silikoff and participated in the 1976 study, was asked what we should do now. As a result of Dr. Silikoff's report we had all these examinations done, this surveillance done on the miners, etc., all this information available, so we said to Dr. Anderson, "What do you think we should do from here on?"

MR. NEARY:

What year was that drafted up?

MR. DINN:

The past Summer, June, July and August. 'Dr. Anderson is of the opinion that a need for further formal study has not been established.' With all the information now that we have with respect to the Baie Verte mine, and all the miners that were checked, etc., and all that information being available, he, the number two man in the world, who worked on the study with Silikoff in 1976 -

MR. NEARY:

Is the member for Baie Verte aware of that?

MR. DINN:

Is the member for Baie Verte aware of it?

MR. NEARY:

What did Dr. Edstrom say?

MR. DINN:

All the information goes to the member for Baie Verte. Look, it is like a stream.

MR. TULK:

He only asked you what he said.

MR. DINN:

Well, he did not indicate to me that there was something wrong and he got all this information, the same as I get it. 'Dr. Anderson

is of the opinion that a need for a further formal study has not been established. The basis for such a study would be determined by the number of cases of pneumoconiosis identified by the annual miners medical examination'- which included now the pulmonary function test - However, as stated above, no cases have yet been identified.'

'At this stage it would appear that the established monitoring and dust control programmes at the mine are adequate and, coupled with the annual miners' medical examination 'should ensure the health of the miners is protected.' 'Should' I mean, you can only go as far as some of the greatest experts in the world, but from all the information that we have been able to establish that is the result.

MR. NEARY:

What about Dr. Edstrom?

MR. DINN:

Dr. Edstrom is totally involved. I mean, he is as involved as anybody else.

MR. NEARY:

Did he do a report?

MR. DINN:

Well, certainly Dr. Edstrom has not come forward in the past year or so and said to me that something else needs to be done. And if he does I will have his information investigated.

MR. NEARY:

He did do a report?

MR. DINN:

He did do a report, yes. As a matter of fact, before 1976 I believe Dr. Edstrom did a report on miners' lung.

MR. NEARY:

In Baie Verte?

MR. DINN:

Well, Dr. Edstrom did a bit of a study on Baie Verte, too, but the biggest report that Dr. Edstrom was involved in was the Labrador lung study. He brought forward the name 'Labrador lung' and he did some studies with respect to Baie Verte but we did not conclude that study for obvious reasons. 'The Division of Occupation Health and Safety, through the chief occupational medical officer, Dr. John Martin, is maintaining close liaison with the chief medical officer of the Workers' Compensation Commission to insure that any cases diagnosed as pneumoconiosis cases are reported.'

Well, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will have an opportunity to speak now. I know the hon. the member for LaPoile is very interested in occupational health and safety in this Province. It is not a joke with him, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the hon. member will be able to add a great deal to the debate. I know he has had an opportunity now to read the amendments that we are attempting to make to The Occupational Health And Safety Act today. Some of them are big amendments, some of them are very important amendments to The Occupational Health And Safety Act. I am sure the hon. member, having read the piece of legislation, will agree with the legislation 100 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, I will be listening to all hon. members opposite who wish to participate in this debate, and all members on this side who wish to participate in this debate, and I will write down any questions that hon. members have and attempt to answer them to the best of my ability. And if I have not got the answers here - and I would say that I have most

of the answers here - I can assure hon. members that I will get the answers before this debate concludes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through if I could, very briefly, what we are attempting to do with respect to the few amendments that we are bringing in here with respect to occupational health and safety. As I said, one provides for the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint subcommittees. We have an Occupational Health and Safety Committee that have something like twenty people on it. They represent industry and labour and special interest groups and some officials in the Department, Health and Occupational Health and Safety. While we have these people on the committee, sometimes, for various offshoots and specialized information the committee requires, they want advisory committees set up as one of their recommendations. So we said it sounds like a good idea to us, we will get it passed into legislation, we will bring it into the House and get it passed and, when it is passed, you make your recommendations to the minister, the minister will bring them to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and get them approved. Now you just cannot do it willy-nilly, there has to be a formal process, so this advisory committee has almost the same authority as under a Public Enquiries Act, has the authority to go and find and get the information. So that is one.

Number two is the authority to make regulations respecting health and safety of workers in mines transferred from under The Regulation Of Mines Act to The Occupational Health And Safety Act.

Number three is a most important amendment. I want hon. members to

listen to this one because it would permit changes to funding arrangements between the Workers' Compensation Commission and Occupational Health and Safety so that we do not get stuck out in left field, and, just because it is under the Occupational Health and Safety Act that I do not order the Workers' Compensation to pay part of the cost of a dust study; that they set aside some money every year out of their reserves for studies just in case something happens, say, down in Baie Verte and somebody shows up with pneumoconiosis or asbestosis, the miner's medical identifies a problem, we can get in there right away and we can go to the Workers' Compensation and they can pay for that kind of a study but they will have some money in a reserve for it so they will put away a portion. We have not decided exactly how much they should put away every year, but we are going to set aside a portion so we are ready and we can perform those dust studies and that that part of Workers' Compensation becomes actuarially sound too. So if a problem arises, gaseous substance, things that we need to identify, experts are needed, we will have the dollars to do it. This is what we call preventive medicine. And the amendment clears the way for changes in the funding arrangements, (a) by removing the requirement for the Commission to levy special assessments - Workers' Compensation will not have special assessments for this on employers. The same assessment arrangement applies, but they will tuck away, they will away in a special fund some money which will cover Occupational Health and Safety programme costs. And (b), removes the requirement that any funds collected by the Commission for occupational health and safety be paid over directly to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The

amounts and manner, as I said, will be prescribed by regulations.

In addition, Clause 44 of the bill, 'Transfers a provision from the Regulation Of Mines Act which requires the employer to pay for medical examinations.' Now I never mentioned that in the first part, but that is important too. Clause 44 of the bill, 'Transfers the provision from The Regulations Of Mine Act which requires the employer to pay for medical examinations on behalf of the worker.' So there is a problem there, the worker has to get medical examination, he goes and gets it and the employer pays it. We are transferring that from The Regulation of Mines Act over to Occupational Health and Safety so that we now have under that umbrella all the inspection services, all the authority and all the regulations and the capability to carry out the mandate of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, and the other act that come under The Occupational Health and Safety Division.

I look forward to comments by hon. members opposite and hon. members on this side if they care to participate in this debate. I look forward to the comments. I will answer all the questions they may have with respect to occupational health and safety. Mr. Speaker, with that I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we had originally intended, I think, through agreement with the hon. gentleman to adjourn debating the principle of this bill until tomorrow. But after listening to the hon. gentleman, if it is agreeable to my colleagues and my friend to my

right, I would not mind having a few preliminary remarks, in general, just to comment on the things that the hon. gentleman said about the Department of Occupational Health and Safety, and then leave myself a few minutes to move the adjournment

MR. NEARY:

until tomorrow to debate the principle and the main clauses of the bill. I am sure my hon. colleague from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) would like to study that bill too before commenting on it. So my comments at the moment will be of a general nature.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I am pleased that the government moved in the direction of establishing a special branch in the Department of Labour and Manpower, a special branch of Occupational Health and Safety, because of the nature of the industries that we have in this Province. We have asbestos, which is a very hazardous industry, at Baie Verte, we had mining going on in Buchans where you had employees exposed to the dust hazard, you had people in the mills in Labrador City and Wabush exposed to a high velocity of dust, and you have people working in other mines and in other occupations, other industries, that are tremendously hazardous. I think that was a wise thing to do, Mr. Speaker, that was a smart thing to do to move in that direction to get it all under one roof, to get it all under one umbrella. I approve of that and I agree with it because I saw firsthand from my experience on Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, the dangers and the hazards that men and women are exposed to. Asbestosis, for instance, we are told that sometimes you can contact asbestosis on the surface from the dust from the road over which the

asbestos is being hauled. So, Mr. Speaker, that was probably a good move, and no doubt the health and safety aspect of working under these conditions has improved tremendously. I am delighted about that. I always felt, myself, that miners on Bell Island, for instance, who worked in the mines for twenty-five, thirty, thirty-five years whom the doctor diagnosed as having angina or asthma or bronchitis, Mr. Speaker. I always felt and I still do to this day that what they had really was what you call miner's lung. They had miner's lung. But the medical practitioner on the Island at the time was also on Dosco's payroll and it is very unlikely that he would go against the company that was paying him. So all these cases were diagnosed, angina, bronchitis, asthma. And you can go on Bell Island today and you can meet men who are now in their late '60s and early '70s, mid '70s, late '70s and you can talk to these men and you would be amazed, Mr. Speaker, if you listened to their breathing, their heavy breathing. You could hear them halfway across this House breathing. And I believe that is a direct result of working in the mine. They have what I would term as miner's lung. Mr. Speaker, they are not entitled to any form of compensation because they were not diagnosed, it was not associated or identified in any way with the dust in the mine. The doctor said that they had angina or bronchitis or asthma or they had pneumonia when they were young or something of that nature. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that never again in the history of this Province will we have a situation develop like developed in St. Lawrence, because that is the scandal of all scandals. And I am sure with the rules and regulations that are in place

today, the organization that is set up under this Occupational Health Branch of the department will stand on guard against a situation occurring ever again in this Province like occurred in St. Lawrence, when men were just dying like flies and nobody seemed to want to do anything about it. I believe it was through the initiative of the union, it was the union down there which took the bull by the horns and finally had a study done, brought in a doctor who called the men together one day in the union hall and said, 'Look, there is a bug in that mine and it is eating you.' Up to that time their pleas and their recommendations were just ignored by the authorities. Nobody paid any attention to them, they were a voice crying in the wilderness, Mr. Speaker. But now that we have this set up we have to be careful, Mr. Speaker, that it just does not develop into another bureaucracy.

MR. TULK:

Leave it to them and it will.

MR. NEARY:

We have to see to it that it is very sensitive to what is happening in these industries where you have a high health hazard. You have to be very careful that it does not develop into another level of bureaucracy.

Now the minister was a little bit on the defensive about Baie Verte. He should not be but he was because he saw bits and pieces of a programme last night on television involving the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board and some of the men who had been exposed to the asbestos dust who now have cancer. The hon. gentleman seemed to be smarting under some of the things that were said on that programme and I think he referred to the attitude.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might be well advised to send for that tape or to go down to CBC and look at that tape and make notes before he responds in an off-the-cuff way. Because, Mr. Speaker, there was a message in that programme last night, there was a message of concern in it. And as a result of that programme last night I did some research this morning myself and I talked to the gentleman who is the head of the union in Baie Verte, who initiated the Silikoff enquiry. I talked to that gentleman and I asked him if he had seen the programme. He said, 'Yes', he had. I asked him if he thought that the statement made by Mr. Maynard, Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board was correct, the statement that there is nowhere in the world where you have a programme to remove people from these occupations where you have a lot of dust, no programme in the world. Mr. Saunders told me there is one in Ontario. The Workers' Compensation Board have a programme in Ontario, and I believe there is one in Labrador. The hon. gentleman told me earlier today, we were chatting out behind the curtain, that IOC has a programme for taking people from the mill where you have a lot of dust and training them for other occupations within the framework of the company. So, Mr. Maynard was wrong. And I do not know how many more points he was wrong on.

MR. DINN:

He meant a regular programme.

MR. NEARY:

Well, all right, I will give him the benefit of the doubt. He did say that to his knowledge nowhere in the world did this type of programme exist. It exists in Ontario, it exists in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, and I was rather shocked and amazed that the

Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board was not aware of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not have an opportunity today to complete my research, but I want to throw a couple of statistics on the table. The hon. gentleman should not be on the defensive about that programme last night because there was a message in the programme. The message in the programme is a follow up, monitor, follow up. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a matter of concern as far as the miners of Baie Verte are concerned, because Dr. Silikoff said this, the programme stated it last night, came through loud and clear, that it takes anywhere from twenty to thirty years before people who have been exposed to asbestos dust get the disease, get cancer or get asbestosis. It takes anywhere from twenty to thirty years. So a lot of the men who worked in Baie Verte for Advocate Mines still have ten or fifteen years to run before they will know for sure whether or not they will get cancer as a result of asbestosis. They will not know.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, twenty former employees of Advocate Mines in Baie Verte, since 1966, twenty former miners have died and seventeen of them, I am told, died with cancer. Seventeen out of the twenty former employees of Advocate Mines at Baie Verte have died with cancer since 1966. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say whether or not the cancer was related to their exposure to dust from the asbestos. It is not for me to say but it is certainly an alarming statistic. Mr. Speaker, the message that I got from that programme and the message that I got from talking to people who know, who are very familiar with the Baie Verte situation, tell me

that the chief concern of all of those who are interested in that problem, the chief concern is follow-up and monitoring all those people who have been exposed to that hazard. I realize 1,800 people passed through the gates and the doors of Advocate Mines when they were operating at Baie Verte, 1,800, and they may be scattered all over Newfoundland and probably a lot of them in different parts of Canada, but, Mr. Speaker, surely in this day and age it must be possible to keep a check on the majority of these men and I am told that it is not being done. I believe the hon. gentleman told us about Dr. Silikoff coming in - when was it in 1976? In 1976 Dr. Silikoff came here, who is the world's greatest authority on asbestosis, and we were very fortunate to have him come to Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, when Dr. Silikoff finished his first report he agreed and it was generally understood that there would be a follow-up report three years hence, that three years after Dr. Silikoff identified the problem, submitted his report, in 1979 a second report would be made. But the second report was not made, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Your Honour, I ask the minister to tell us why it was not made. Dr. Silikoff, as I understand it, was available, but Dr. Silikoff is not a man who would work under another doctor who is not knowledgeable in these matters, or not as knowledgeable as he is. And the scenario that I have had laid out for me is this, that when Dr. Silikoff was asked to come back to do a follow-up report he was told he that he would have to work under another doctor, that he would have to work under a doctor in this Province and that arrangement was unsatisfactory to Dr. Silikoff.

MR. DINN:

Or he would have to agree to provide all of the information within numerous studies.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Silikoff, as the hon. gentleman says, would have to agree to provide all the information that he did not provide in the first study. That may very well be. I am only asking the hon. gentleman. I am explaining the scenario as I know it. I do not know what kind of information Dr. Silikoff did not give the Minister of Health or the hon. gentleman in his first report. I do not know what kind of information we are talking about, but what I am -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Does Your Honour wish to say something?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

Sure. Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

I thank the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for allowing me the time to announce that we have three questions for the Late Show this afternoon, the first one asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) of the Premier with regard to Mobil's environmental impact settlement on the Hibernia field; the second one asked by the hon. member for LaPoile of the Premier with regard to the question on the BTM Station in Port aux Basques; and the third one asked by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) of the Premier pertaining to the layoffs at IOC in Labrador.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate indeed that some arrangement could not be worked out by the government, the union, and Dr. Silikoff so that he could have come in and done that follow-up report. It was tragic, unfortunate, that this dispute should have arisen that barred the 1800 or so former employees of Advocate Mines from having that follow-up done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am told also that when the dispute arose, and the money would not be made available to enable Dr. Silikoff to come to Newfoundland to do his second report, a local medical man was employed by the Workers' Compensation to do a report. Now I do not know what the terms of reference were for that doctor whom I only know by reputation, who has a good name, probably a very qualified man, but I would have to say probably not as qualified in the field of asbestosis as Dr. Silikoff, but I am told that that gentleman was employed to do an enquiry, to do a report, paid for by the Workers' Compensation Board, so I am told, to the tune of \$300,000. I wish the hon. gentleman was in his seat to hear what I am saying because this is a very sensitive area that we are in here. I would assume from remarks the hon. gentleman made this afternoon that the report did not only include Baie Verte but Labrador City and probably Buchans, Mr. Speaker, there was a study done but the study in no way could take the place of the one that should have been done by Dr. Silikoff, in no way.

But, Mr. Speaker, that report has been put on the shelf, The former employees of Advocate Mines, the union that was involved at the

time, have not seen or read that report. The government and the Workers' Compensation Board have refused to date, right up to this moment, to release that report to let the people who are attempting to do something about this problem read this report. And I ask the minister why cannot that report be made public? Why cannot copies of that report be given to the Steelworkers Union who played such a prominent role in trying to arrest this great problem in Baie Verte? Why can they not be given a copy of that report? Through a variety of circumstances, misunderstandings and disputes Dr. Silikoff could not come back to Newfoundland to do his second report. I think the whole matter could have been resolved if the government had made a few dollars available to him. The figure I heard was \$30,000. If he had \$30,000 Dr. Silikoff could have come into Newfoundland, could have done his follow-up, could have made his recommendations, written his report and we would have had the advice and the recommendations of the top person in the world, the number one man in the world on asbestosis. We had to take second choice that, I am told, cost \$300,000. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, that is the scenario I am laying out, I want the hon. gentleman to give me some information. And no doubt the hon. gentleman is listening. But if it did cost \$300,000 that is ten times more than Dr. Silikoff wanted. And then to add insult to injury nobody can see the report. And my hon. friend is right, there are a few things I have to say about this. Nobody can see the report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

I knew there were.

MR. NEARY:

I doubt very much if there is

anything in the report that is going to shock anybody out of their shoes.

MR. TULK:

Have you seen it?

MR. NEARY:

No, I have not seen it. It is safely guarded and protected by the hon. gentlemen there opposite and by the Workers' Compensation Board.

MR. CALLAN:

It is not as readily available as the Mifflin Report.

MR. NEARY

It is not as readily available as a lot of other reports that are around. But, Mr. Speaker, the people involved have a right to that report. And apart from that - I do not want to get sidetracked of on just making this argument over whether or not the government should release the report - I believe the Premier of this Province and his ministers have an obligation to get Dr. Silikoff back to Newfoundland and let him do that second report as was promised back in 1976. It should have been done in 1979. Get that second report done. Because, Mr. Speaker, we do not want another St. Lawrence type situation on our hands. Asbestosis or cancer of men and women exposed to the dust hazard of asbestos will not reach its peak for twenty or thirty years after they come in contact with it. They still have ten or fifteen years to run and these people are walking around, Mr. Speaker, maybe with the disease germinating inside of their bodies because of some dispute or misunderstanding or not being able to get together, or somebody wanting the upper hand or somebody refusing to give us some information. Dr. Silikoff would have come, gladly come, to

Newfoundland to do this study if he had a free hand, if he was the boss, but he was told, 'You have to work under a medical man designated by us.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour and ask members, is that good enough? That is why I issued the warning to the hon. gentleman that I hope that this does not develop into another bureaucracy, that it does not get bogged down, that it will be able to function the way that it should and that the potential dangers and hazards that are lurking out there in some of these industries especially the offshore, Mr. Speaker, that they will be reduced to a minimum or eliminated altogether if it is possible. I doubt it is possible to eliminate these hazards altogether where you have high levels of dust in mines and in plants and so forth and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are my preliminary remarks. I would like to get back on this bill again tomorrow and talk about the bill itself. I think by agreement we have already decided that I would move the adjournment, Mr. Speaker, of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile has moved the adjournment and the question is how much time does he have left in the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER:

About thirty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

About thirty minutes remaining, approximately.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 4, Bill No. 2.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Boiler,

Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act." (Bill No. 2).

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, we have amendments to the Boiler, Pressure Vessel and Compressed Gas Act just about every year. This is another update on that piece of legislation. Basically the bill revises the duties of the Boiler, Pressure Vessel Advisory Board appointed under the Boiler, Pressure Vessel and Compressed Gas Act.

The board would cease to act as an administrative entity and assume a purely advisory function. The amendments would transfer most of the duties presently assigned to the Advisory Board to the Director appointed under the Act, and the remaining duties would be assigned to committees appointed under the regulations.

We have had several problems with respect to the Advisory Board's capability to make decisions quickly and sometimes you have to make decisions relatively quickly here. The Director, who is a professional in the field, is capable of making decisions and has on several occasions, and after several months of controversy surrounding the decision that was made by the Director, then we found that the legalities of the Director operating the way he was operating were not in the act so we have to change the act such that the Boiler, Pressure Vessel and Compressed Gas Advisory Committee do the role as an advisory committee and the Director, who is the professional, can make the day to day operational decisions.

These amendments were deemed necessary because of the few problems that we had as it pertained to the capability of the

Director to make decisions under law. We have to change the law so that he has the power. The Director appointed under the Act may issue temporary certificates without any reference, for example, to the Advisory Board. And what happens is in the event that you have a huge plant operation that needs a Class 1, say, or Class 2 power engineer, as the Act reads right now the Advisory Board, after he goes through a testing process, etc., can allow a qualified engineer, graduated from university, maybe operating in industry and working in industry for ten or twenty years with different or bigger power capabilities and boilers, etc., and plants, huge plants, might apply for a job in a plant, have all of the qualifications and capabilities, but one of the requirements is that he work six months in that plant to become acquainted. But we might not have the capability of having somebody there to train him for that six months. So here is a qualified engineer who operated plants twice the size, knows what the capability of the boilers are, as a matter of fact engineers sometimes design them, you know, and these engineers have the capability of doing this, designing these buildings and plants and so on, these power plants. It has not got the capability because it has to go to the Advisory Board for certification for him to operate that plant.

So what we are saying here is the director, who is, by the way, a first-class power engineer, which is very difficult, it is easier to become an engineer in this Province than it is to become a first-class power engineer.

MR. SIMMS:

What is he director of?

MR. DINN:

He is Director of Engineering and Technical Services. But he has the capability basically to operate just about any boiler or power plant in this Province. He has that capability. But one of the regulations states you have to have six months, and you have to be passed by the Advisory Board. But in order to go through that process the plant has to close because they do not have a power engineer to do it. So what this does is it permits the director to look at the guy's qualifications and say, you still have to pass the test, fellow, when the time comes, but you can operate that plant. I mean, you have operated, for example, the plant out at ERCO, so surely you can operate the plant, for example, at the Grace Hospital. So he has to go through the process, his qualifications have to be checked out, but the director can make that day to day decision. Okay that is a temporary -

MR. SIMMS:

It might not sound like much to people, but this is a very, very critical.

MR. DINN:

It is very important. We have had several fairly critical operations. In one instance, we had to take a retired power engineer who had the capability to operate this plant, and put him in with a qualified engineer, who could probably have designed the plant, for a period of three to six months and the company paid him to walk around behind him just because he had the qualifications and wrote the test and this guy could not write the test and go through the Advisory Committee process. So the plant had to hire two people. This will permit the director appointed under the Act to issue these temporary

certificates. The director appointed under the Act has the unreserved authority to grant exemption from strict compliance with the regulations in exceptional circumstances only without reference to the Advisory Board. This applies in situations where you have a plant, you have a qualified person to operate that plant, so the director, who is a professional in his field, a first-class power engineer, looks at the guy and says yes, you are an engineer, you operated a bigger plant, you might have even operated this plant or a similar plant, so you can operate this plant, go in and do it. This temporary certificate allows that to happen and that function cannot be performed by an advisory committee, so this is what we are want to do here. And, of course, number three is the establishment of a Boiler, Pressure Vessel Appeals Board. Appeals were previously heard by the Advisory Board. Now, the Advisory Board is a fairly large board and they are attempting to deal with making regulations, providing advice to the minister; they meet on a monthly basis sometimes and they have quite a large agenda. But when you have a case where you need an appeal body you generally only require one or two or three people to hear an appeal, so what we need to do here in the case of an appeal is to provide the capability of setting up this Appeal Board so the appeals can be heard by the Appeal Board and the Advisory Committee can go on with and perform their functions of going through regulations, of looking at the changes that are required in industry and making recommendations to the minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are only three items. I trust that I have provided hon. members with an outline of basically what we are

attempting to do here and hope that they concur. And, of course, as with the previous bill on Occupational Health and Safety, I will listen attentively to what hon. members have to say and answer any questions towards the end when I get up to close the debate on second reading. With that, I move second reading.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that what this bill does is it removes the authority from a board to examine people who want to get their fourth class stationary engineer certificates. It takes the authority out of the hands of the board and gives it to the director. I thought I caught the hon. gentleman saying that the director will only issue temporary permits and later they will have to be re-issued by the board. Is that the procedure?

MR. DINN:
Well, in the case of an emergency where you need a power engineer for a plant and you have an engineer who has the capability but has to go through the process of writing the examination and being passed by the Advisory Board, which might not meet until the end of the month, the director will give him a temporary certificate. Then he will write the examination and go through the same process he goes through now.

MR. NEARY:
Well, what the bill says, Mr. Speaker, is 'The director may for cause cancel, suspend or recall a

certificate issued under this section', he can issue certificates without any reference to the board.

MR. DINN:
But we are providing an appeal process. So the director does it. You will have an appeal. Now, the Advisory Committee which handles appeals now is a big committee.

MR. NEARY:
Yes, I know.

MR. DINN:
It is a function that they cannot perform by virtue of their size alone. So what they want and what we want is to set up this small appeal panel so they can handle -

MR. NEARY:
Will there be any need for a board at all if you are going to give the director all the authority?

MR. DINN:
Certainly. I mean, that is the overseer. If the director appears to do something wrong, the employer or the employee or anybody can go in and register an appeal against what the director does. I mean, that is the overseer of it.

MR. NEARY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I am still not clear on what it is the hon. gentleman is trying to accomplish.

MR. DINN:
Well, go ahead and ask your questions and I will write them down.

MR. NEARY:
Well, I will just ask a few questions. I am not going to debate this at any length because it is not the most important piece of legislation ever to come before this House. But it is an

important piece of legislation because it changes procedure, and it changes procedure drastically, Mr. Speaker. And as I see it what it is doing is taking the authority for examining individuals for certificates, under certain circumstances, away from the board and giving it to the director.

Now the hon. gentleman can argue all he wants but that is the way I see it.

MR. DINN:

That is what it is.

MR. NEARY:

And that is what it is. That is what I said a few minutes ago and the hon. gentleman disagreed with me.

MR. DINN:

But there is a process to appeal a director's decision.

MR. NEARY:

There is a process.

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

That is right, there is a process of appeal and that may cure any wrong that may take place. But it is a drastic change in policy. Perhaps it is warranted, I do not know. The hon. gentleman may be able to elaborate a little further when he closes the debate. Perhaps it is warranted in view of all the things that are happening in the Province. Maybe the old system is outdated, I do not know. It could be. It probably is. But the board heretofore, the board previously, was made up of people who are fairly busy people, good people, but they could only meet occasionally. I know a few years ago when I was minister of that department, and even when I

was not minister of the department, that I had occasions when engineers and people who worked around vessels and gas and so forth, with tanks and high pressure boilers and so forth, that they wanted to write their exam for their certificate and there was some difficulty in getting the time set down and the procedure. You know, we are getting highly sophisticated in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We have the new technology here the same as they have anywhere else in Canada, and we have made tremendous advances and strides and we are putting up buildings now where you cannot do without a fourth or a third class engineer. We have the vessels, we have the offshore, we have the supply ships and airplanes, we have it all. We are now in a high tech stage in this Province, Mr. Speaker, so the old system may be outdated, and perhaps that is the argument the hon. gentleman should be putting forward to give the authority to the director, but I advise the hon. gentleman to move slowly -

MR. DINN:

Make sure there is protection.

MR. NEARY:

That is right, the protection, in doing away with the protection. And, Mr. Speaker, they should make sure that the advisory board is not made up of political appointees. I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that in the Department of Fisheries there are a couple of advisory boards there that are very good and the heads of the boards are non-partisan as far as I know. But the hon. gentleman should see to it that his advisory board is made up of good men and women, because I think there should be some women on that advisory board because women are now moving into that

area, Mr. Speaker. We had a case there, the hon. Premier might recall, a year and a half or a couple of years ago when a lady, in Goose Bay I believe it was, was refused a job on an oil rig, and won the case. I am not sure if there has been a second one since then.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is she working on the rigs now?

MR. NEARY:

I do not know. But women are moving into that area and there is no reason why they should not. There is no reason why they should not. What is to stop a woman from being a fourth class stationary engineer or a third class stationary engineer? I have been at vocational school graduations where I saw women graduating as welders. I was down at CN one day and actually saw - I am not sure if it was in the dockyard or up in the car shop - a lady there welding. So there should be equal representation on that advisory board because that is the key to the success of these changes that are being made. The key to the hon. gentleman's success in making these changes is that he has a good advisory board so that men and women can appeal their cases if they feel they have been unjustifiably dealt with. And if the hon. gentleman could promise us that he would do that, Mr. Speaker, then I believe we might be tempted to vote for this. Certainly we will not vote against this bill. I would like to hear more comment from the hon. gentleman as to why it was necessary to make these great changes in procedure and how quickly he will move to set up this advisory board where appeals can be processed.

MR. DINN:

That is already in place. The

advisory board handles that now.

MR. NEARY:

Well, is the hon. gentleman going to use the old board to process grievances and complaints and that sort of thing?

MR. DINN:

We are trying to set up a smaller board for appeals.

MR. NEARY:

Will the members be reappointed or will there be new appointments? Would the hon. gentleman tell us how many women are on that board now?

MR. DINN:

I do not know. I do not have the list here right now.

MR. NEARY:

I would say not one.

MR. DINN:

The lady from Glovertown with The Building Accessibility Act, what is her name?

MR. SIMMS:

Irene McGinn.

MR. DINN:

Irene McGinn, I believe she is one but I am not sure.

MR. NEARY:

But anyway, one of the big complaints of the Status of Women and other groups in this Province is for the administration to not only preach equality for women but also to see that they are put in key positions.

MR. DINN:

Excuse me.

MR. NEARY:

Sure, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Just for the hon. member's information, outside of the officials on the board - and I do not think they even have a voting privilege on the board; for example, the Director of Engineering and Technical Services is part of that board but I do not even think he as voting privileges - all of the other people recommended for the board are recommended by employers groups and unions.

MR. NEARY:

And most of them are tradespeople or employers.

MR. DINN:

And most of them are associated in the field -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We do not have any control over whether they are male or female.

MR. DINN:

Yes, we have no control really over that, although I suppose we could recommend to them that the next time they are sending in recommendations they might send in some names of females. Most of the people on the board - and it is almost on a 50/50 basis - are suggested by unions or by companies which employ workers in this field. For example, there is a representative from the newsprint industry, and so on.

MR. NEARY:

Make recommendations to the minister?

MR. DINN:

That is right, and they are never changed.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, while it may be true that they make the recommendations, nevertheless it is the Lieutenant-Governor in

Council who makes the appointments. So all they have to do is reject them or say, 'Look, we would like to recommend that you submit the names of some women.' Well, that is fine, Mr. Speaker. So if I have these assurances, Mr. Speaker, I would go along with the recommendations with a little more explanation from the hon. the minister of why they are necessary at this time.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

It being 5:30 p.m. we have three questions for the Late Show and we will recognize another speaker on this bill next day.

Question number one is the question asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) of the Premier with regards to the federal government's decision to delay the filing of Mobil's Environmental Impact Statement on the Hibernia oil field.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in all governments there is a tendency to want to have secrecy. Yet governments realize that with information given to the general public there is a greater opportunity for the public to fully understand what a government may be doing, what agreements it may be entering into and what the consequences of those agreements might be. Now we have a very important development hopefully going to take place off the shores of this Province with the Hibernia development. It is crucially important that everybody in this Province fully understand the significance of the steps which might be taken in the course of developing the field. We see

both levels of government agreeing to delay the time when information will become available to the public which would permit men and women in this Province to fully understand and fully be able to analyse and appreciate what is about to take place, the things that government might be agreeing to.

Now it is not, Mr. Speaker, sufficient for the Premier to say that the provincial government or the federal government has not yet gotten their acts together, and that may be so. I would say that by now the Province should have its various studies completed for alternative modes of development and should be in a position to deal with the environmental impact statement right away. If the federal government needs more time because it is a new government, then, Mr. Speaker, this might be understandable, but it should not be a matter of any more than a couple of weeks. Now even if that is the case that the federal government may need more time to develop an approach with the provincial government, that still does not justify or explain or excuse delaying the time when the Mobil impact statement is made available for study and analysis by this House and by the general public. What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that there will eventually be a delay. Now the Premier has given an undertaking that there will be full opportunity for examination. Well, that may be so but all that means is that it will be that much longer before the Hibernia development can start. And at a time when we have such a high rate of unemployment in this Province, a record rate of unemployment, it is cruel and it is callous to force men and women of this Province - the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is

laughing, presumably in the district of St. George's there is full employment. I am sure there is not a person unemployed in the district of St. George's and they will be happy to hear that the minister is chuckling away as we refer to the thousands who are unemployed in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is callous and cruel to have any delay of the development which may provide jobs for those thousands of unemployed men and women who are presently desperately seeking jobs in this Province.

MR. BARRY:

I would like the Premier, when he responds to indicate, first of all, whether the Province has gotten a sneak preview? Were there any draft plans submitted, any draft environmental impact statements submitted to the Province which they now have in their offices, hidden away from the general public? And I will also ask the Premier if he would give an assurance to this House that there is no more to this than meets the eye, that there are not some hidden problems, whether relating to the fact that the international price of oil has declined significantly and has, at best, reduced the revenues available for sharing between both levels of government or, at worst, getting to the point where the viability of Hibernia might be put in question? Has this maybe had some impact upon the decision to delay the release of this environmental impact statement? I would also ask the Premier whether the delay in the filing of the environmental impact statement indicates that there may be possible delays in the signing of the offshore agreement, in completing the details of the offshore agreement with the Federal government? Is this something that may be occurring?

Is the road not as smooth as the Premier would have us believe? -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The time for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has expired.

MR. BARRY:

Is this why the environmental impact statement is not required to be filed and revealed to the public right away?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will only be to happy to try to answer the questions for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). First of all on the whole concept or question of secrecy, I remember back a number of years ago when we were devising these regulations, because I was very much a part of them, and one of the things that we were very strong on at the time, which we still are just as strong on, if not stronger, is this whole question of public hearings in the filing of the development plan as well as the environmental impact statement. Now we can get all these buzz words all tangled up, but what the operators want to do is file an environmental impact statement and, of course, in order to file an environmental statement you have to be able to say what kind of a development you are going to have and how that will impact on the environment. How can you file an environmental impact statement if you do not know what it is that is going to have the impact, what kind of a development it is going to be? One goes hand in hand with the other. This is the problem with it: because of the federal system which moved ahead very quickly, if you will, or the operator moved ahead

quickly under that until such time as the government changed and then there was the exchange of letters on the offshore agreement which is coming. So on the first thing, the secrecy thing, there is no question that we are extremely strong on that point and will under no circumstances sign anything or allow things to occur which do not take into full consideration a full debate and public hearings as it relates to the development plan which impacts upon the environmental impact statement or upon the environment. So it is just a question of when the release comes. I mean, the big thing here, outside of the political debate and the partisanship, the big thing here which has to be clearly understood - and I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) understands it but he is playing at staging a Leader of the Opposition role as opposed to being an informed citizen of the Province in some of these questions that he is asking, and that is fair ball, I do not mind that as long as we understand where the hon. gentleman is coming from - is we have now in Ottawa, as has been demonstrated not only in the exchange of letters but in what has just been announced by both governments, a government here which has just recently said again, in the telegram to Mr. Marshall, to the President of the Executive Council the Minister responsible for Energy, that we are responsible and we will have the last say in the mode of development and all the rest of it. It is a complete new change of attitude and you know, with the new group of people now leading the Liberal Party in Ottawa, it could have happened under a Liberal administration, so I am not trying to be partisan on it. So there is a whole new approach here on how we are going

to proceed. Now on this whole business of trying to release some of the information, I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and most Newfoundlanders know that some of the oil companies, including the major operator, right now are going around the Province holding public hearings or information sessions and they are saying various things. As a lot of us know, one of the interests of the oil companies at this point in time is to proceed in a manner which may not be consistent with the objectives of the Government of Newfoundland as it relates to more jobs under one mode than another mode and they have been making a great hullabaloo about this over the last several months. I do not think it would be in anybody's best interests to release and that is all that could be released now - the company's point of view as it relates to this development because you do not have anything to compare it to. And at this present moment there is a lot of new concepts going around: You can talk about your floating steel platforms and you can talk about your concrete gravity based structures, but in between that there is a whole new concept being considered by some other people in the oil industry which marries the two, in which you would still get a significant amount of employment opportunities in this Province and have perhaps the top side of it being steel and the bottom part of it being concrete. This is a new concept. A lot of money has been spent, millions of dollars over the last Summer, looking at that concept. So that will give you an idea of what you are confronted with.

Now because we have this new co-operative arrangement with the government in Ottawa, and through discussions with the hon.

gentleman to my right and the minister in Ottawa, it was felt for all of these various reasons of new concepts, of getting firm data on costs for the various modes that have to be established, that have to be credible, that it was in everybody's best interests to delay that filing for six months so that we would have received some of the studies that have been commissioned now in the last few months by the Government of Newfoundland and extra information that COGLA and the Government of Canada would get so that at the time of filing there would be sufficient data and information around for reasoned and informed opinion for informed and reasoned decisions. That is the only reason.

There is no thought of the price being a deterrent here at all at this point in time, no thought at all. There is some reduction in the price of North Sea oil from Norway and Great Britain, but there is also some stabilization going on, I think, with the OPEC countries. You may see some further erosion of it, but the price is not the determining factor here in the six month delay at all and it in no way should signal that there is any delay in the offshore agreement. We have all kinds of assurances, which we will be announcing in the not too distant future, perhaps in the next few days, as to when the first series of meetings will take place leading to the agreement so that it will be in place for 1985. So I do not think there is any question about that. But both governments do feel, as do the experts who advise us, that it would be in everybody's best interest, given the enormity of this thing, given the fact that new concepts have come on the table as to how the mode of development is going to be

handled, with us having the final say on that, we want to be sure that when we go to public hearings, and when we go to public debate, both in this House and outside, that the individual or the citizen has the benefit of two or three different points of view. If you allowed the filing to go ahead right now you would only have one point of view, largely the company's, articulated with back up figures and all the rest of it, all from their own point of view without the benefit at the same time of having on the other side these other concepts and other proposals fed out in proper, credible information. Because it is going to be a big decision and it is going to involve thousands and thousands of jobs and billions of dollars. For that reason that is why the delay is there. I think it is justified and I think we will be able to show that over the next couple of months.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The Premier's time has expired.

The hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), question number two.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason I put down my question to have it debated during the Late Show is because I was very disappointed with the answers that were given to me today concerning layoffs at the BTM station in Port aux Basques and the elimination of the truck to truck operations in Port aux Basques where they transfer wide gauge wheels to the narrow gauge system that we have in this Province. It is going to be shut down and six TerraTransport employees will lose their jobs.

MR. DAWE:

They will lose only one shift. It is not being shut down.

MR. NEARY:

Well, one shift has been shut down. I was disappointed that the hon. gentleman did not deal with the closing out of the BTM station at Argentia.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, elected to remind me of Liberal projects in the area on the Southwest corner of the Province, the industrial park, for instance, was announced two years ago by Mr. Herb Grey and by Roger Simmons. Granted there had to be a provincial/federal agreement, but the park is being funded by the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Then the \$6.5 million that Mr. Crosbie, bully boy Crosbie, is trying to steal from the people in Port aux Basques was announced by Roger Simmons, by a Liberal government.

There was another project the hon. gentleman announced but anyway, Mr. Speaker, all the projects that the hon. gentleman referred to were Liberal projects that had been announced previously to deal with the economic situation on the Southwest corner of the Province because we have been going through hard times out there, there have been major layoffs. And I asked the hon. gentleman today if he was aware of these recent layoffs and the hon. gentleman instead of dealing with my question, instead of answering the question, chose to ignore it. Now the hon. gentleman had meetings concerning a road to the gold mine that he refused to help the company to build, and I will deal with that in due course. The hon. gentleman should keep quite on that.

MR. DAWE:

Is that another Liberal project?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is another industry that is likely to go because the hon. gentleman would not co-operate.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier chose to ignore the questions that I put to him. Now I know that the Premier cannot be knowledgeable in everything that goes on in this Province and if he had stood up man-fashion and said, 'Look, no I did not hear about these recent layoffs but I will look into it and I will fight just as hard' - because he likes now to remind us of the co-operative arrangements between this Province and Ottawa - 'I will fight just as hard to keep that station as I did to keep Shoe Cove tracking station or to get a full military base in Newfoundland. I will fight just as hard for the people of Port aux Basques and Argenticia and the people of TerraTransport. I will not let Ottawa ride rough-shod over the people of this Province. It is not because we are of the same political stripe that they think they can do what they like.' If the hon. gentleman had said that I would have understood it. The hon. gentleman will soon find out the problems we had with ministers in Ottawa not informing us as to what is going on and I presume the hon. gentleman is running up against the same problem.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We do not have the same problem at all.

MR. NEARY:

I can only assume from the answers that were given that the hon. gentleman was completely ignorant of what was happening on these three projects I asked him questions about today and he did not have the answers. Instead he chose to play a petty game of

partisan political politics.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) must be deaf and that is why he is speaking so loud today, I suppose. The member for LaPoile, I mean he must have a hearing problem. He asked me a question in Question Period. 'Are you aware,' and when I got up one of the first words I said was, yes, y-e-s. I answered his question. I said yes, I was aware of them. And here are the things that we are trying to do to alleviate the problems in Channel - Port aux Basques. I said yes, y-e-s. Oui, oui. Si, si. We are aware. Affirmative. The answer is in the affirmative. We are aware, for the hon. member for LaPoile's information, yes. Then I went on to answer the other part of the question, what were we going to do about it. And I indicated to the member for LaPoile what we were doing about the problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he wants me to deal in the details of the problem of TerraTransport, for example, which the member for LaPoile tried to indicate was all closed down, there was one shift dropped because of the demand situation as it relates to the rail cars versus the trucks and the containers. Now it is this government who stopped the Liberal government in Ottawa from phasing out the railway altogether about three or four years ago and made sure that the rails stayed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And our position remains the same. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was in Ottawa - by the way, the Minister

of Transportation, did you hear what he did yesterday and in the last couple of weeks as it relates to Air Maritime?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He forced CP to buy new planes for the service here. He persuaded CP to come through with new planes on the Air Maritime routes in Newfoundland. He persuaded them and CP had to get on the air last night and apologize. What a minister. What a minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He went to Ottawa and sat down with Mr. Mazankowski, the Minister of Transport, and repeated the same policy that we had articulated to the Liberal government there, it is still the policy of the government of Newfoundland, and it remains the same, there is no difference in it, that the rail section of it must continue. One of the problems we are having right now as it relates to that shift is that the demand is just not there. You cannot keep people on if the demand is not there. So if there is more freight going the other way on the container side, on the truck side than on the rail side, then you just cannot have them sitting around all day twiddling their thumbs. But what we have got to try to do even harder in the future, as the minister has told the minister in Ottawa, is to make it more attractive to continue this box car and rail car thing from the wide gauge to the narrow gauge so we do not lose it. We are going to need it because there are a lot of things that are going to come into the Province that cannot go

in containers. So we still have to have that rail mode as well.

There is no relaxation of our determination to ensure that the mode stays. But right now there is a higher demand in one area rather than the other and therefore that leads to more jobs in one area and less jobs in another area. That is the situation on that. But, I mean, the member for LaPoile gets up and he rants and he raves about that. And talking about the industrial park out there, we were the government that put forward a proposal for industrial parks. The federal government did not come out and announce an industrial park for Newfoundland out of the goodness of their heart. They did not even want to sign it. I spent two years trying to force them to put an industrial park in Gander, along with putting one in Port aux Basques, and the incubator mall in Pasadena, and the one for Windsor. We were two or three years trying to do that, and it was because of our proposal to the federal government that they finally agreed. So it is not a federal Liberal project, it is one that we are going to have to take over and fund forever. We are the ones who are going to have to pick up the tab on Port aux Basques and on Pasadena, and Windsor and Gander and all of the rest of them. The capital cost is miniscule compared to the administration of those parks forever and ever amen.

So the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) should count his lucky stars. We have a \$15 million hospital over in Port aux Basques.

MR. NEARY:

What a member.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for LaPoile should be

very careful when he attacks the member for St. John's West. I happen to know it was the member for St. John's West who has seen to it, with the new member for the area - it is funny that this great Liberal government did so much for Burin-St. Georges and then they kicked out the MP. That is a funny turn of events. That does not usually happen. If you have a real good MP who is effectively fighting and getting all these things for his district, you would think he would have gone in with a massive majority. How come he lost, Mr. Speaker? But the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) should remember what side his bread is buttered on. It was the member from St. John's West (Mr. J. Crosbie) with the new MP who argued very, very strongly - even though there was no documentation on the water system that was announced two days before election day; no work done, no documentation in Treasury Board or Cabinet in Ottawa - the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), the member for St. John's West, who was just ridiculed by the member for LaPoile, was one of the two people responsible for getting that shallow political promise translated into reality by the new government in Ottawa for that water system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for the Premier has expired.

On the third question, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely unsatisfied with the answer I got to my question today.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

I am glad he has got his English skills back; he might need them after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

There is a difference in what is going on in Menihek and what is going on in Corner Brook or what is going on in St. John's when a layoff occurs and I want to go back over the details of it because that is what I have been sent here to tell you.

When the layoffs started to occur we are looking at a community in which there is basically no way out other than a railway or other than flying on the hopeless service offered by EPA. What happens when people start leaving the community, as 100 or 500 or 600 did in the Summer two years ago, was enlarged numbers of houses are dumped on the market and the market collapsed. Now it did not collapse the way it does in St. John's when a \$100,000 house goes down to \$90,000, it collapsed totally. People who had spent \$50,000 for a house, had spend \$10,000 down and \$40,000 in a mortgage, found that the best that they could get on the open market for their houses from then on was \$10,000 or \$12,000 or \$13,000. The money that they had saved for decades and put into the homes they fixed up was written off in a short Summer and the year that came after it. What happened then was even worse. Those who were unlucky enough to have their mortgages insured by the MICC Corporation were told that not only would they lose the equity they had built into their homes but at the same time if their

houses were sold for less than what the mortgages were, they were still liable for the difference. So people who had lost \$10,000 or \$15,000 in equity left Labrador West owing another \$10,000 or \$15,000 to a mortgage corporation which to this day has not forgiven them. Now, what happened was a task force was set up, about a year too late, and it came back and presented a comprehensive study of what went on up there. As a matter of fact, the then member from Labrador West (Mr. Walsh) was on the task force, the fellow who ran for the PCs in the last election, and I had a feeling that we had a comment from the people of Labrador West on what I think of the task force report to start with. But one of the things that happened was that the task force report recommended that these people who had been bankrupted or close to bankrupted should receive some help in order to leave Labrador West and look for a job elsewhere. Because in an area where you have only got two mines which are the basic employment and you lose your job, there is not another job for a labourer or for a mechanic or a millwright. So what happened was a number of them over the last year have received up to \$2,000 or \$3,000, depending on circumstances, in order to leave Labrador West and come here. Now it has happened again. A lot of the people in the group that are being laid off in December are people who have been laid off two and three times now. They have lost all the equity they had up there. They had to pack up and leave, they sold their furniture at a tremendous loss and they went to the Island and tried to rebuild their lives somewhere else. Then the Iron Ore Company of Canada said, 'You are recalled and if they do not come back immediately you lose your seniority rights,

you lose all the benefits that you have accrued under your contract.' They came back, and now 118 of them have been laid off again. What I am asking for on behalf of those 118 people, and indeed on behalf of all the people of Labrador West, is that a little common humanity be shown for these people who are stuck in a situation not of their own making, because they had nothing to do with the huge economic downturn that causes the layoffs up there, that they be given a little assistance. When I say a little assistance I mean a little assistance; it is a drop in the bucket compared to what Brian Mulroney and the Quebec government and the Canadian government did on behalf of the people of Shefferville, who actually gained all their equity back and were given thousands and thousands of dollars to move. So I say to the Premier it is not good enough to say maybe no is the answer, which is the answer you gave me this afternoon, but give us some clear answers on what you are going to do. And if the answer is no, I would ask you to go to Labrador West and tell the people directly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair to the new member of the Legislature but I have to say that I did not need an information lesson from him on what the story is like in Labrador City. For the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to bring up this book of the Task Force Report and condemn it, and then from the other side of his mouth say that we want more money for the people of Labrador West, the same as recommended in that

booklet, well, he cannot have his cake and eat it too. You either say that that programme is good because now you are asking for it, or you do not. Do not say the people of Labrador West have just given this government a good lesson because they did not like the Task Force report after we put over \$3.5 million into the pockets of the people of Labrador West, and that we have no compassion for what has happened in Labrador West. It is a question of degree. It is a question of our ability to pay. And I agree that there is a difference in Labrador West especially with the massive layoffs that are concerned. But the people of Bay d'Espoir can say that there is a difference in Bay d'Espoir that does not exist anywhere else in the Province. The people of Corner Brook can say our particular circumstance in Corner Brook is unique and therefore it does not exist anywhere else in the Province. And you can go around this Province in many places and in many depressed areas and find the same kind of thing. I am sure the people of Roddickton, Englee and Main Brook can make a case that they have a unique circumstance that does not exist anywhere else in the Province. I mean, that can be made many, many times over. The people of Buchans can make it, in spades, and have made it to us many, many times. Sure there is a difference, there is a difference everywhere, there is a difference from your place on your side of the House and my place. There is a difference between Water Street and Flower Hill, I suppose. So, I mean, the question of there being a difference, there is no question about that, that begs the issue, that begs the question. The question is just how far down the road can you go to prop up people who legitimately deserve it without recongizing at the same

time that there are differences in Bay d'Espoir, in Corner Brook, in Buchans and somewhere else? How far can you go with one area without finally saying that, whilst it is not the same in Corner Brook yet they too have a special circumstance that somehow then must be addressed if the principle is going to be extended fairly and squarely right across the board? We tried to do something and the Task Force was not too late. We did a good job on that Task Force, Mr. Speaker, and I am very proud of it and what we provided for the people of Labrador West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How can the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) get up and say on one side of his mouth, I want what was in this Task Force Report and on the other side of his mouth say, you got a lesson from that Task Force in the by-election down there, on one hand condemning the report and then on the other hand saying give me more money as recommended by the Task Force Report? Well, that is pretty darn inconsistent.

Now the hon. member for Menihek should get his facts straight on that. Now we have tried, not only to do it through the Task Force Report, to assist people directly. We have gone and we have got on our hands and knees and we fought with that private mortgage corporation not to go to court with anybody and we were very, very successful. We sat down with all the banks, not in St. John's, Newfoundland, but in Toronto and Montreal, wherever their headquarters were, and told the banks to lay off because it was a circumstance, yes, a special circumstance existing in Labrador

West and we were very successful.

We went to CMHC and did the same thing. Simultaneously we went ahead with the Arts and Culture Centre for two reasons. Number one, contrary to a lot of opinion now coming out of Labrador West which you hear from time to time in the motherhood statement that there is more to Newfoundland than oil and gas and fish, that there is a spirit and a soul to Newfoundland and there is a culture, and therefore the government recognizes that broader philosophical question in any society and provides an Arts and Culture Centre for the right reasons, for artistic and cultural reasons, and then, as a spinoff, for economic reasons, and then to be slapped in the face by people who are saying, all of a sudden, they do not want it. The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary was extended to Labrador West for the right reasons, but also with an economic spinoff; and the industrial park was established in Labrador West for the right economic reasons, to try to diversify the economy of the area. So we take no back seat to what we have done in Labrador West, in Labrador City - Wabush, and we would put our record up against any government in the Western World as to how we have tried to treat the people of Labrador West, Wabush and Labrador City. But the question still remains, Mr. Speaker, after saying all of that, How far can we go to say to the people of Labrador West and Wabush, even though they have a special circumstance that there is not in some other part of the Province, while it may have a road - Burgeo has a road, but it is a long road from November to June or November to May, or Roddickton or wherever, or Bay d'Espoir - but how far can you go? How much money do we have to spend on that,

number one? And number two, when is it that you cross the line when it is pretty hard in conscience not to provide some other kind of programme which suits the special circumstance of Bay d'Espoir or Corner Brook or wherever it has to be? That is what I was trying to say in my answer in Question Period. That is pretty difficult. That is pretty difficult, because you can have a lot of people from a lot of different parts of the Province say that they too have a special circumstance. It is not defined as the same special circumstance as Labrador West, it is different, it is special in its own way and, therefore, that has to be recognized. And whilst I understand that the hon. gentleman is only the member for Menihek, I happen to be Premier of the whole Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A motion to adjourn is deemed to have been made. It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 P.M. Those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay'.

Carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 9, 1984 at 10:00 P.M.