



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 19

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

24 April 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order I am sure the House would want to be aware that it was a year ago today that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) was appointed to Cabinet. At that time, there were twenty-two inches of snow on the ground. Look at the weather today. That is performance!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, today I would like to inform the House, on behalf of my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), about government's plans for dealing with the second year or a major infestation of the insect pest hemlock looper, which continues to threaten some of our valuable forest stands across the Island.

Before giving details of this year's activities against the

hemlock looper, I would like to announce that, for the first time since 1977, nine years, there will be no spray programme against the spruce budworm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Another battle won.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. POWER:
If the Minister of Environment can take credit for the fine weather, I might take credit for getting rid of the spruce budworm. The spruce budworm has been reduced to a level where it is no longer a danger to our forests.

Mr. Speaker, government has decided, after carefully considering all the alternatives, to once again meet the hemlock looper threat by conducting an aerial spray programme using the chemical insecticide fenitrothion.

While we carefully examined all aspects of the hemlock looper threat and ways of dealing with it, we found we had virtually no choice but to chose fenitrothion, since it is the only insecticide registered by Agriculture Canada for use against the hemlock looper. We are seeking temporary registration from Agriculture Canada for BT for limited use in environmentally sensitive areas. But BT is, of course, not as effective as fenitrothion and it is much more expensive. We expect to receive this temporary registration, as we did for last year's programme.

Mr. Speaker, the severity of the threat posed by the hemlock looper

left us with little choice but to decide to undertake a spray programme. The looper is capable of killing a tree in one of two years, depending on its population level. The looper very quickly causes major damage because it is what is called, a wasteful feeder, consuming only parts of the needles on the branches of coniferous trees, especially balsam fir. It literally takes a bite out of one needle and then moves on to the next. Consequently, the trees suffer crippling damage in a very short time. This feeding pattern makes the looper far more deadly to trees than the spruce budworm, which can take up to five to seven years to kill a tree.

Mr. Speaker, our proposed programme for this year is for one hundred hectares, 247,000 acres, but this may vary depending on last minute examination of insect populations. The total area is made up of twenty-eight spray blocks ranging across the Island from near Codroy Pond on the West Coast to the Southern part of the Bonavista Peninsula on the East Coast. A map being distributed with this statement shows members where those blocks are.

MR. FLIGHT:
Shame!

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, the interruptions from the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLight) just continuously shows that that member, in particular, fought against the spray programme and wanted the spruce budworm to destroy the forest and the thousands of jobs that go with it. Now he seems to be in favour of the hemlock looper rather than the foresters and mill workers in

this Province.

The entire programme is aimed primarily at protecting areas forecast to receive moderate to severe defoliation. These forecasts, Mr. Speaker, were made by scientists from the Canadian Forestry Service based on actual egg surveys. We will also spray some stands forecast for only light infestation - these stands generally are those where investments in silviculture treatments have been made or are scheduled.

Details of the spray programme, including precautions to be taken, have been referred to the Pesticides Advisory Board, which has the responsibility of ensuring that all environmental and safety conditions are properly adhered to.

The programme is expected to begin in late June or early July and will take four weeks to complete, depending on weather conditions.

During the spray programme, the public will be advised ahead of time of each block to be sprayed. This will be done through messages in the news media, supplemented by a telephone hotline for answering public inquiries. Printed information and maps will also be available for public viewing at Forestry Unit Offices in spray areas. In addition, department officials will hold several public information sessions in Central and Western Newfoundland to allow people who are interested in forest protection to ask questions directly. In addition, Mr. Speaker, any group wishing a meeting to obtain details is welcome to contact any Forestry Office to make arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of this

year's spray programme is expected to run between \$3 million and \$3.5 million, with government paying one-third. The other two-thirds will be shared jointly by the two paper companies. We expect, Mr. Speaker, to be awarding tenders for spray aircraft within a month or so.

In concluding this statement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind hon. members of the fact that we will not have to take any action against the spruce budworm this Summer. We believe this is worth noting, considering that the budworm once threatened the very future of our vital forest products industry. We also believe that our determination to stick with the decision made in 1977 to use the chemical spray matacil contributed in a significant way to the reduction of the spruce budworm.

As a final word, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate on behalf of my colleague that this government is determined that never again will we allow an insect pest or any other threat to our forest to put our economy and lifestyle in jeopardy.

For the further information -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Career Development is sounding very much like the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, when he speaks about the Contras in Nicaragua, in his last reference to the

budworm. I wonder if he could repeat that paragraph?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

There is no point of order.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I would be more than delighted to repeat the last paragraph or the whole statement for members opposite. Members opposite are extremely callous and uncaring about the many thousands of jobs we have in the forest industry in Newfoundland. If anybody wants proof, the other morning when I went down with my colleagues, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), to sign a technology memorandum of understanding, I happened to meet, going into the door of Hotel Newfoundland, one of the senior forestry officials in Nova Scotia and he told me that they had just finished the Eastern Spruce Budworm Council which takes in the Eastern United States and Canada, including New Brunswick, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Is this a Ministerial Statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

It is part of my statement.

That senior official from Nova Scotia says the only part of Canada that has a serious problem with the spruce budworm now is Nova Scotia, and Nova Scotia is the only Province that has not sprayed. He asked me to find some way to convince the politicians in

Nova Scotia to do a spray programme.

MR. BARRY:

How is the Reye's Syndrome going up there?

MR. POWER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, for anyone in a responsible position in this Province to say in a very offhand manner, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) just said, that there is some connection between a spray programme of matacil or fenitrothion with Reye's Syndrome is extremely, extremely irresponsible. We have gone through that with the Newfoundland Medical Association, we did a Royal Commission, they did commissions in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the best they could find was some very sloppy - as defined in New Brunswick's Royal Commission - methods used by some professors at certain schools to try and make a connection between Reye's Syndrome and spraying.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude my statement, I just say that the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is today in Corner Brook making exactly the same statement to show his concern for the forests of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to speak to this announcement by the stand-in minister today. I want to thank him also for the press release, or the Ministerial Statement. I have only had it about a minute but that is okay, I do not need it to make my comments.

We are for protection of the forest and we are for protection of the jobs in the forest industry. That is fine, but one of the points that has to be made is that if better management and better management techniques were followed, then you would not have to go to such extreme actions to protect the forest. For example, if we had a federal forestry center in Corner Brook which could help watch the forest industry in this Province, you might not have to wait for an extreme case to go right nuts and then try to solve it by coming out with a spray programme and blanketing the whole Province.

We are for protecting the forest and protecting those jobs, and we will support moves to that effect. But we feel there are other things that could be done, such as better management, and we are going to do that when we take over.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House today that government has signed a letter of intent with Dor Chemicals of Israel concerning the Come By

Chance refinery and the possible uses for that facility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

Dor Chemicals have agreed to undertake a comprehensive three month feasibility study which will examine the possible future uses of the refinery.

Dor Chemicals interest in Come By Chance covers two main areas: Firstly, the company is currently studying the feasibility of setting up a petrochemical complex at Come By Chance, which would be a new facility utilizing natural gas from Hibernia to produce basic petrochemical products such as methanol, ammonia, urea, melamine, etc. Phase two of this project would entail the use of natural gas as well as liquid feed stocks from the refinery to produce higher value products such as plastics, resins, moulding compounds, etc.

Secondly, under the letter of intent, Dor Chemicals will study the feasibility of reactivating the Come By Chance Refinery as a fully operational facility.

I should emphasize here that Dor Chemicals is interested in two distinct yet interconnected activities for Come By Chance - the establishment of the petrochemical complex which is their main thrust, and the separate but related reactivation of the refinery.

The letter of intent calls for Dor Chemicals to initiate their study immediately. The completion of that study, if favourable, will be followed by a formal agreement between government, Dor and Petro

Canada, for Dor Chemicals to take over the Come By Chance facility, including all its maintenance and ongoing "mothballing" costs. Government will obtain ownership of the lands upon which the refinery is built and lease these to Dor Chemicals until such time as the refinery is reactivated.

I would like to caution members of the House that the signing of this letter of intent should not be construed as the answer to all the problems we have faced with the Come By Chance facility. However, this does represent a real and serious interest on behalf of a private concern, in this case Dor Chemicals, to look at the possibilities for the facility and to seriously consider opportunities for its further development.

In July of last year, officials of my department and senior staff of Dor Chemicals were appointed to a joint committee to assess the feasibility of establishing a petrochemical facility at Come By Chance and we have been working together every since. However, while I am pleased to bring this announcement to the attention of hon. members at this time, I must emphasize that it is much too early to speculate on either the reactivation of the refinery or the establishment of a petrochemical complex. We can only hope that Dor's findings are favourable, and that the economics and the numbers support the project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for giving us a copy of his statement at least a half hour ago. In responding to this Ministerial Statement, I am pleased to see the minister, on the third page of his statement, cautions members of the House of Assembly that all the minister is really doing today is announcing a three month or a ninety day study by Dor Chemicals. I hope, Mr. Speaker, as the member for the district of Bellevue, that this is not a ninety day promise or a ninety day wonder.

I hope the feasibility study proves worthwhile but, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the minister, and I am glad he took a full page to do this, cautioned members of the House and, of course, people anywhere in Newfoundland who can be effected positively by this if it turns out to be favourable, that all the minister is announcing today is a study.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad, I am happy government has taken a different stance today than it did, say, six months ago, when they pooh-pooed the Dor Chemical proposal. The Premier is on record as pooh-pooing it at that time and saying that there would be no gas from Hibernia being used in a petrochemical plant because it is going to be pumped back in to force out the oil and that sort of thing. Whether what government is doing today is a result of the pressure put on by Liberal Opposition members, like myself, Mr. Speaker, or whether it is because government is grasping at straws in view of the fact that six months ago the price of oil was very high and now it is very low not does not matter. We hope that the feasibility study does prove worthwhile.

We have had feasibility studies before. We had one on the aluminum smelter in Labrador which was paid for by government. Let me ask the minister, are the taxpayers of this Province paying out any money for this feasibility study? The minister can answer after I take my seat. I want to also ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, are we not talking about a Petrochemical plant five, six or more years down the road?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Are there any further Statements by Ministers?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, today I would like to inform the House about a most encouraging development in by-product utilization that is taking place in our Province.

Hazel Industries Limited of Milltown, Bay D'Espoir, has developed and is currently promoting a high protein animal food which it feels could be commercially produced at an existing fish meal plant, with some minor modifications.

Mr. Speaker, in a normal meal plant fish water or offal, as it is commonly called, is put through a cooking, dewatering and drying process. The final product is then available for use as a

protein additive in animal feeds. Hazel Industries, on the other hand, use a process that involves combining fish offal, potatoes and other necessary ingredients in large tanks where a natural co-fermentation process occurs. This product is also dewatered and dried. The final product, however, is ready for use directly as animal feed.

The original plan, Mr. Speaker - and here is the good part, perhaps - was for this product to be manufactured in either Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia. Digestibility and feed trials using swine would then be conducted at the Federal Agricultural Station in Nappan, Nova Scotia. The reason for conducting those trials in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, is because the Agriculture Canada Research Station in Mount Pearl is not equipped to perform this study. The projected cost of the project at the time was \$61,000. It was anticipated that equipment could be rented and transportation costs would be minimal, since both production and testing would be done within a small geographical area.

Since then, however, due to the encouragement of both Fishery Products International and the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, and to avail of the existing fish meal plant at Harbour Breton, a decision was made to manufacture the product here in Newfoundland. As a result of this decision, Mr. Speaker, the estimated cost of the project has increased. This is due in part to the necessity of purchasing equipment to construct the pilot plant. Much of this equipment could be utilized if a commercial scale operation results

from this pilot project. As well, considerable transportation costs are now involved in shipping both raw material and finished product to and from the Nappan Agricultural Station where the product will still be tested.

Mr. Speaker, at this time the necessary equipment has been purchased and the pilot plant has been set up at Harbour Breton. Trail runs have been conducted in an attempt to identify potential problems. Several test batches are being produced at various protein levels for testing and the most suitable protein level would then be chosen for use in subsequent feed trials.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce today that my department has approved a grant of \$20,000 for Hazel Industries Limited. This grant is designed to help make up the difference between the present projected cost of the operation and the funding available from other participating agencies. In other words, Mr. Speaker, make up the difference in bringing that project from Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, my department and I believe that this project has the potential to become a very beneficial means of addressing the problem of the disposal of fish offal. The project is also related to the new programme I announced in this House recently concerning future initiatives in the area of by-product utilization. I am pleased to be able to support this project on behalf of the Department of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon.
minister for giving me a copy of
his statement before he made it.
I suppose anything in any area
where we have such high
unemployment is important and,
therefore, what I am going to say
is not at all to take away from
the importance of this project. I
am glad to know it is going there,
because the type of operation that
he describes does serve a two-fold
purpose, it disposes of fish
offal, which can be a very serious
problem in communities where there
are fish plants operating and, of
course, as he points out, it is
giving the people in the area a
chance to earn some money from
that aspect of the fishery.

I notice in the minister's
statement he makes no mention of
the number of jobs that will be
provided in this pilot project. I
would hope that it will provide a
number of jobs and that even
though it is a small investment on
the part of government, I hope it
pays off.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker,
that today the minister could not
have made a more substantial
statement on by-product
utilization. I know there is a
need for it in this Province. In
fact, at one time we had a very
thriving fish offal business. I
am not sure what has happened to
it really, but there was a
considerable amount of fish meal,
and that sort of thing,
manufactured from fish offal.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my
colleagues on this side of the
House welcome the announcement.
While it is not the kind of
announcement that will send the
Dow Jones index into a spiral, and
I doubt if Dr. Ballard will lose
any sleep over it, nevertheless it
is an important step forward and
we welcome it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Notices of Motion.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, what about Question
Period.

MR. SPEAKER:
I beg your pardon! I was trying
to cut that out. I am sorry.

MR. MATTHEWS:
We will go along with that.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we thought that there
had been a new approach to
Question Period.

I would like to ask the Premier,
now that the United States Senate
has approved, by a tie vote, the
sending of the freer trade
negotiations to the fast track
route, I wonder if the Premier

would indicate whether there is a mechanism for consultation yet set up between the provinces and the federal government on this matter of free trade. Would the Premier indicate whether there are regular meetings between the Government of Canada and the Province with respect to provincial input?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is yes. There is a mechanism established and we have been meeting regularly with the federal government on the whole question of free trade. May I go on to say that I am pleased that we are now going to get started in that direction. It is going to be a difficult process but I think it is a worthwhile one, not only for Newfoundland but for Canada. I do not share the view that some do that somehow or another, because we are negotiating with the Americans, we are going to be taken to the cleaners. When I look at the auto pact and what Canadians were able to negotiate there on behalf of Canadians in Ontario, I am sure we can do the same thing on behalf of Canadians in other parts of the country. I do not have the same fears as other people do, that somehow we, as a country now over 100 years in our existence, are not competent to protect Canadian interests in the same way as Americans are to protect the American interests. I think it is a positive and bold step.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier indicate whether he has communicated to the Prime Minister a list of items which should not be bartered away in the process of free trade negotiations? I refer here to the fact that in the United States they have identified just about every form of assistance to the fishermen of this Province, every form of regional development, every form of social programme except unemployment insurance, as unacceptable methods of subsidy. Has the Premier established a list and communicated this list of programmes to the Government of Canada which this Province is not prepared to put on the table to be bartered away in the manner that the Newfoundland railway has been bartered away?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it was the Liberal Party of Newfoundland that bartered away the railway a long time ago, bartered it away and allowed it to go and run down into the ground to where it is now and we are trying to revive it after the Liberal Party had let it go down.

MR. BARRY:

It has gone now, has it?

MR. PECKFORD:

They are the ones who started that process of getting rid of the passenger train service, and all the rest of it, which led to downgrading of the railway in this Province. So, let nobody be under any misapprehension about that. I guess the Leader of the Opposition is referring to certain countervail activities that have occurred in the United States as

opposed to the free trade negotiations. The Leader of the Opposition is implying that what has happened in the various countervail things is the agenda that the United States is going to have when it comes to the free trade negotiations. Of course, that is not necessarily so, that was another process. What we are trying to do now is to eliminate some of those non-tariff barriers, like the countervail process, so it is no longer there in trade between Canada and the United States. The Leader of the Opposition is wrong in the sense that we have not yet sat down at the table with the Americans, and therefore their agenda, and whether it includes all of these programmes that were there in the countervail case, which was for a different reason, remains to be seen. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, we are, as are all the provinces, involved in studying our own provincial economy and identifying where there may be a problem in the negotiations as it relates to Newfoundland in the Canadian negotiations with the United States. There is a process established whereby we will have very meaningful and significant input into that and will be able to bring to the Canadian government our concerns and have them put on the table in the negotiations. We are pretty much ahead of the game. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), in concert with the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and other departments, is busily engaged in doing studies on behalf of the Province. We will be participating in a significant way in those negotiations. I can assure the hon. member and members of the House and the public at large that we will ensure that Newfoundland's interests are

protected. We must not get lost in short-term negatives for long-term positives. Overall a more comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States is a positive thing not only for Newfoundland but for Canada. If we are going to put our heads in the sand and suddenly deny the fact that we are on the same continent with the United States, that it is virtually impossible to establish another Panama Canal across the forty-ninth parallel, then we had better sit down and negotiate and get a deal which is going to be good for Newfoundland and good for Canada. I think this is a bold, visionary step on behalf of the federal government and we fully support it. At the same time we will do our own homework and be part of the process to ensure that Newfoundland is protected in the overall negotiations.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we hope the Premier does a better job on free trade than he is doing on the Newfoundland railway in terms of seeing that Newfoundland's point of view is protected, and also a better deal than he did in protecting the restructuring agreement in the Newfoundland fishery and factory freezer trawlers. With respect to those key areas, those primary areas that are essential, that must be protected and preserved for the essential interest of this Province, has the Premier ensured that there is a provincial veto in the course of these free trade

negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have not and we do not intend to. No, we do not intend to. We do not intend to have a country go to the table on comprehensive free trade talks with the United States and suddenly have ten or eleven jurisdictions there all having the right to veto. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to take that approach that is fine for him to do. I do not intend to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

May I just also comment that we on this side of the House are also very proud of the restructuring agreement. At Twillingate and New World Island, in the hon. member's district opposite, the plants have been sold and they will be open this year and will be more prosperous than ever. The plants down on the Great Northern Peninsula have been sold without any government assistance. FPI is going to make money. And all the plants on the South Coast are going to stay open. We have now a better offshore fishery in Newfoundland today than we have ever had in our whole history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I am not sure the Premier understands what he said in his last response. Does the Premier realize that he has now passed over provincial jurisdiction, which under our constitution is given to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? Does the Premier realize in that approach he has passed over that constitution to Ambassador Simon Reisman in the course of these free trade negotiations?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what a foolish thing to do. Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition saying we never joined Canada in 1949? Is that what the Leader of the Opposition is saying?

MR. BARRY:

Under a constitution.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

May I answer the question? I did not say anything when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. Mr. Speaker, could I have silence on the other side?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask hon. members on both sides for silence.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What we are saying is if one of the prerequisites for Canada to sit down to try to work out a more comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States is that every Province will have a veto, then there will be no comprehensive free trade talks.

Neither American nor Canada would have any intentions of sitting down with the United States if all fifty states had a veto at the table— over what is presently within their jurisdiction.

What we must have, Mr. Speaker, is very, very meaningful and significant input into the Canadian position and be there at the negotiations. That is what we are going to have, and that is the way Canada is going to grow and be better. If we are going to go the way that the Leader of the Opposition is implying, then he better suddenly win the government, which is highly unlikely in the next twenty or thirty years, and then he had better put a referendum to the people of Newfoundland to get out of Confederation.

MR. TULK:

What a switch! Is there a new government in Ottawa, 'Brian'? There must be a PC Government in Ottawa.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), and because this is a policy question I will direct my question to the First Minister. In an Estimates Committee it was unanimously agreed for a variety of reasons, involving equity and fairness and so on, that School Tax Authorities should be abolished. I would ask the Premier if he would make a commitment to the people of this Province that he will work towards the abolishment of School Tax

Authorities in the next while?

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I chaired that Committee and certainly all members of the Committee agreed that taxes are not desirable, and some taxes may be more desirable than others, but the hon. gentleman is misinterpreting the facts that actually happened. It is quite wrong of him, I think, to get up and say that the committee would like to do away with a particular tax. That just is not correct. Nobody likes taxation. Only a fool would say they liked taxes, and some taxes are preferable to others, but that does not mean to say that the hon. gentleman is stating the correct state of affairs. It is quite distorted.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I simply said that the members of an all-party committee agreed that the school tax authority should be abolished. I realize they do not have the power to abolish them or anything else. I am simply stating what happened in the Committee and Hansard will bear me out. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think Hansard

should be procured and read before this question is admitted. This is quite wrong and quite erroneous.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order, but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not mind answering the question, Mr. Speaker. I would agree if the hon. member would agree that the sales tax has to go up and the income tax has to go up in order to compensate for the over \$20 million that now comes in from School Tax Authorities. The question is not whether the School Tax Authorities should be eliminated. The question is how does the Government of Newfoundland still provide at least the \$20 million that is now being provided through School Tax Authorities to the education system with school tax authorities gone? I have not heard a good alternative to that yet.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The Premier realizes, of course, that the reason for the existence of the School Tax Authorities was to transfer some of this tax burden anyway, to take it from where it rightly belongs, to the government of this Province.

In the absence of the Minister of

Justice (Ms Verge), whom I hoped to ask this question to, I would like to again direct my question to the First Minister. In light of the fact that sixteen of the twenty-one School Tax Authorities have had no basis in legislation to collect taxes since January 1979, would he please explain to the House the legality of these authorities collecting taxes, and especially the legality of these authorities taking people to court to collect taxes that were due during that period?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I guess the courts will decide. If the court has no jurisdictional authority to levy fines or to carry out its mandate as a court, if they do not have any act to go by or any piece of law to go by, then obviously I guess the courts would say that they have no power to levy fines or to do the things that courts normally do. Courts do not just flick out of the air something from which they get their authority. They get their authority from the law. If the law is not there, then obviously people who have been taken to court cannot be fined or cannot be charged. So that would take its normal course, one would think, reasonably.

MR. BAKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

These people, Mr. Speaker, are being taken to court and are being charged. I am wondering if the Premier could tell the House if the Department of Justice has been

informing the courts that in fact this illegality exists in legislation?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am absolutely astounded by the hon. member for Gander to think that a judge of a court in Newfoundland would issue an order for which there was no foundation so to do.

MR. BAKER:
Through your mistake.

MR. BARRY:
Why are the charges laid?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
This is unbelievable. The hon. the member for Gander is saying that there are courts in this Province who are making decisions for which there is no basis. I trust the courts of this Province and the judges of this Province.

MR. BARRY:
You are deceiving the courts -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer a question.

MR. BARRY:
- the same way you did with the injunction against NAPE.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I called for order three or four times.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, because the hon. the Leader of the Opposition one day comes in with dark glasses on, the next day comes in with none on and all the rest of it, I mean, I do not know if the guy is all there or not. All I can say is he should keep quiet while I answer a question. I keep quiet when he asks it, so I should have the right to silence when I am trying to answer it. All I can say is that I do not have the same skepticism about the judges of this Province as does the member for Gander and obviously his leader, the Leader of the Opposition. And I mean if he has those kinds of skepticisms that is his problem. As far as I am concerned no judge in this Province will issue an order or make a decision based upon power that that judge does not have.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications. Mr. Speaker, on the media this morning a spokesman for Shell Oil admitted that profits are being made by his company due to decreasing world oil prices and these profits are not being passed on to the consumer but rather they are being absorbed by the company, to bolster company profits, windfall profits. The minister has consistently claimed that he has done surveys of oil companies to ensure the consumers are not being ripped off. Could the minister tell us how the surveys he has done square with what the Shell Oil Company spokesman said this

morning about taking more profits away from the consumer and into the companies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the statement referred to by the hon. member, which allegedly was only made this morning. I will certainly take a look at that statement in its full context and take the question under advisement and get back to the hon. member.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe, a supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we are into the construction season very soon and we have had a number of calls on this side, as I am sure members opposite have had, from independent truckers, etc., I want to ask could the minister tell us whether his so-called surveys of companies have shown a decrease in the cost of diesel fuel for truckers in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, my department did a minisurvey on home heating fuel and gasoline prices, but I am not sure that that survey included diesel or not. I will again take this question under advisement.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my survey shows, and I have made four calls around the Province, that the average price for a liter of diesel is 65.9 cents a liter, or \$3.20 a gallon. Now this is a crude product. If prices for gasoline, which is refined, are going down at a substantial rate in the minister's eyes - not far enough in our eyes; we believe it should be cut in half - can the minister tell us why diesel prices, and I have called four different areas of the Province, have not gone down? These are crude prices. These should go down first.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that diesel prices in proportion should go down the same as the others. The hon. member indicated that I was satisfied with the rate of decrease of gasoline and other prices. That is not correct. I have said so many times in this House. The price of gasoline has decreased somewhat, forty to forty-five cents per gallon. I have never said that I am satisfied with that rate of decrease. In fact, I am not satisfied with it, I would certainly like to see it go down at a much greater rate than it is going down, but I agree that the price for diesel should reduce as well.

MR. FUREY:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That was a final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

To the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER:

A short supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Very quickly, again, I ask will the minister consider forgetting about his minisurveys, which are foolishness, and initiate an independent arm's length enquiry into why these prices of gasoline and oil are so slow coming down in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have already given an answer to that question some days ago.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

My question is for the hon. the Minister of Health. As the Minister of Health is aware, there is a bill before the House of Commons which, if passed, will give drug companies eleven years' protection for new drug patents. This, of course, will lead to the higher cost of drugs for the consumer. I want to ask the minister what action has he taken? Now I would assume he met with the minister or he will meet with the minister. I assume he wrote the minister. I assume he is lobbying backbenchers. But I wonder could the minister explain

to this hon. House and the people of Newfoundland what other action he has taken to try to keep the drug companies from getting this piece of legislation through?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, when you have reached the zenith of all possible ways of approaching a problem, I do not know how you can find one other way at this time.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, when the minister is making those petitions, I suppose, I am sure he will admit that the things which I outlined and which he accepted, that any member could do, will the minister tell this House if he is finding any advantage in dealing with his federal counterparts, is there any advantage that there is a Tory administration in Ottawa and a Tory administration in Newfoundland? Is this to his advantage?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister was being facetious in his answer and I will give the minister the opportunity to clarify matters. Will the minister admit that the reason he was facetious with his answer that all this silliness that they went on with during the election, and all this silliness in the budget about the co-operation, is only a big farce? Surely the hon. minister, who is a gentleman, will tell the House whether or not it is a farce.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. Last week I had the privilege of meeting with one of the federal ministers. We had a problem partially related to the Department of Health, and after a discussion with that minister he saw our point of view and that policy is still in practice.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). On May 1 Newfoundland fishermen owning boats forty-five feet in length and over will be required to pay a berthing fee to the federal government. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, this amount will be as high as \$45 a month, based on the length of the boat. Has the minister made representation to his federal counterpart opposing the imposition of that fee? If not, will he contact the minister

and ask him to defer it, at least for the time being?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the hon. gentleman asked a similar question on wharfage fees, for leased space on federal wharves a week or so ago, and just as he was misleading and wrong in the information that he made to the House at the time, he is again misleading and wrong now.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that this fee structure for berthage fees for vessels over forty-five feet in Newfoundland was put in place several years ago, back around 1982 or 1983. There was some deferment of the imposition of the cost for vessels in that category. It will impact on less than 10 per cent of the fishing vessels in Newfoundland. And Mr. Speaker, the third part of it is yes, I have contacted already, without any prompting from the Opposition, the federal minister and explained to him that I do not think that this is the time to impose the fee, even though the fee structure was put in place by his new-found friends when they were the government in Ottawa.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that beginning May 1 fishing boats in excess of forty-five feet in length will be required to pay berthage. Now,

that could very well be the thin edge of the wedge and I suspect that next year it will be reduced to boats thirty-five feet in length or over. In view of the fact that there are some very serious complaints coming in from parts of the Island, certainly from my district, opposing this fee, will the minister contact his federal counterpart and again plead with him to at least have that fee postponed for a while until we see what is going to happen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how dense the hon. gentleman is but I can repeat the previous answer if the House wishes me to. Let me also, Mr. Speaker, say to the hon. gentleman that he should not try to be devious in his question. The fact of the matter is that in the announcement made by the federal government they said that this Liberal fee that was imposed a few years ago 'will now be charged by us in areas of Canada where we have management people in place.' How many areas in Twillingate do the federal Small Craft Harbours have management people in place, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). It has to do with an issue raised yesterday in one of the estimates committees

and it deals with the Public Service Commission's examining of applicants who wish to take jobs as typists and stenographers, and those are the two areas I am concerned with. As the minister responsible for education at that level and that kind of education, the Public Service Commission indicated last night that there was a very high failure rate. Could the minister give us some indication of why he thinks that kind of failure rate is going on and what is being done to make sure that that does not continue?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I read the report of the estimates committee and I read the answers of the President of the Public Service Commission, Mr. Withers, who made comments about exactly why he thought the failure rate was so high. I obviously have not seen the actual tests that are put out by the Public Service Commission, nor have I seen the actual examinations that are put out by any either private or public school in post secondary. If there is a very high failure rate I guess it just comes from the fact that the Public Service Commission has a mandate to make sure that the persons that they hire for the public service are the very best possible people that the public service can have. That is a principle that was brought in by this government, the Public Service Commission having a mandate to get the very best people possible, and I think they do that very well. The failure rate in no way prevents us from getting the best people possible. The solution might be in the

revitalized vocational school system that we have. Obviously, there is much change required, there is a new mandate to improve courses, to bring in new equipment, to retrain instructors and to make sure that our students have the best training possible. I think that in the past I guess maybe some of the courses were not up scratch as much as we might like, Mr. Speaker, but generally speaking the vast majority of people the public service hires are quite well educated and quite competent and have no difficulty in passing the public service examinations.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is to the minister. There are two major streams from which students come. One is from the vocational schools and the trades colleges, and the other is from private colleges. I believe a short while ago the minister increased the inspection division responsible for examining private colleges. My question, Mr. Speaker, is would the minister give us his opinion as to whether the beefing up of this particular inspection section somehow connected to this large failure rate? In other words, are these private colleges not being inspected properly? Perhaps there is some question about whether they have the highest quality of standards there and are producing the highest quality of graduates.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. The fact that we are reorganizing the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, putting in a new organizational structure than we had when we formed the department first, which was basically taking people from labour and education and becoming responsible for manpower training and post-secondary training. Now we are revitalizing and reorganizing that whole department of government, which we are glad to do and which will make significant changes in how post-secondary education is delivered in the Province.

At the same time, we went through a very extensive White Paper process to look at how we should reorganize our vocational school system to make sure that the citizens of Newfoundland, particularly the younger ones who are in those institutions, get full value for the monies that are spent.

There is no connection really between the revitalized, reorganized department or vocational school system and the fact that there may be a high failure rate at the Public Service Commission. It is our intention, as a government, to make sure that we put in place the best departmental structure that we can and, at the same time, make sure that the organization structure for post-secondary education is as good as it could possibly be.

We have concerns, as a government, yes, about private training institutions. That is not the reason, basically, why we are reorganizing our department. But certainly in the reorganized department there will be more

controls placed upon the licensing of private schools, the curriculum, the types of instructors and their qualifications, and the advertising placed by private schools.

I had a discussion this morning with some of the private school people. The ones who are most reputable and who are doing the best jobs are very delighted to see that we are going to bring in those kinds of regulations. There may be some other persons in the private sector not so delighted to see those kinds of regulations.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
I want to ask the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) a question pertaining to his earlier statement. Would the minister not agree, assuming that the ninety day Dor chemical study is favourable, that we are talking possibly five, six or even more years before anything is done in the way of a petro-chemical plant or a refurbishing of the Come By Chance oil refinery? Would the minister confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, to respond as the hon. member opposite would like to have it responded to would be idle speculation on my part. That is one of the chief reasons for the time required to complete the study for the project. To try and speculate on whether that would

be six months or six years is impossible at this point in time to say.

MR. CALLAN:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister a question that I asked earlier, which his colleagues would not allow him to answer. Are the taxpayers of this Province paying for any part of this Dor Chemical study, as was done with the aluminum smelter study?

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:
Again, Mr. Speaker, to correct the hon. member, it was not my hon. colleagues who prevented a response, it was the House procedures that prevented me from responding at that time.

However, I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that the study that is under review by Dor Chemical is not funded in any way by the Province.

MR. CALLAN:
That is good.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is just time for a very short question and answer.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have a question for the Premier. It relates to his press release this morning which appeared to me to be just attempting to paint NAPE as being totally unreasonable, and in some ways poking fun at the NAPE position. I have a number of questions I want to ask the Premier, but if his proposal is the panacea that he is saying it is, why does he then not insist that this is the final offer that he is going to make and insist that the union put this final offer, which is what it appears to be, put the final offer, the package proposed, to a vote of the membership? Or is he just attempting again to force NAPE on the street?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what we want to do is get back to the table and resolve the issues that are outstanding. There are still negotiations going on. In other words, we are prepared to negotiate on the positions that we have on the table right now. But what NAPE really wanted was some kind of third party intervention or some kind of final offer, so then they go and vote on it and, say, reject it, and then that final offer becomes the first offer from government to go to mediation or arbitration later. I mean, the hon. member for Fogo is not suggesting that somehow that is not the probability that is going to happen in that kind of situation.

As it relates to third party intervention, we take the position that boot allowances and tool allowances and other small minor matters should be negotiated out at the bargaining table and should not have to be the subject of some third party mediator or arbitrator. They should be off the table. This was an attempt by me this morning to say to the union let us get back to the table, let both of us get those foolish things out of the way and get a collective agreement. We are willing to sit down and negotiate and we hope that the NAPE leadership are as well. We do not believe that the membership of NAPE in GS and MOS are excited about what it is we are now at an impasse over. They wanted wage parity. They wanted to change to Bill 59. We have given them wage parity, we have given them changes to Bill 59, and we have given them twenty other concessions on language parity. They have hardly moved on one single item. There might be one or two things that they moved on, which were insignificant. And it time for the NAPE leadership to come to the table and say let us get on with these other matters which are really minor items in comparison to the things that they went on strike for in the beginning. And we want to sit down and negotiate those out and get a deal and stop the foolishness.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The time is up. No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! We will get back to the item that I skipped.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to table the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Assembly for the financial year ending the 31 March, 1984.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of a number of questions from the Opposition, I undertook yesterday to get some answers. I am sure they are waiting with bated breath for the answers to these questions. I tried to get as many of the answers as I could in twenty-four hours.

There was a question yesterday about the federal employees who work in Newfoundland in a zone different from a zone on the Mainland where they may be doing the same work. I do not have a complete answer but I have a

partial answer. I have a preliminary legal opinion which indicates that it is the opinion here, the preliminary opinion as I say, that Section 6 and 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms are not being violated and there is a long dissertation as to why that would be so, in the opinion of the Department of Justice.

MR. BARRY:

Are they doing that though, are they discriminating?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not under Section 6 and 15.

MR. BARRY:

But are they paying less in Newfoundland?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am trying to get some more information on the zoning situation and if they are paying less. I am still waiting for that information and I will report back later on that. As far as this preliminary legal opinion from the Department of Justice goes, it does not look like there is any violation of those two sections. At least, that is the opinion of members of the Department of Justice.

MR. BARRETT:

Even if they pay Newfoundlanders less!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have just received the other part of the answer to that question on regional pay differentials for employees performing federal work. The following information on regional pay differentials was received from an official of Labour Canada in St. John's and an official of Treasury Board in Ottawa in the

last twenty-four hours as a result of my enquiries after Question Period yesterday.

"Employees of the federal government who are covered by a national collective agreement, i.e. PSAC, Postal Workers Union, etc., all receive the same salary for doing the same job regardless of the areas of the country in which they work except for some employees working in the general labour and general services group.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ah, ha!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am reading this for the first time. I did not try to say I did not have it, read it and then try to change it. I will say ah, ha too.

"Certain hourly paid employees in those groups are paid in accordance with specified zones. This could result in workers in St. John's, for example, being paid differently from a worker in the rest of the provinces. The same principle would apply throughout the country. The professional institute of the public service provides for payment of nurses working under federal jurisdiction to be paid by region of the country, thus creating possible wage disparities. Teachers covered by the professional institute of the public service are paid by province with wage scales being provided for each province. For other employees who are working for non-union operations, such as banks, they have to be paid the federal minimum wage, \$4 an hour, and consequently there may be variations in wages paid to these categories of employees across the country. The Fair Wages and Hours

of Labour Act governs salary structure for employees working on federally sponsored construction related projects. Under this Act, surveys are conducted to determine the going rate for particular classifications of jobs in the jurisdiction where the work is being carried out. The system may also lend itself to wage differentials in the different regions for employees doing the same or similar work." That is what I have on that. I will have to get some more information on that for hon. members.

As it relates to Workers' Compensation, I was asked yesterday about that. One of the questions I was asked was concerning injured workers who are cleared to return to light work. The 1985 rehabilitation case load, to which the question referred, because it was a 1985 report of the Workers' Compensation, I think, shows there were 956 cases active. These workers were medically advised to change occupations or seek other jobs or it was anticipated that, following medical treatment, the worker would require employment assistance for different or modified work. Two hundred and twenty-five of those returned to employment, 148 completed retraining programmes, 138 were in retraining programmes as of year end, and 167 were provided with assistance sufficient to attain a requested goal, such as completion of a training programme, the attainment of certain UI eligibility goals, assistance in retiring from the work force or other skills. This represents approximately 50 per cent of the total case load which, in terms of assisting them to reach requested goals, are considered to be successfully resolved. Of the

remaining 50 per cent, rehabilitation councillors are still working with them, even while they are under medical treatment. Some workers, a very small percentage, refuse to avail of rehabilitation programmes. These are, in the main, workers who feel that even though the disability is not really great, the compensation system must continue to pay full benefits for life. Fortunately, only a small number have that attitude. In these cases, however, there is little the councillor can do to assist. So they have about a 50 per cent success rate but they have not given up on the other 50 per cent. Some of them are still into medical treatment and into other retraining programmes. So they are not really ready for the work force. That is not too bad.

There was another question on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and from the Minister of Fisheries Department and the minister this morning, I received a report that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the department and Intergovernmental Affairs are still working on the matter of a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Mr. Siddon, the federal minister, has clarified the position that he made about NFDC and is still eager to work on it with the Province.

I was also asked a question on Tornгат Fishery Producers Co-operative Society Limited and Mr. Alec Saunders down North. He is upset because he is not getting his hands on all the plants that government now owns. Every Fall we work out a lease arrangement with him for Makkovik, to do some work after we are finished with the salmon season.

MR. CALLAN:
He is losing money.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What happened to (inaudible)?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Just one second now. Number one, there is a question of the financial viability of that company. We do not want to put it into a worse position than it is in right now. There is a very big question about financial viability.

MR. BARRY:
Of what? Of which company?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Of Tornгат Co-op itself.

MR. WARREN:
Check it out boy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, no question. So we do not want to, I mean we could easily -

MR. BARRY:
There is going to be a bigger question after that comment.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Just a second now, let there be one. We have the facts. We do not mind saying if there is a question of financial viability.

MR. BARRY:
You do not mind putting them under.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer questions that were asked yesterday and I have worked as hard as I can to get these answers for the hon. members opposite. At

least they can be silent while I am trying to give all the information that I can.

We are saying that we have some questions about the financial integrity of that co-op. Now if we wanted to slough off all those plants, which are such a problem, as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) knows, there are no easy answers to those plants on the Northern Labrador Coast. We could give him the Torngat Co-op, pass them right over, let the whole thing go bankrupt and say, "It was not our fault, it was Torngat Co-op's fault." We are not going to do that. We have more concern for what is going on in Labrador than that. That is number one.

Number two, the people in Makkovik, where the Torngat people have had a lease from us for the Fall part, just for the Makkovik plant, the people of Makkovik are not happy with the company. We have a brief from the Labrador Inuit Association which says that we should not be passing them over at this point in time. And the Labrador Inuit Association speaks for just about all of the people of Northern Labrador because they are all Inuit.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are a group (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Exactly. So I mean there are three good reasons but we will do what we can and try to work something out to try to help Torngat Fish Producers, if we can.

MR. TULK:

Are you proposing that the company come under NFDC?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I am not saying anything like that. We are still working on NFDC but Torngat Co-op - and what they are saying is, we said, "Well, we can work out another arrangement with you on Makkovik." "No, we are not satisfied. We want all the plants now or nothing, or I am going to resign" or all this old foolishness.

All we are going to say is that we have an obligation because we now have those plants in Northern Labrador, to operate them, to get as many people working as we can, look after the fishermen and if something good comes along where we can see that the fishermen and the fish plant workers are going to be protected, we may consider selling them. But we are not going to do it hastily and we are not going to do it unless the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) agrees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I can tell you that, because the member for Torngat Mountains knows more about Labrador than all the rest of us put together. He is doing a fantastic job down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So the Cabinet of Newfoundland, and the Government of Newfoundland, is going to take an awful lot of guidance from what the member for Torngat Mountains says anyway on this and other matters dealing with Labrador.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
If the Premier had that much confidence in the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), obviously he would be in the Cabinet by now.

Mr. Speaker, the matter that I would like to address is the Premier's response to the discrimination by the Government of Canada. It is not good enough just for the Premier to bring in a series of general statements. I thank the Premier for getting that information quickly, but the information provided indicates that there is a serious problem here. It confirms that for one category of employees - and I think there are around 1,000 of them -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not know what the point of order is.

MR. BARRY:
The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that we have asked the Premier whether he will undertake to see that these Newfoundlanders are protected who are being discriminated against and whether or not it is against the Charter of Rights. The Premier has an obligation to these people and to the economy of the Province to pressure his federal counterparts in Ottawa to see that this situation is corrected.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity, while breaking the rules, to get up to try to make a response to me. He asks me questions one day. I say I am going to get as much of the information as I can. I do it in twenty-four hours and get up under the appropriate heading of Answers to Questions and then the Leader of the Opposition, because he is not the Premier but he still wants to pretend that he can have just as much to say as the Premier, has to get up under some illegal method to try to do it. Well, that is his problem, not mine. All I can say to him is I got some of the information -

MR. BARRY:
Are you having a bad day or what?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- and I will get the rest and I will get it to him, perhaps in the next twenty-four hours. I am sorry that I am over here and he is over there but that is the way it is going to be for a long time to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

Petitions

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

MR. Speaker, I have a petition signed by twenty-seven people who are residents of Old Mill Road in the town of Roddickton. The prayer of this petition is:

"We, the residents of Old Mill Road, Roddickton, hereby pray the hon. House of Assembly will instruct the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Transportation to take immediate action to have Route 432 completely upgraded and paved."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this petition I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that on Thursday past, when I presented petition number eight - this is petition number nine - as soon as I began reading from this petition, the hon. the Premier got up and left his seat. I did not notice it. It was quite normal because he always does that. Every time someone brings in a petition, he gets up and leaves. I did not even notice it. But sitting up in the galleries were twelve students from the town of Roddickton and later on in the night I took them out for dinner and they said, "The Premier left the House when you began to mention the road from Plum Point across to Englee, across to Roddickton and we wonder why he did that." Mr. Speaker, I could not answer their question. I guess it just shows the arrogance that he has, the way he feels towards Newfoundlanders outside the overpass. Well, I am sure that is up to the Premier to answer that.

One of the "Whereases" in this

petition, Mr. Speaker, says that, "WHEREAS Route 432, which connects the Viking Trail to the Canada Bay Branch, is not completely upgraded and paved." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. I do not know if hon. members of this House are all aware of that or not. But, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that that route, which is the main lifeline, the main thoroughfare leading into Roddickton, is not paved.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago the federal member of parliament, the hon. William Rompkey, forced the Minister of Transportation for this Province to start an upgrading process on Route 432. The Minister of Transportation did not want to do it. I do not know what his reasons were other than political reasons. After all, the Minister of Transportation in this Province is the fellow who said that he would rather deal with friends than enemies. Somehow in his perverted mind he thinks that a person who is a Liberal and pays taxes, does not have as much right to drive on pavement as a person who is not a Liberal has. In his perverted sense of the way things are, he believes that. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help that, but this is what he said and this is the way he acted. Therefore, when Bill Rompkey was a minister in the federal government, he had to force, he had to fight to get federal money in to upgrade Route 432.

There are three or four kilometers of this road which was not totally upgraded. This, Mr. Speaker, can be attributed to many reasons. There was a little more than \$8 million set aside to do that particular section of road. I would suggest that there was lots of money to totally upgrade it but the silly way the minister awarded

his contracts, he awarded the contracts a little bit here, a little bit there. He moved all over the place, from one side of the peninsula to the other and he ended up getting, I suppose, almost a duplication of effort. He had too many contractors working on one small piece of road over a three year period and, as a result, there is a little over three kilometers of Route 432 which is not yet completed, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what the people of Old Mill Road in Roddickton are asking for are road improvements. This is the ninth time that I have brought this request to this hon. House, in a very reasonable manner, as the people back in the Strait of Belle Isle would want me to do. They do not want me to come in here, Mr. Speaker, and get rambunctious and kick up some foolish racket. They want me to act in a very reasonable manner and on their behalf, I am doing that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the Premier and I drove in a Volkswagon from -

MR. J. CARTER:
Which Premier?

MR. DECKER:
Premier Peckford, the present Premier.

We drove from Englee to St. John's and I am not sure of this - the Premier might have to correct me - but I believe that when we were driving from Roddickton to Plum Point, we were commenting on the state of this road. We were saying, "If only there was some way that this road could be upgraded and paved." Now, Mr. Speaker, if that conversation actually took place - and the

Premier will have to correct me because my memory fails me here - if that is the case, then what better opportunity could he have than now, when he is in the position to do something. I am not in the position to do it. If I were in his position, it would be done, but the Premier, who I would assume with me chatted about the terrible condition of that road is now in a position to complete the upgrading and begin the paving. What better opportunity could he have?

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those people on Old Mill Road in Roddickton, it is my privilege to stand here today and to support their petition totally.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support the sentiments in the petition presented by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

I think it is the ninth time, perhaps even the tenth time that he has gotten up. I think what he must have done is taken one petition and subdivided it many times because the rules of this House permit a petition to be as small as three names. That is fair game. I do not criticize him for that. There is nothing wrong with that. If he wants to do it that way, that is his business. He has a perfect right to do it.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that he is speaking to the petition but I did not in any way doctor with this petition. I have a whole mess of petitions from various places in my district on the road. I know it might look like that to a person whose devious mind would suspect another hon. member of doing it but that is not the case, Sir. These are legitimate petitions. The Speaker can sit down with me anytime and discuss all fifty, whenever he wants to do it.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest at any time that these petitions were not in order. But, nevertheless, what I did suggest was that the hon. member is unnecessarily dragging out these various petitions, which is his right. I have no problem with that. If he wants to get up every day on a different petition from his area, that is his game. I am not suggesting there is any wrongdoing or anything improper. Would you like to rule on that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, was that I suggest that the member would be a lot more effective if he changed his tactics. I am suggesting now - and this is a legitimate suggestion - maybe to get the kind of money he wants for the kind of improvements he wants may take some time. But in the meantime, if he were to ask the government, either publicly or quietly come over and talk to the minister concerned - quietly or publicly, it does not matter, you could do it either way or both - and ask for some road grading equipment to be made available to the various councils in the area.

Now, if the member cast his mind back to 1964, I am sure he can remember the old Argentia Road which was not in the best of shape because it was a gravel road. It was maintained by the Americans who put a grader over it practically every day and that road, as a gravel road, was in reasonably good shape. It was a well maintained road. It was not paved at that time. Except for the dust, and that only happened occasionally, it was a pleasure to drive over. I would suggest that half a loaf is better than no bread. I am sure that some road grading equipment or some grant or fund could be found to make these bits of equipment available to the councils in the affected areas and, in the meantime, while the member is waiting for some definite big improvements in the road to be made, the road could be kept passable and a pleasure to drive on.

Another point should be made, Mr. Speaker, and that is, with the falling world prices of oil, the prices of heavy oil, that is for asphalt, should come down and, in fact, will probably come down quite dramatically in the next few months. At that time, pavement might be a lot cheaper, and I think it might be a lot more useful then to go looking for pavement. In the meantime, I think, rather than ask for something that he knows cannot be granted immediately, he should ask for something that probably does have a chance to be granted immediately. I would suggest he change his plea along those lines.

MR. DECKER:

It is not my plea, it is the plea of the people.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, he might suggest that the people who are signing these petitions sign a petition of a slightly different nature.

I am just as anxious as he is to see roads in his area upgraded. I think bad roads are very hard to put up with and we have become used to much better roads and that is only as it should be. So I support the sentiments of the member but I do not support his tactics.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the Strait. Unlike my friend from St. John's North and namesake, I

happen to believe in the principle that all Newfoundlanders should be treated equally and that none of them should be treated as second class citizens. To go along with the suggestion made by the hon. member, then you are, in effect, relegating the citizens of the district represented by my friend here to that of second class citizenship.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not know very much about living in -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

My namesake is twisting my words, not deliberately I am sure. He is a very gifted politician and he knows how to make the most out of a little.

However, I am making a concrete, constructive suggestion of something that can be done right away. No matter if this entire House and the entire Cabinet and all the civil service said "yes, this road must be paved immediately," everybody knows that it would be some months before it could be done. But I am making a suggestion of something that can be done in a matter of a couple of weeks. That is the point.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers in that district, as the taxpayers in my

district, should not be put in a position of an either/or situation.

- The thing being suggested by my colleague is something that is taken for granted by most Newfoundlanders. On roads where we lack pavement, is it too much to expect that these roads be properly graded, even though, we know they are not. Certainly we should not have to be prepared to forfeit the laying of black top because we are going to get an extra grader or two put in a district. That is the logic that we seem to be getting these days, Mr. Speaker, from the other side.

My colleague referred to the statement made by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) last year. He clearly gave the impression that you had to be of a certain political stripe in order to get the proper kind of attention on your district roads.

Mr. Speaker, Route 432 is a very important road insofar as the people living in that district are concerned. For example, it connects the Viking Trail to Canada Bay Road. On that road there is fish transported, fish caught in the area, transported for further processing, in the plants I presume whether in St. Anthony and Englee. All kinds of provisions, goods, fuel oil, building supplies all have to travel that road. Ambulances taking sick people to and from the hospital in St. Anthony have to use that road. So it is not something that can be just sloughed off in a nonchalant way as the hon. member opposite appeared to be doing.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is not fair.

MR. W. CARTER:

The roads in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are a mess. The roads that do not have pavement are a mess and I have them in my riding. I have roads in my district without pavement that are not fit over which to drive a car. In fact, one of the biggest industries in some parts of my riding, as I am sure is the case in my hon. friend's riding, is in the mechanical trade of repairing broken shocks, broken springs, and cars that are just about torn to pieces driving over them.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that more emphasis should be put on grading. Until the government is prepared and willing to put pavement on some of these roads, then I believe they must step up their grading programme. I had an experience where a certain community, the Chairman of which called me this morning, asking me to get a grader. She said, the grader came up to a certain junction, instead of coming down to where she lived, it went off to another area, about eleven miles away. That was on Tuesday, and strangely enough by an hour I got a call from the Chairman of the Council in a second community, the community to which the grader had left to go, and it had not turned up. There is a case where a grader is being used somewhere, between one community and another, a distance of eleven miles for about three days and it still has not turned up.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that there must be a greater effort made on the part of the Department of Transportation to keep the gravel roads, at least, in a motorable, passable condition. I am afraid now and the roads in my friend's district,

as they are in my district, that that is not the case. Government has a responsibility. All Newfoundlanders have a right to be treated fairly and equally. And if they are not prepared to do what has to be done and put blacktop on these roads, then I think they have a very serious obligation to make sure that these roads are kept properly graded. As for the attitude of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), as espoused by him on television, I believe it was last year, that we look after our friends, or at least our friends have a better chance of getting attention than the enemy across the way, that hardly deserves comment, because it is a despicable attitude to take.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 13, Bill No. 7.

MR. SPEAKER:

Second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Justice Act." (Bill No. 7)

That debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much of the time of this hon. House. I realize there is an awful lot of other legislation coming. I think somewhere The Atlantic Accord is supposed to come before this House and I would not want to be accused of delaying

that monumental piece of legislation. I will just summarize the few remarks I have made.

I was saying that the law is something greater than the Premier, it is something greater than the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), it is something greater than the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) or any other hon. gentleman or lady in this hon. House. I am sorry to see the Minister of Justice is not here today, because she was extremely interested in my remarks. She was giving me an audience and she was quite interested when I explained about the old gentleman from Conche who held the law in such esteem that even to avoid paying a fine of \$500, which was an immense amount of money in his budget, he would not dare in any shape or form whatsoever even entertain the suggestion of somehow abusing the law. I was making the point, Mr. Speaker, that the law is something we all must revere, is something we must hold in esteem, and we must be ever vigilant to attack anyone who would in any way cast any reflection on the law, who would in any way cheapen the law.

Mr. Speaker, I went on to suggest that what we have seen in this Province in recent weeks is a brutal attack on the whole concept of law and order by an arrogant, uncaring government, a government which has been in power so long that they somehow believe the old devine right of kings has been manifested into the divine right of Tories. They feel that this devine right they have gives them the right to take the law and use it to their own ends and, therefore, abuse the law, Mr. Speaker. The illustration I used

to back up my point was the way the Peckford Administration used the law, used a court injunction to force members of the Newfoundland Constabulary to go out and trample over fellow Newfoundlanders. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe was an abuse of the law. It was an attack on the law.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Your leader wanted to put them all in jail.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I heard the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) right, but I believe he is saying they did not have enough space to put them all in jail. I could certainly believe that. I could believe that the only reason they did not put them all in jail was because they did not have enough space. I honestly believe the Premier and the Minister of Justice, when they first got that injunction, were determined to put every single member of NAPE in jail. That was the whole reason of the court injunction. They now realize, Mr. Speaker, that that was physically impossible. You would think the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Justice could count. Surely they could count how many members NAPE had. The next logical thing to do, Mr. Speaker, would be to count the number of prison cells we have in the Province. They surely should have been able to count and say we have 5,500 members in NAPE and we only have enough prison space for 300, 400, or 500 hundred people. It seems to me that the Premier, the Minister of Justice and the whole Tory caucus could not even count, because it is logical to assume that when that

court injunction was called for and served, it meant that there was a potential to arrest every single member of NAPE.

When the Premier realized the silly mistake he had made he then interfered with the law again, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the person from Conche who had such reverence for the law, the Premier because of his arrogance, because of this belief he has in the divine right of Tories, he had to interfere again and say, this is not practical, we cannot do this.

Mr. Speaker, when we begin to make silly laws or when we begin to manipulate the law, this kind of interference brings on chaos, the kind of chaos which even reached the National News, which said that Newfoundland was on the verge of chaos. This is what happens to any society when lawmakers clearly have a contempt for the law themselves, when lawmakers see the law as something for a certain group but not for another group, when lawmakers see the law as something to be twisted and used to the unfair advantage of one particular group. When this happens to any society and when this is done by the lawmakers, then there is a lessening of respect for the law. The man on the street, the man in Roddickton, the man in Noddy Bay, the man on Fogo Island, the man in Twillingate looks and says, why can I not shoot turrs in July if the Premier can abuse the law? And the man on the South Coast says, why can I not go and jig for salmon if the Premier can use the law to his advantage? Why should I have to obey the law? This is what happens, Mr. Speaker, and the whole thing will collapse.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is only

fair for us to make some allowances for this administration because, as I said, they have been in power so long they have forgotten the obligation they have to the Province and the obligation they have to the concept of law. This is a very normal thing to happen to any group of people who are put in office for too long a time. I am sure the people of Newfoundland today are becoming more and more aware of that because they see the rot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, could I be protected from members on my own side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

The people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, see the corruption that is creeping in. They remember when the Premier was squeaky clean. They remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier did not come under the influence of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) as he does now. A few minutes ago, we saw the Premier get up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he actually tried to imitate the voice of the member for St. John's East, the way he was answering one of those preferred questions. I have seen the member for St. John's East do it. The influence that the member for St. John's East has on the Premier is so strong that it explains why Route 432 is not paved. This explains why there is very little concern for any part of Newfoundland outside the overpass. It explains all this. The influence that this hon.

member has on the Premier is staggering. It is almost unbelievable. The influence is so strong, Mr. Speaker, that even a person in Hay Cove, right up on the Northern tip of Newfoundland, up on the Northern tip of the Peninsula, can see what has happened to the Premier. He can see the St. John's influence which has come so strong on that Premier who, at one time, was held up as being a great rural Newfoundlander, a great man from the outport, a great bayman like myself. But the people of Newfoundland have seen what has happened.

I will say this in all honesty, that when the people of Newfoundland go to the polls again and throw the Premier out they are going to do it a little bit sadly, because they realize that he is a victim of circumstances. I feel for him and the people all over Newfoundland will feel for him, because it is the influence of this Tory clique which was bred in St. John's, this Tory clique who did not want us to join Confederation, who wanted to maintain a class system, who wanted, Mr. Speaker, as the member for St. John's North gets up and says, "Let's give them a grader. Let's give them the odd load of gravel." What a patronizing, condescending attitude to have towards a group of Newfoundlanders who pay taxes, just as much as the member for St. John's North pays.

This is the attitude that has permeated this Tory Administration. Because when the hon. the Premier tries to abuse the law, when he tries to abuse society, he is so much under the influence of this Tory clique that he cannot help it, he cannot help but go against his own people,

those of us out there in the mud, those of us out there in the dust, those of us out there on those gravel roads. The hon. the Premier is a victim of circumstances and it is sad that like the baby in the bath water, he is going to have to be thrown out too. He is going to be thrown out when we throw them all out after the next election.

MR. TULK:

What did they spend the money on? A big Ring Road around St. John's.

MR. DECKER:

A Ring Road around St. John's, Mr. Speaker, that is where they spend their money.

The member for St. John's North says, "Let us give them a grader. Let us give them a bit of gravel." I remember when the member for St. John's North himself travelled over that road. It was under circumstances a little different from those he is in today, it was just after he was Minister of Education. I remember he travelled that particular road.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to bore the House any longer. I am going to summarize by saying that the law -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Well, if you insist. I will speak on, if you really want me to. If you want me to speak on, I will.

In summary, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the law must ever be held in reverence. Newfoundlanders would not think about abusing the law, the government, duly elected, has chosen to abuse the law. Mr.

Speaker, my final word is this: The Premier and the Minister of Justice should get up in this House and apologize to the people of Newfoundland for that vicious, brutal attack they have made on the concept of law.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Justice Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 7).

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just before we get to the rest of the business, I wish to propose, because these are nominations from the official Opposition, that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) replace the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) replace the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) on the Public Accounts Committee as permanent members.

MR. SPEAKER:

There are three questions for the Late Show. The first is by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who is not satisfied with the answer from the Minister of Justice on Affirmative Action in the uniformed trades; the second is from the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) who is not satisfied with the answers he got today from the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell); and the third is from the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who is not satisfied

with the answer he got from the Premier on the dispute between NAPE and the government.

The hon. the member for Menihek is not here, the hon. the member for St. Barbe is not here, so I call on the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

With all due respect, it is not yet 5:30 p.m. Is there some mix-up?

MR. SPEAKER:

No. Are there any other orders?

MR. MARSHALL:

I was thinking Your Honour was going to call the motion replacing the members on the Public Accounts Committee, but then Your Honour announced what was there for the late show, which is fine. I wonder whether Your Honour might call that motion now on the replacement of the compliment of the official Opposition on the Public Accounts Committee, and then I will call the next order of the day.

Motion, that the replacement of the compliment of the official Opposition on the Public Accounts Committee be as read, carried.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Environment Act." (Bill No. 3).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, what we propose to do with those amendments to The Department Of Environment Act is increase fines. Another part of the amendment has to do with the recovery of government costs incurred with hazardous material

spills, response and clean-up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could, for just a few moments, give a little bit of background. It has been the department's experience that fines imposed by the courts for pollution-related convictions usually bear little or no relationship to the magnitude of the offence in terms of either resource damage caused or cost for the regulatory agents response and clean-up. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have no other way of recouping this money except under Section 32 of the Storage And Gas Handling Regulations and Associated Product Regulations. There is no provision in the enabling legislation for the recovery of hazardous material spills response and, where costs are incurred, the initial cost of clean-up activity from the polluters. This has been a big problem for the Department of Environment, Mr. Speaker, and we would hope to correct it by bringing in those two amendments.

Now, a frequent criticism today is that government is not sufficiently aggressive in pursuing polluters and the fines levied against them are not very prohibitive. I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that maximum fines are rarely levied by the courts. However, raising the maximum fines from what they are now to \$1,000 and \$25,000 should come out in judgments passed on polluters and should result in higher fines being applied by the courts. I suppose by increasing fines you would generate some revenue, but the chief benefit is likely to be an enhanced awareness and respect for anti-pollution legislation and so on.

It is not a real big amendment or

anything, but we feel it is a very important one.

With hazardous material spills, response and clean-up activity can be extensive and costly. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last year there was a PCB spill in Northwestern Ontario which captured National headlines for quite some time. It cost a tremendous amount of money to arrest that problem. If my proposed amendments go through, government would, in fact, be able to respond to those kinds of spills and have the cost borne by the polluter, something which we do not have regulatory or enabling legislation to do now.

Right now the Department of Environment, in many cases, relies on the goodwill of the polluter himself, or some community-minded person, to bring to our attention when a spill occurs, particularly in a remote or an isolated area. As I have said, it is very costly to have these spills cleaned up and the costs are sometimes borne by the taxpayers of the Province. The proposed amendments, of course, would ensure that the polluter would bear the full cost of recovery. In the event that the polluter did not act immediately to clean up, the department would be able to go out immediately, on a contractual basis, to get some individual or company with the wherewithal to do it and then, in the final analysis, bill the polluter.

The maximum fine currently permitted under the act will usually fall short of any response and clean-up costs and, therefore, fails to act as a deterrent to the polluter in preventing future incidents. It is therefore proposed that Section 48 (1) of

the act which provides for maximum fines of \$10,000 and \$100 as compensation for corporations and individuals be amended to increase these amounts to \$25,000 and \$1,000 respectively.

So while it is a fairly significant increase, we believe that it reflects the reality of the day in addressing pollution that is taking place in our environment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving these amendments to Bill No. 3, "An Act To Amend The Department Of The Environment Act." I will be willing to answer any questions any member may have.

Thank you.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In responding to these amendments, Mr. Speaker, I would tell the minister, in the first instance, that we have no problem with supporting the bill in principle, no problem! The amendments raise more questions than they answer, Mr. Speaker. Now, we are talking fines. Right now the fine is \$10,000 and he wants it raised to \$25,000. That is the fine aspect of it. One could presume we could have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the clean-up cost may be minimal but the fine is severe. Suppose, for argument's sake, the minister were to determine that a company knowingly and willingly dumped PCBs, for instance, in a given area and that the clean up cost was \$100 once it was

identified - a bit of gravel taken out and that - but that act, on behalf of the perpetrator, warranted a \$25,000 fine - maybe he should be fined \$25,000.

That is one aspect of the legislation, but the other aspect of the legislation, clause (1), indicates that this legislation will enable the minister to recover costs to Her Majesty, to the government, for a clean up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he alluded to the accident in Ontario and the enormous cost. How much cleaning up does the minister expect to do with \$25,000? The fine may be good but a limit of \$25,000 on what -

MR. BUTT:

That is the fine for causing the pollution.

MR. FLIGHT:

Is there an upper limit on what the minister can recoup from a municipality?

MR. BUTT:

No. If in fact there was a major spill, it could cost \$200,000 for clean up.

MR. FLIGHT:

Does the minister have the legislative ability to collect that \$200,000 from a company?

MR. BUTT:

I will with this amendment.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am wondering why municipal authorities are identified here as opposed to major moving companies, for instance the major oil companies, the major mining companies. Why are municipalities identified in Clause (1) as opposed to the major movers?

MR. BUTT:

I will make note of the hon. member's questions and rather than interrupt him, I will respond to them.

MR. FLIGHT:

I cannot visualize a municipality knowingly, or unknowingly for that matter, causing a great deal of pollution. If we are talking about the lack of sewage treatment plants that could have the effect of polluting, for instance, the Exploits River, can the minister point to the towns with no sewage treatment plants and say, "You are responsible for polluting the Exploits River. It is going to cost us \$50 million to clean it up, we therefore hold you responsible under this clause." As we understand it, Mr. Speaker, a municipality which causes that kind of pollution will never be subject to the cost of clean up, so why does he identify them? Moving companies, companies which move hazardous materials across this Province, there is a far greater risk that there will be pollution from that source than from a municipality. The minister might point out why he identifies a municipality as an entity from which he can recover costs.

Why does he not identify the people who will most likely be the cause of pollution in this Province if, indeed, there is a serious pollution problem, or the chance of a spill of that nature. I am going to ask the minister while I am speaking here, Mr. Speaker, if he has a list of the various companies that are moving hazardous materials around this Province. Is his department aware of the point of departure of hazardous materials and the destination? If there are hazardous materials rolling today

on the Trans-Canada Highway, is the department aware of those hazardous materials? The minister nods his head.

MR. BUTT:

Oh, yes. Under transportation of dangerous goods regulation, you see, all that has to be documented, laid out. I will explain it to the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT:

So the minister is comfortable that if there are hazardous materials moving in this Province today he knows and he will not be taken by surprise if a truck overturns on the Trans-Canada Highway and we have to do an evacuation of a community?

MR. BUTT:

That is right.

MR. FLIGHT:

I doubt it very much, Mr. Speaker. I accept the minister's word, but I doubt very much if we have that kind of control.

Mr. Speaker, this bill opens up the whole Environment Department for debate. I have to tell the minister there are some grave concerns about what is happening in his department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to continue on with this debate until I have the minister's attention. Would the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) be decent enough to let me continue?

MR. PATTERSON:

You are doing a good job. We are listening.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the minister concerns we have with the Environmental Assessment Act, the major legislation in this Province. This government has brought in three or four pieces of major legislation, good legislation, the kind of legislation that would have protected the environment, but there is one major fallacy in it; they bring in the legislation and then they exempt the people who will probably be responsible for the most damage to the environment of this Province.

The Upper Salmon Project, all kinds of potential for environmental damage, exempted from the Environmental Assessment Act; the Hinds Lake Project exempted; the Cat Arm Project and the access road exempted. Now, would the minister indicate, when he gets up, whether he intends to continue to exempt the major mining companies, the major construction companies, the major hydro companies, the groups who have more potential for pollution in this Province than everybody else put together? Does he intend, as minister, to take a strong stand and say there are no more exemptions, that he will have an Environmental Impact Study and if the companies concerned cannot convince his department or him, as minister, if he is prepared to go with the project, that there is no risk, there is no environmental damage, that the project will not be exempted? He knows that these projects that I have mentioned and others have been exempted from the Environmental Assessment Act.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government has been known to use the Environmental Assessment Act to its own end when it has

been deemed necessary. For argument's sake, one of the arguments used to stop the construction of the Buchans - Burgeo Road was that it was environmentally unacceptable. Abitibi Price was forced to do an environmental impact study, Mr. Speaker, in order to build a twelve mile hookup so they could use the road. The whole purpose of that was to slow down, indeed stop, the Buchans access road.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT:

I am sure the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is going to take part in this debate, but I want to tell him something, Mr. Speaker. Driving in here this morning, I was listening to Open Line. We are not perfect members, but that member there would do well to pay attention to his constituents. No constituent of mine can call an open line show and tell the host that they have made twelve telephone calls trying to find me, the member, they talked to my secretary twelve times but the member would not return his calls. This morning when the host asked, who was the member? The answer was Glenn Tobin, MHA for Burin - Placentia West. Mr. Speaker, if I performed like that as an MHA, I would keep my mouth shut while sitting in the back benches of that government.

MR. TOBIN:
If it were not for (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans is speaking?

MR. FLIGHT:

Let us have silence and not answer the telephone. Twelve calls to his secretary and not one call returned.

MR. TULK:

You should see the one I am trying to handle down there for him. One of his constituents was on Open Line this morning saying, 'I finally had to phone the Leader of the Opposition and Beaton Tulk to try and get something done.' I will tell you something, it is not very nice when somebody comes in and cuts off your power. Would you like that?

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) could inform the House who his hairdresser is?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

As the member for Windsor-Buchans said, all he is trying to do is interrupt the House. It would be much better if he went out to one of the offices and tried to take care of some of his constituents.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) announced a spray programme in which fenitrothion, a very hazardous material, in its concentrated form will be sprayed all across this Province, from the Codroy Valley on the West Coast to Bonavista. That means that airplanes will be flying around with fenitrothion. We had a situation in the Gander area, as the member for Gander knows, where a pilot had engine trouble and dumped a load. Now the Minister of Environment of the day indicated to the House - and misled this House - that they had identified that plane load of pesticide and, three days later, it was determined that they did not know where it was. I want to ask the minister if this act, assuming that he can identify a spill and that kind of damage to the environment, will entitle the minister to go to the company responsible, get a \$25,000 conviction and recover the cost of clean-up? If the minister is capable of getting a \$25,000 conviction, is he also, under the act, able to recover the cost of the clean-up? I wish the minister would indicate as to whether or not a conviction and a paid fine lets the people who cause the pollution off the hook? Can we get both? Can we have the fine and the cost of the clean-up under the existing legislation?

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in Central Newfoundland which this bill may have a fair amount of impact on.

Over the years, since 1977, we have had very serious flooding, as the minister knows, on the Exploits River. It is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that one of the causes of that flooding in the area where is flooding occurs is the fact that construction companies, aggregate companies, over the years dug pits on the banks of the Exploits River and in the process of crushing materials for constructing highroads, they took out the natural banks of the river so that you had, all the way from the Exploits River to the Trans-Canada Highway, an area of about a quarter of mile, a situation where the bottoms of those pits are actually lower than the Exploits River itself. When you get a situation with the right water conditions, with the right ice conditions, the ice coming down, it takes the line of least resistance, goes into those pits and we get flooding in that area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the solutions that have been suggested by many people to help alleviate and avoid future flooding in that area is the putting back to its natural state the banks of that river. Mr. Speaker, the companies that have done this damage are easy to identify, some of them are still operating in Newfoundland, some of them are still operating in the same area. Will the minister guarantee the people of Central Newfoundland that they will not be inconvenienced by the closing of the Trans-Canada Highway for three or four days at a time, when you get the right conditions, and by having to detour on an access road that is dangerous because of the concentration of traffic? We have had tragic results over the years in that area, Mr. Speaker, as a result of flooding. Now one of

the solutions is the replacement the natural banks of the river that were taken away over the years by these quarry companies. I would presume that this legislation and existing legislation will enable the minister to go those companies and say, 'We intend to correct this. You are responsible, you will pay the cost.' We are not talking peanuts when we talk about replacing the banks of the Exploits River, if that is going to be the solution.

Another solution is to raise the road by another seven or eight feet. As far as the minister is concerned, this damage was done willfully, knowingly. Anyone would know that when you take away the banks of a major river like the Exploits, given the right ice conditions, given the right water conditions you are asking for trouble, and we have had trouble in Central Newfoundland since 1977, practically every year. Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to be involved in that up to his ears because it is not a dead issue, it is not going to go away, and I will continue to raise it or other members will continue to raise it. Under this legislation he can go to the companies responsible. I want to hear the minister indicate when he decides to close the debate what he intends to do from his point of view, from an environment point of view to make sure that the work required to eliminate the possibility of that kind of flooding is done.

Mr. Speaker, another situation the minister is very close to is the dust problem that exists in Buchans right now.

Last Spring, as the minister knows, there was almost a

disastrous situation. The dust from the tailings left by the mining companies over the years was blowing into the town, seeping into food supplies, seeping into refrigerators, causing unbelievable distress for people, particularly older people. As a matter of fact, the mayor of the town came close to declaring a disaster in that area that particular day. The minister accepted responsibility that day, or two or three days after, to correct that situation.

Now he also put out a press release that proved to me, anyway, that he did not know - he may know now - what he was talking about. That statement may well come back to haunt the minister one day - it is not forgotten, it has not been torn up and thrown away - his statement that the miners in Buchans never, never suffered any lung problems, there were never any dust problems. I mean, it was an unreal statement. Only for fact that the minister is such a nice fellow, I intended to come into the House and try to embarrass him, but I decided not to do that.

MR. TULK:

It is true.

MR. FLIGHT:

But I have the statement, Mr. Speaker, and there is no way in this world that the minister can justify some of the comments he made in that statement. But be it as it may, that is water under the bridge.

My concern now is that the people of Buchans are not going to continue to be exposed to that dust. And it is his responsibility totally, no one else's, it is the Department of

Environment's responsibility to see to it.

The minister committed himself, Mr. Speaker, last year to the public of Buchans, to the town council and to the authorities, that there would be a vegetation programme. Maybe the only solution is to vegetate the area, get grass growing.

MR. TULK:

He committed himself to take care of it.

MR. FLIGHT:

So I want the minister to inform the House, when he gets up, just exactly what he intends to do.

MR. TULK:

Does he have his estimates done for this year?

MR. FLIGHT:

We have not done his estimates yet, but I am looking forward to the minister's estimates.

I am not going to go into my version of what the solution will be or my thoughts on what I understand has transpired in the past week and a half or two weeks relative to the dust problem in Buchans. I want to hear the minister, if he will, in closing this debate point out to this House exactly what his approach is and what agreements he has gone into and what will be done, Mr. Speaker, to alleviate and to correct the problem so that the people of Buchans, the children and the elderly particularly, but everybody in Buchans will not have to live under those conditions in the future, as of this year. It cannot be allowed to exist any longer. Thirteen hundred people cannot be subjected to the kind of dust concentrations that that town

was subjected to for a couple of days this Spring. They are looking to the minister to correct the problem, and he said he would do it. I know there have been negotiations. I am sure the minister is not backing off from his commitment to the people of Buchans and that problem will be taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on and on. I suppose I have raised some of the concerns, but not all. Surely there are other concerns, and my colleagues will raise them. I have raised some of those which concern me and concerns the Opposition. The bill itself we support, but we are not sure it goes far enough. Also, we are not sure, by the way, that the minister has the means of enforcing this piece of legislation. The minister might explain when he gets up how he will identify the culprits.

We had a situation in Central Newfoundland a few days ago where an individual went to a certain dump, got out of his pickup and walked down the road. All of a sudden, he realized his boots and his pants were disappearing, burned off his body. He was taken to hospital where it was determined that a hazardous material caused it. How does the minister propose to identify the person who dumped that particular hazardous material? Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I should make an announcement now. If the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) would have no objection, of course, I will make an announcement on the hiring -

MR. BUTT:

Is the hon. member finished?

MR. FLIGHT:

No, I am not finished yet.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Environment is about to announce that thirty new employees will be hired for the purpose of protection and policing, and maybe that is the way the minister proposes to be able to identify all the people and all the companies in this Province who are polluters.

One could go on and on and on. The campsites around this Province on the major roads, on the Trans-Canada, the gravel pits where year after year there is the worst kind of mess left by people who pull in their trailers and stay for a week - and I, for one, defend the right of those people to do that - I suggest to the minister that we should find ways to police those areas, we should find ways of making people who use those pits responsible for the protection of the environment. Will that fine apply to somebody, Mr. Minister, who simply dumps his garbage on the side of the road, if you identify them? Will that particular piece of legislation apply to that type of offence. If it does, the minister will need more than thirty people out around the Province checking on who is polluting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, without being repetitious, I have covered some of the major concerns I have and, as the debate goes on, we will identify others. In Committee I will have other questions to ask the minister, but when he rises in this debate I would appreciate it if he would address himself to at least some of the issues I have raised.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me say that I am sorry I was not in the House when the minister introduced the bill. I was attending a very important meeting having to do with House business. I wanted to get in here to hear his introduction to the bill, but unfortunately I could not.

I am sorry I missed his introduction, because I realize that in the little skirmishes we had almost a year ago now the minister was a rookie minister, and I would hope that in the interim he has learned an awful lot. Part of my job a year ago, Mr. Speaker, was to try to help educate the minister in environmental matters. He has a department, of course, which has been trying for a year to educate the minister in environmental matters, and I was hoping to see in his introduction an indication that indeed over the last year he has learned quite a lot. However, I will be looking forward very eagerly to his summation. He has some time left when he can get up and make his presentation. I am looking forward very eagerly to that presentation. I am sure it will show that the minister has progressed an awful lot in the last year, and perhaps one of those days we will no longer refer to him as the rookie minister, he will be a well-established minister in a department that is working well.

I am very pleased that he is increasing his staff. That is a real good sign. It means, perhaps, that he has twisted a few arms in Cabinet to get a few more jobs in his department, jobs which are badly needed, trained people in the field doing work on the

environment, and I would congratulate the minister on achieving that much.

With regard to the particular bill here, Mr. Speaker, it is a small step.

Obviously, polluters of the environment have to somehow be held responsible for the damage they cause. If the Department of Environment can go in and clean up situations that companies either do not have the capability of cleaning up or do not want to clean up and then collect up to \$25,000, that also is a step in the right direction.

I would suggest that it is a small step in the sense that many types of spills and many types of clean-ups cost far in excess of \$25,000. I am sure the minister realizes this and I am sure he has plans for these other instances. Maybe he dealt with it in his introductory speech.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, I talked about the Minister of Environment in terms of his department not really having the capabilities to carry out environmental concerns and environmental investigation. At that time, I did refer to the spray programmes that have been ongoing for a number of years which the present Minister of Environment, of course, had nothing to do with, but now he will have a great responsibility in that regard.

The spray programme for the spruce budworm, of course, is finished, we hope, forever. In the areas of the Province that were sprayed, the population of budworm is down. Also, of course, I would like to point out to the Environment Minister that in the

vast forest area of the Province, by far the greatest forest area, that was not sprayed, the spruce budworm population is also down, and I think of areas like the Terra Nova National Park where there was intense, heavy infestation of budworm; you could not walk through the woods without getting budworms all over you. It was really intense. That has started to come back, too, and the forest in the National Park looks really nice now. A combination of factors, of course, helped, and the minister will recognize in his investigations, I suppose, that the weather situation helped. The fact that the reproductive rate of the budworm in Newfoundland is only half the reproductive rate in New Brunswick, for instance, is also a very important factor. This natural cycle is now over and I am very happy to see that it is.

I would like to point out to the Minister of Environment, though, that in New Brunswick where they have been spraying for - what? - thirty-seven, thirty-eight years now, the budworm population is still a serious problem. They have been able to protect some of the forest, granted, but the budworm population is still there. And this is something that certainly environmental people and foresters have been pointing out, that spraying does not kill the population as such, all it does is protect the forest while the population goes through its natural cycle. This is the approach they have been taking, rightly or wrongly.

These are good things. I am really pleased with it and happy about it, but I am concerned about the fact that there is another insect pest that is now coming on the scene, and apparently there is

going to be a \$3 million spray programme against the hemlock looper. Here is where the Minister of Environment comes in. We are getting into a spray programme now that may increase or decrease over the years, but may increase - this is the point I want to make to him - over the next two or three years, depending on how quickly this particular pest spreads through the forest. This is where he is going to have some concern. He is going to have an awful lot to do with what is happening in our forests right now with regard to hemlock looper.

I would like to remind the minister, as I did last year at one point, that the situation with regard to the bacteriological spray agent is not nearly as serious as people like to pretend. As I pointed out to him last year, in Manitoba where they were undergoing an extensive spray programme, much more than is envisioned here next year, against a looper that is similar to the hemlock looper, the same kind of organism and so on except it is in a different type of tree, they could spray the whole of their infested area with Bt. Now, either what we heard from the ex-Minister of Forestry today is ill-conceived or the Manitoba Department of Environment and Forestry knows something that we do not know here.

We are told that Bt is not registered for use. I have checked on that and it is not registered for use. That is absolutely right.

I do know, however, and have been told by people working in pesticides in Ottawa, that all that is needed is sort of a label to be done and a formal

application to be made for the registration, that they have the data in with regard to the use of that substance. But, somehow, the Government of Manitoba can get Bt registered for use on a scale far in excess of what you would need here. Somehow, however they went about it.

Maybe they just simply went out and bought the stuff. Maybe they wrote a letter to the people in Ottawa saying, "Look, we do not want the use of fenitrothion or matacil or some other chemical. We want to use Bt." They went through some process, Mr. Minister, that obviously we have not gone through. We are going to wait until Bt is formally registered before we use the stuff on any large scale. We keep saying, "We are going to spray experimental blocks." We have been spraying experimental blocks with Bt since 1978 or 1979. We have data on that and I am sure the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) has data on the use of the bacterial agent, and he knows whether or not it is effective. Now, against the hemlock looper, maybe we do not have enough information, but at least against the budworm.

It would be worthwhile checking with Manitoba. Maybe the minister has done that. It would be worthwhile checking with them to see what success they had last year with their massive Bt spray programme. Did they have a good protection rate? Did they have a kill rate of 80 per cent or 85 per cent, which would constitute, Mr. Minister, good protection from the point of view of forestry and would not affect the population?

MR. TULK:

Where was that?

MR. BAKER:
In Manitoba.

If in fact they had good protection last year with Bt, then I would strongly suggest that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), who is concerned about the environment and so on, would really very strongly make the case for using Bt over the whole spray area, if the information is satisfactory.

I know that Bt is more expensive to use; I know that there may be problems with clogging in the nozzles, but I think they have worked out a lot of these problems on the West Coast and in other areas. They also use it in British Columbia, on the West Coast, as well as in Manitoba and in parts of Quebec. They probably have worked out to a large degree some of the clogging problems they used to have.

The reason I want Bt to be used rather than fenitrothion should be self-evident. There are masses of documentation, and in a library, I have a lengthy section of shelf full of fenitrothion information, books just on fenitrothion alone, this chemical that the minister is okaying for spraying on our forests. I have all that and, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, I have read it and I understand what is there. I know that when you have a chemical that is designed to kill living tissue, then it kills living tissue.

Now, the little hemlock looper does not require a great deal of this chemical to kill it, a bird requires more; therefore, under controlled conditions, the amounts that are supposed to reach the forests and kill the hemlock looper will not kill the bird. It

will maybe interfere with its behaviour for a little bit. It might have other sublethal affects that might build over the years, but it has no immediate affect on the birds. That is absolutely true. I understand that.

I understand that other organisms like fish and so on are not killed by the amount of fenitrothion that is suppose to be reaching the forest under the spray programme, I understand that, under controlled amounts, under controlled conditions. But I do understand, as I said a moment ago, that any chemical that is designed to kill living cells, and you look at a cell from a bird, a cell from us, a cell from the hemlock looper, there is no difference when you get down to that level, a chemical that is designed to kill living tissue will kill living tissue, if used in large enough amounts. The problem with the spraying, Mr. Speaker, is that the controlled conditions never ever match the field conditions. Sometimes they might, sometimes everything might be ideal and the lab conditions match the field conditions. However, what really happens is that you have drift problems. You have problems with double swathing because of drift problems. You have problems of double swathing because of equipment failure in aircraft. You have problems of double swathing because of the fact the wind does not blow steadily, especially here.

Now out West, out in Manitoba, believe it or not, the wind tends to blow steadily all of the time. If you have a wind at 10 miles per hour on a day, it generally blows steadily 10 miles an hour. Here in Newfoundland it goes around and around, you do not know where it

is coming from, one minute it is going sixty kilometers an hour and the next minute it is zero. So you have the gusting conditions that again create double swathing, and therein lies the problem, the imperfect -

MR. BUTT:

If the hon. member would permit an interruption, that is why last year we did not reach near as much as we wanted, because of weather conditions.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, I understand what the minister is saying is true. I do not know if it was picked up, but I am trying to make the case now for the Bt rather than the other, okay, which is a very relevant situation. So, there are problems in double swathing. That is something that cannot be controlled. The minister knows about the conditions in this Province and the problems the conditions can create.

So, that means that this chemical that is designed to kill living tissue will, in fact, kill living tissue and will in fact, if the double swathing is enough, kill birds. There have been some tremendous bird kills documented in New Brunswick.

As a matter of fact, there have been bird kills documented in Newfoundland, back in 1968. I can look it up and show the minister. Do you remember that spray programme for the hemlock looper that was back in 1968?

MR. BUTT:

What chemical was used?

MR. TULK:

Will you make an offer to the minister?

MR. BAKER:

What?

MR. TULK:

That you will give him a two or three day seminar so that he will know what is this Environment Ministry is all about. Will you make that offer before you close the debate?

MR. BAKER:

They were using a couple of chemicals, but one of them was fenitrothion, fenitrothion was used.

So I want to make the point very strongly to the minister that I think that he should check out the Bt situation and, if it is at all possible, and I say do not worry about the bit of extra cost, it is worth it, if you can have the security that these things will not happen and then I will not be jumping up in the House and going down your throat when an incident happens. You will have peace of mind in this House, Mr. Minister. You will be able to sit there securer than I that no incident is going to happen that would cause me to go after you in the House of Assembly.

If it is at all possible, use Bt instead of the fenitrothion. Look at the masses of evidence yourself. I know when people make recommendations, I know the way things go. They say, "There is an acceptable risk." In the Matacil controversy, the Newfoundland Medical Association came out and said, "There is an acceptable risk because unemployment creates all kinds of problems," and so on. They drew this parallel, it is an acceptable risk. My point, Mr. Minister, is simply that if it is possible to have no risk, then an acceptable risk is not

acceptable. I think that that is maybe the situation we are in here.

I would like to go on to another couple of things, Mr. Speaker, but I want to adjourn debate at this point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now five-thirty and the motion to adjourn is before the House. I call on the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who is going to answer during the five minutes we have on it. My question that I did not feel that I had a satisfactory answer on has to do with the Affirmative Action Programme adopted by the Cabinet of the government, I think, last August, was the information we got last year. The Affirmative Action Programme was set up in order to make sure there were more women going into non-traditional areas of employment in the government.

Of course, one of the former male bastions has been the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. The question that I had asked was: Given the information that we had in the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Public Service Commission going up to the end of March, 1985, why in that time period only one woman was hired for the Constabulary? It was followed up by questions in subsequent days of why, in the following year, that is the year that ends March 31, 1986, that only one more woman was employed. Although, to be fair to the Public Service Commission, actually two women were recommended in that calendar year. But, nevertheless, over the last two complete years,

up to the end of March, we have had two women hired and somewhere in the neighborhood of around seventy men hired. If there was an Affirmative Action Programme adopted by the government last August and if they were serious about it, surely this very obvious area could have had a number of additional women employed.

As a matter of fact, as I look at the figures, prior to 1984, prior to this time period, there were somewhere around twelve or thirteen women in a force of about 300. In other words, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary had about 4 per cent of its force made up of women. After two years of action, including a time period where there are approximately eight or nine months when we have been under an Affirmative Action Programme, it is remarkable to see that the actual percentage of women in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has decreased from the 4 per cent down to somewhere around 3.5 per cent. In other words, we have an Affirmative Action Programme in place and yet the percentage of women in this one identifiable group has actually dropped.

One could ask oneself, if the Affirmative Action Programme continues on in that direction, might we eliminate women entirely from the Constabulary over the next three or four years since that seems to be the direction they are going in?

So my point to be made is that last year, during the election, the Premier, in a televised debate, made significant hay out of the fact that he had appointed an Advisory Council on the Status of Women and that he was working hard to see improvements in the

Status of Women in terms of employment in the public service. Last year we saw, for example, the fast track programme, the accelerated programme of putting women into the senior management levels of government departments. By the way, considering the thousands of people working for the provincial government, it seems to me that - I think twenty is the number of women that are on this fast track - that is tokenism of the most extreme. Of course, twenty women in the fast track there is a little bit better than what we are seeing in the Constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me that if you have an Affirmative Action Programme as a policy of the Cabinet, somehow you should tell the people of the Public Service Commission who are doing the hiring that you have one. In related questions the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) actually gave as a response, "Well, maybe we hired them because there were none qualified," or "Maybe because the men were more qualified and the merit principle is being used on hiring." Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, there were 199 women in the time period covered by this particular report who applied and yet one was hired. Well, that would mean, if you have an Affirmative Action Programme in place, that the other 198 did not even meet the minimal requirements for the job. That is the only way you could dismiss that many of them. I submit that it is extremely difficult to think that the 198 of the 199 were not capable of doing the job.

I would like to be able to give you the numbers for the last calendar year and the fact that

there was only one woman hired for the Constabulary then, even though two were recommended, and I am being fair to the Public Service Commission, I would like to know how many applied but we have not got that information. We asked for it in the Committee last night but we still have not gotten it. There may have been 100, 200, or 300 I do not know but I would suggest that there were a substantial number and probably some excellent candidates that could have been hired.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no conceivable reason that a policy adopted by this government last Summer should not have been in effect in time to allow for the major expansion of the Constabulary because the one interesting thing that we should say here is that we just finished hiring for Labrador West and for Corner Brook and it has been indicated that that is the extent of the expansion of the Constabulary. So the hiring in the future will be on a replacement basis at a much lower level and, unfortunately, we missed our opportunity to increase the number of women in the Constabulary.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, just to respond in general terms, I do not have detailed information to give the hon. gentleman but just speaking generally to the Affirmative Action Programme which this

government has announced, we have been doing our best to implement this particular policy.

I think it has been said that very little has been done in that regard. I disagree with that. Every collective agreement that we have negotiated over the past six or eight months at least has taken account of the policies that have been enunciated in the Affirmative Action Programme and indeed it takes time as a result of collective agreements to make the necessary changes. It is not something that you can implement immediately.

MR. FENWICK:
On hiring?

MR. WINDSOR:
I am sorry?

MR. FENWICK:
On hiring? I thought you had absolute discretion on hiring.

MR. WINDSOR:
Oh yes, that policy is there on hiring as much as possible, Mr. Speaker. But in many other areas, it takes time to change collective agreements as they are being negotiated. In this present round of negotiations with NAPE, there are quite a number of items in the collective agreement that are being changed in accordance with the Affirmative Action Programme.

In the agreement that we signed two days ago with the Waterford Hospital workers, a number of very important items relevant to the policy have been negotiated dealing with maternity leave and issues of that nature which were very important issues to the hospital administration and to the hospital association, Mr. Speaker, because they can have a very

serious impact on hospitals, not only maternity leave but, what was always known as compassionate leave. Now it is special leave, I think that is the title now, or family leave entitlements. The Hospital Association felt strongly that that would be a difficult situation for them. Nevertheless, it was a policy that was announced as part of the Affirmative Action Programme and it has been implemented in the new agreement signed with the Waterford Hospital. I am sure it is welcomed indeed. In fact, mention was made of it by some of the employees of the hospital. They recognized that that is a major step forward.

We are doing the same thing, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to hirings in the public service, wherever possible. It will take longer, obviously, in some of the uniformed services where training and everything is required to implement these policies there. It will be put in place just as quickly as possible.

I guess you have to look at the number of people who were applying for these positions as well. Our purpose is not to force people to apply for certain positions but to ensure that there are no impediments that are stopping women from applying for these positions and being involved in these particular activities. So, let me assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that the policies announced in the Affirmative Action Programme are very real and important to this government and we are doing everything possible to put them in place. Let me say that our Affirmative Action Programme is a leader across Canada in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I call on the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was asking a question today in the House with respect to oil prices. I have said time and again that the world price of oil has been slashed by more than half in the last three and a half months and yet we do not see that direct proportional reflection at the gas pump or at the home oil heating tank.

Mr. Speaker, this side of the House put forward a resolution yesterday wherein two of the clauses read: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that government commit itself to passing on, as they occur, the full benefits deriving from the decline in the world price of oil to reduce the costs of gasoline, home heating fuel and electricity to Newfoundland consumers; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government undertake an investigation to determine whether the full benefits resulting from the decline in world prices in the areas of gasoline, home heating fuel and electricity have been passed on without delay to the Newfoundland and Labrador consumer by the oil companies and Newfoundland Hydro."

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) whose purview, whose mandate it is indeed, to protect the consumer of this Province from being gouged, ripped off, etc., voted clearly and unequivocally against this resolution, a resolution aimed at protecting the consumers of this Province. Now, I read that clause for a reason, Mr. Speaker, 'that

the Newfoundland Government ensure that the consumer be given, without delay, the benefits of lower prices'.

What did we hear this morning on CBC radio, Mr. Speaker? We hear a spokesman from Shell Oil Company this morning admitting that profits are being made by his company due to decreasing world oil prices and these profits are not being passed on to the consumer but rather are being absorbed by the company to bolster company profits. In other words, Mr. Speaker, as the decline in the price of a barrel of oil happens, in relation to the consumer at the gas pump, it is not happening. He admitted this morning that they are keeping their prices artificially high in order to bolster the company's profits. They are taking advantage of the consumer by reaping windfall profits, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know the ministers over there, particularly the two backbench ministers, do not want to hear this because, quite frankly, they are insulated against high prices of gasoline. They are insulated in that they have government cars and government credit cards. They do not know the real cost of these consumer products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has consistently claimed that he has done many surveys of oil companies to insure that the consumers are not being ripped off. Now, I asked the minister this morning

could he tell us how these mini-surveys of these companies square with what we are hearing from the spokesman from Shell Oil this morning that indeed they are reaping windfall profits on the backs, Mr. Speaker, of the consumers?

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder we see such headlines in national magazines. I am sure some of the hon. members, although I doubt if the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) reads the business magazine, *The Canadian Business Journal*, but let us look at one headline from there: *The Oil Patch Beggars Are Already Lining Up Outside Pat Carney's Door*. What does that tell you?

What does this headline from a national newspaper tell you, Mr. Speaker? *Imperial Oil Cutting Spending*. Imperial Oil is the largest, biggest, private sector oil company in Canada and their President or Chairman Arden Haynes last week reported Imperial Oil's earnings in the first three months of 1986 fell 26 per cent to \$96 million from \$130 million during the same period last year.

I submit that the multinationals, the large oil companies are looking for ways to bolster their profits, profits on the backs of the consumers of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Why are they doing it? They are doing it because the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), whose mandate is to look after the average, ordinary consumer of this Province, to protect him and her, has acquiesced. He has taken the silent route, he has taken the naive route of asking the multinationals, "well, boys, where do you stand?" "Well, Mr.

Minister, here is where we stand." He has accepted this, Mr. Speaker, unequivocally accepted it.

Now, I ask him again, with relation to diesel prices, we know that this is a crude product; we know that that product, if any product, should decline fastest in this Province and yet what are we seeing? We see an average price of diesel fuel across this Province for the trucking industry who transport our goods, for the truckers who are going to gear up for the construction industry right now, are they getting a break, Mr. Speaker? Are they getting help from this Minister of Consumer Affairs? No, they are not because the average price of diesel has not moved in six months, sixty-five cents a litre, \$3.20 a gallon.

A quick call around this Province, two firms in St. John's, Irving 65.3 cents for diesel a litre, Esso 64.3 cents a litre for diesel, beyond the overpass, 65.9 cents per litre per diesel. Are these consumers, these truck drivers, these hard Newfoundland workers who are gearing up for the construction industry? Are they getting a break, Mr. Speaker? If they got a break, perhaps they could hire some other people.

My final question is will the minister undertake to have an independent, arms length people's enquiry into why the price of gasoline, why the price of diesel are moving at a molasses slow crawl, moving downward in this Province? He knows in his heart of hearts, Mr. Speaker, that if the multinationals saw the price of a barrel of oil go up tomorrow, it would be reflected tomorrow at the pumps, at the home heating oil

tank and at the diesel stations for our truck drivers in this Province.

By leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

No leave.

MR. FUREY:

I have some further comments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order?

MR. FUREY:

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) gave me leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has no leave.

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the hon. member was not given leave to continue because if the comments he would make after having been given leave were no better than the ones he just made, then it would be a complete waste of the time of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to a statement that was made by a representative of Shell Canada on CBC radio this morning, I guess. I have not had the time, I was not aware of that statement.

MR. FUREY:

I made you aware of it at three o'clock.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, at that time I became aware. I have asked people in my department to see if they can get a copy of that statement in the full context in which it was said. I will reserve any comment on that statement until I have an opportunity to get the statement itself and take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker, as it pertains specifically to Shell Canada, I do not think that the consumers of this Province are getting ripped off particularly by Shell Canada because, as far as I am concerned, there are none, if there are there are very few, Shell stations in this Province.

MR. FUREY:

Shell is a cartel, you know about that.

MR. RUSSELL:

If the hon. member says it is a cartel, Mr. Speaker, if he has some evidence that the oil companies are contravening the Combines Investigation Act, maybe he should bring it forward.

MR. TULK:

We will have to do your work.

MR. RUSSELL:

I do not require the hon. members opposite to do my work. However, Mr. Speaker, every other day they are posing questions and making statements about the consumers not being protected on the declining price of oil and electricity and I have admitted many times in this House that it is a severe problem for the consumers and, particularly, for people on fixed incomes.

Now, if the problem is as serious and severe as the hon. members opposite indicate that it is, then I think it is time for them to put their collective minds together and come up with some very positive and very practical suggestions as to what might be able to be done to, within a very short period of time, reduce the cost of electricity and the cost of gasoline.

MR. FUREY:

Have an enquiry into it.

MR. RUSSELL:

The hon. member says have an enquiry into this. He is willing to spend several thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money -

MR. FUREY:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:

- for an enquiry to get information, a lot of which has already been provided to this House. The hon. member says that the companies are ripping off the Province or infers that they are ripping off the consumers.

MR. DINN:

They have no proof.

MR. RUSSELL:

Again, if the hon. member has good, strong, concrete evidence that the companies are ripping off this Province, then, Mr. Speaker, he has a responsibility to bring it forward so as to protect the consumers of this Province, Mr. Speaker, which he is certainly not doing.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the minister but, the minister has clearly said on a number of occasions that he has gone and sought from the companies only what the reasons for their pricing was. If he is going to stand there and simply accept the multinationals' reasons, he might as well be the minister of multinational oil companies because he is doing a lousy job as Consumers Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it appears when you hit a bone, the hon. member for St. Barbe cannot take the heat. If he cannot, he better get out of the kitchen.

He has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that there is a cartel. I said if the hon. member has some strong, concrete evidence to prove that, then he should bring it forward for the protection of the consumer. Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite are content not to do any of their homework but to sit back and do nothing except verbalize about all of this, not bring forward, Mr. Speaker, any concrete proposals, anything that is practical and thus, try to get out of their responsibility as reasonable members of the Opposition.

MR. FUREY:
An enquiry!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member persists in interrupting. I do not recall that I interrupted him once during his five minutes. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that they do not know what they are talking about. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. He is not prepared to bring forward any concrete and practical solutions to this problem and, thus, I suspect he does not have any to bring forward. He is verbalizing, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of verbalizing. It is a case of verbal diarrhea from the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, this afternoon during Question Period I raised a question with the Premier. Basically, I asked him was what he was going to do to see that there was an end to the NAPE strike? If he was so taken up with his own package, was he going to insist that that package be put on the table and that a vote of the membership be taken. What the Premier basically said in his answer and in a few little words in between was that, and I think the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) is probably going to answer for him, what he said in those few little words was that he

really thought that that was no good because the membership would, of course, vote against the package that would be put forward by the government itself.

MR. WINDSOR:
What would make you think that?

MR. TULK:
What makes me think that? Because the people who are in this strike with NAPE know that their cause is just, they know that the inequalities that are built into the system will always, and I say this to the President of Treasury Board, will always have the support of the Newfoundland public. The Premier can try in any way he likes, the President of Treasury Board can try in any way he likes, he can issue statements like he issued this morning which basically made fun - it was an insult, it was arrogant and it was making fun of a serious group of people in this Province who are trying to redress some inequalities that exist in this Province. The President of Treasury Board knows full well that he can do what he likes, he can put all the ads that he wants in the papers, he can have the Premier appear on television looking calm, cool and collected and trying to look good, he can do all of that but, in the final analysis, this government will be told by the Newfoundland people, through NAPE, that the cause of the people of NAPE is just.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Premier's statement this morning. He says the dispute began over Bill 59 and wage parity in one contract, and he says, "We have met all that." But the key to what the Premier is saying and how that lowers his stature, those three little words 'in one

contract'. How that lowers his stature, to try to put that piece of paper out to the Newfoundland public and try to deceive them in the way that he is trying to deceive them! Mr. Speaker, the weasel words in there are 'in one contract'. He is going to give them parity, equality, in one contract.

We know that the government has proposed at least four or five years to reach parity and that was their last proposal. They have only made one and the union has made three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not true.

MR. TULK:

That is the truth, and we also know, if you care to ask, at the present time, and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) knows this, that NAPE at this point in time has agreed to go two and a half years to reach parity. We know that that is the case.

MR. WINDSOR:

That is not true.

MR. TULK:

NAPE will make that statement publicly if they are forced to. But, Mr. Speaker, the real thing that is going on there is that this government has come under the greatest fire since it has been elected, it has come under the greatest fire from one called NAPE, led by Fraser March. Make no mistake about that. His cause, as I said, is just. His cause is just.

We find the Premier today standing up in the House in answer to a

question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) yesterday concerning an agreement signed by CUPE with some federal workers, we find the Premier standing up and saying that indeed he agrees that people who work in the federal service, regardless of whether they work in Moncton or St. John's or in Fogo or in Gander should be paid the same wage for the same work. He said that. He admitted that. Yet, in his own Province, the very thing that he has control of, the very thing that the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and the Premier and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has control of, the chance to give equality to their own workers, they refuse to do it. They absolutely refuse to do it.

And they use taxpayers dollars for ads. The Premier does not even know how much those cost. In answer to a question that I believe I put to him the other day, he does not have a clue about how much they cost. He does not know what department paid for them, and it does not matter to him. The truth is it does not matter to him. He would spend the last cent in the Treasury to try to put down this drive by a group of Newfoundland people for equality and for a sense that they live in a Province that has some equality and cares for them.

That is the real answer that the President of Treasury Board should stand up and say to us that he is going to see that what the Premier said he would do in forty-eight hours will be done in the next forty-eight.

MR. BAIRD:

Stop your bawling!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that what we are going to see is tomorrow or the next day the same situation that we saw two weeks ago. That will put the lie to exactly what the Premier said on television a little while ago.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made a number of statements that he knows are not true. I am really amazed at him, because he is normally fairly accurate in what he has to say. This afternoon he has distorted what is taking place in this Province. He has distorted the issues and he has sidestepped the issues. He is not prepared to face the fact that what we are dealing with here is a union leader who is not serious about negotiating. He has no desire to negotiate an agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

I have no doubt that the employees of this Province, who were out there on the street for five or six weeks, that they are the people who are losing, not Mr. March. I have no doubt that they are serious in their demands for wage increases and for parity, and this government has agreed to give them parity, Mr. Speaker, not in five and a half years, as the hon.

gentleman led the House to believe, not in five and a half years.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How long?

MR. WINDSOR:

By September of 1989, wage parity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

I do not know how the hon. gentleman's calendar reads, Mr. Speaker, but it is not five and a half years before September, 1989. That is well within the back-to-work agreement. Neither has the union said we want parity in two and a half years. They want parity immediately, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

They said two and a half years.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

That is not true. It is a two and a half year agreement, Mr. Speaker, but they want parity immediately. That is what has been asked for. The hon. gentleman can say what he likes but he cannot change the facts. Maybe he has not bothered to read the agreement, Mr. Speaker.

And he talks about ads, that the government is placing ads. Well, you know, what choice do we have when we get statements that are made by the media, Mr. Speaker, that are not accurate. All you have to do is look at The Evening Telegram tonight and see that

their article on the Premier's statement this morning, well, they cannot even read from the printed statement that he gave them. They cannot even read! I do not have it in front of me. If I did, I would quote it. Now that is why we have to have ads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

You know, what is good for the goose is good for the gander, Mr. Speaker.

By the way - he talks about buying ads - I am advised that the union has already bought space in this weekend's papers and next weekend papers. Now, is that the union that is serious about reaching an agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

They have already purchased space for next weekend, that is how serious they are about trying to reach an agreement, Mr. Speaker, and coming back to the table. There are over seventy items still on the table, boots are still on the table, boots are still there, Mr. Speaker, tool allowances and promotions based on seniority. That is how serious they are. Where have they moved?

We have moved on over twenty items. We have made offer after offer, after offer. The union is still looking for \$2,400 April 1, which gives more than parity to

some people. Their first offer last week was not only parity two and a half years, as the hon. gentleman would have us to believe, it was parity April 1, plus 6 per cent on top of that. Where is their parity, Mr. Speaker? They talk about parity but parity for whom? Where is the parity for the health care sector when they want 6 per cent more now for GS and MOS than the health care sector? Where is the parity there?

MR. BAIRD:

That is telling them.

MR. WINDSOR:

They cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is this government is doing everything possible to negotiate an agreement. We have continuously been tolerant and reasonable and tried to deal with this union, asked them to come back to the bargaining table and we are not getting any response at all from the union leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn comes, I would like to inform hon. members that the Social Services Committee will meet at 7:30 p.m. in the Colonial Building to consider the estimates

of the Department of Culture,
Recreation and Youth.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House
at its rising do adjourn until
tomorrow, Friday, April 25, 1986,
at 10:00 a.m.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,
April 25, 1986, at 10:00 a.m.