

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1980

The House met at 10.00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I am sure hon. members will join with me in welcoming to the galleries this morning nine students from Makkovik All Grade School in Labrador and nine students from the Foxtrap Junior High School in Conception Bay South. We hope that they will enjoy their visit here.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members on both sides of the House and indeed all Newfoundlanders are very concerned about reports in connection with faulty equipment, a breakdown in equipment surrounding Ben Nevis and Hibernia wells. At Hibernia 0-35, a step-out well being drilled near the most promising hole,blowout preventers are acting up a spokesman said. Can the hon. gentleman tell the House, the hon. President of the Council who obviously right now is the only one who can answer the question, how serious is this problem? How often does it occur? What is involved? I mean, is there danger to the environment as the result of the breakdown, of this equipment acting up because this is the thing that controls blowouts from these wells? Does the hon. gentleman have any first-hand information he can give the House? How serious is the matter? They had to shutdown, I am told, equipment on the two oil drilling rigs, Ben Nevis and Hibernia. And is there indeed a threat or any danger to the environment and to the fishery? Because the Premier hinted at it the other day when he came back from New York. What is precisely the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there have been shutdowns and there has been malfunctioning of equipment and this obviously would occur. But to our knowledge, and, of course, this matter is being monitored, and the situation with respect to the activities of the oil companies is being monitored very carefully, to our knowledge there is no - as a result of the breakdown in this equipment, there is no extra danger of any blowout or any environmental hazards as a result of it, over and above, of course. It would be silly to say that there were not because I am sure as the hon. member knows and all hon. members know that there is a certain amount of concern wherever drilling of this nature occurs. But in reply to his specific question as a result of this malfunctioning, really of equipment and that, there is to our knowledge, and when I say to our knowledge this matter is being monitored by us, there is to our knowledge no immediate cause of undue alarm.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this leads to my second question about monitoring the offshore rigs. Is that the responsibility of the provincial government, the federal government or is the responsibility for environmental matters jointly shared by the Province and the Government of Canada as indicated in the formula that was worked out between the Province and the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Gillespie in Ottawa? Who is

MR. S. NEARY: responsible for it and do they keep a continuous check on it? Because this matter is very serious, Sir. I do not know if hon. gentlemen are aware or not, but they call them BOPs - blowout preventers. They are huge valves the size of this House of Assembly, underneath the water, and in case anything goes wrong they are reading gauges on the rigs all the time and they are supposed to be able to use what they call shut-off valves. Now, who keeps a check on that? I mean, is there somebody on board the rigs all the time or do they just go out occasionally? Whose responsibility is it for monitoring the offshore rigs?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Matters of environment in that area, Mr. Speaker, are primarily the responsibility of the federal government and I am sure, as the hon. member knows, the federal government is keeping a very close watch, and as a matter of fact, I believe now is conducting a study to assure that its knowledge in that with respect to offshore drilling is up-to-date. Further to that, of course, even though the provincial government has no direct responsibility in the legal sense, obviously, it has a great deal of concern with the matter and it keeps an eye on it and receives a report on this matter as well as other matters from time to time with respect to the offshore.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: On this particular aspect of it, Sir, would the hon. the minister undertake to get us a complete and full report from the environmental people who are watching the blowout preventers? Because the reports reaching us are that they are acting up, there is some problem with them, and as hon. members know, if they cannot be shut off then she is going to blow. And, you know, they had to shut down the rigs. Obviously, it must be a pretty serious matter when they had to shut down the rigs because there were cracks in them - in the reamers and so forth, and in the valve itself, which is, as I say, as large as the House of Assembly. But I would like to get something factual from the federal

MR. S. NEARY: environmental people, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would feel more assured too, himself, if we can get factual information to bring into this House so that the people of this Province will be reassured that they can shut off the blowout preventers and that there is no possibility that she is going to blow out there now any day at all.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is accustomed to do, from time to time when he asks questions, he also makes certain statements that I would feel should not be taken as the gospel. But certainly, we are all concerned about this and certainly, we will take that matter under advisement, because not only the hon. member but every person in Newfoundland is obviously very concerned, to assure that the optimum safety procedures are being implemented and that everything is done.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other aspects of the oil exploration situation that we want to go into. Again, I am going to ask the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) who seems to be in the barrel these days with the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) both of whom, as I understand, are out of the Province and presumably, given the weather, not likely to be back today anyway. Hopefully they will be in the House Monday.

I, first of all, wonder if the President of the Council could tell us whether the timing forecasts - they are in this mornings paper, and he has probably heard the reports as well, quoting a Mr. Basten who is apparently employed with Mobil Oil of Canada - of 1986 at the earliest for production from Hibernia assuming, as we all do and as we all hope, that the Hibernia find proves to be of a sufficient size and scope? Is that a realistic forecast? What are the government - the government tell us they are monitoring it and I have no doubt they are, and could the minister tell us whether that is a reasonable sort of timing? I am not concerned to the precise day or the precise month but give or take a year, are we looking at something within five or six years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for anyone, including the gentleman who was quoted by the hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. E. Roberts), I would suggest, to give any kind of a specific date, particularly at this particular stage. We have heard, as I think has already been indicated, and I think we have got to couch our answers at all times, to say that if there is a commercial find, we all certainly hope there will be, but the fact of the matter is the earliest figures that we had heard before would be possibly 1985, then this gentleman says 1986,

MR. W. MARSHALL: and then there are all sorts of permutations and combinations involved that I think would be impossible and indeed irresponsible for us to give any kind of definitive date because there are many aspects of it. The nature and the way in which the production, if it does occur, will be performed in one thing and, of course, of paramount importance is the issue of the environment itself and what environmental safeguards will have to be adhered to. And, you know, as I say, at this particular stage I think it is much too early for any person, with respect the person who was quoted from Mobil Oil, to come up with any kind of a definitive statement with respect to the time.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. I understand what the minister is saying essentially that really nobody knows at this stage because there are a number of factors which are not determinable at this point and that 1985-86 is certainly on the optimistic side of early and on the early side of realistic, given what we now know.

Let me switch to another aspect of the offshore thing if I might, Your Honour. Again I believe it was Mr. Millan who is the head of the - what is it called? - the Offshore Petroleum Directorate - Super Agency. Mr. Millan -

MR. S. NEARY: The Director.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - the Director of that particular branch of the Public Service was

MR. E. ROBERTS: quoted as saying that about seven cents of every dollar being spent on exploration currently stays in the Province. Given that there are \$220,000,000 to be spent this year by the oil companies off Newfoundland and Labrador, is that the figure the government has? Are we getting seven cents out of every dollar?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position now, you know, to verify that figure. The only thing I can say to the hon. member is that as far as the government is concerned it has a concern that we get the optimum from each dollar that is spent and it is also a concern that our people in the business community in this Province take advantage of the opportunities that are available to them. It has been stated from time to time, and, I think, with a certain amount of justification, that because of the nature of our commercial activity, historically in this province over a period of years, that much of the business community has concerned itself with matters pertaining to agencies, retail trade and what have you. In other words, many of the business community in this Province have been to one degree and another really just manufacturers agents.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes, manufactureres agents. And it is a matter of real, real concern to us. I mean government cannot do everything, and we would like to see the business community in this province, you know, showing a little bit more initiative in many respects, and prepared to perhaps take a little bit more entrepreneurial risks than perhaps they have in the past. And we are quite sure that this will come in time.

In answer to the hon. gentleman's question, I mean, I cannot say that, you know, that is the exact amount of the return derived from exploration in the Province but certainly the government is working as hard as it possibly can to see that that is

MR. W. MARSHALL: maximized and whatever the return is, that it is increased.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Your Honour, we, on this side, would agree with the goal. I cannot pursue it now, obviously, and so I will not we are not so sure that the government are taking the maximum steps but we will come back to that.

Let me again, on another aspect of this oil thing, ask the minister if the government are prepared to table the exchange of letters between the hon. the Premier, who was then the Minister of Mines and Energy and the hon. Allistair Gillespie, who was then the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa, between the two levels of government with respect to the development of exploration and the issuing of joint permits? Could they be laid on the table of the House? Will the government consent to that?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. President of the Council.
MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, not having seen the detail of the letters, I cannot at this time give an undertaking because there may possibly be something in the exchange of letters which were as happens from time to time, correspondence flowing from one minister to another, from one Cabinet to another.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend has them.

MR. MARSHALL: I know the hon. gentleman probably has them, undoubtedly he has, as he usually has copies of most letters. But I will certainly take the matter under advisement. As far as I can see, I can see no reason why it should not be made public unless it is a matter of confidentiality, to protect confidentiality for some reason or other, between the ministers. But I will certainly take the matter under advisement.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me the Gillespie correspondence, the exchange of letters between the hon. gentleman's administration and Mr. Gillespie of the Government of Canada. You cannot table them, I suppose, unless you quote from them but just to show you the air of co-operation that existed—and the rigs would not be out there, I think, hon. gentlemen are aware, but for this formula that was worked out. Is the hon. gentleman aware, for instance, that Mr. Gillespie in his last paragraph of a letter that was written to the Premier back in 1978, says, 'I have designated Don Crosbie, Glenn Yungblut and Michael Bell of my department to be the Federal representatives of this proposed committee'. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? If he is not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, I just quoted from the documents, I would be glad to table them because I believe the press, the media of this Province should get a hold of this correspondence and put things in

MR. S. NEARY: their right perspective for a change. So I am going to lay it on the table of the House. But is the hon. gentleman aware of the things involved in this correspondence in showing the air of co-operation between the Province and Ottawa as far back as 1978?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems in getting up on a point of order during Question Period, from the government point of view, is that it might be construed that the government does not want a question levied against it. The hon. gentleman has made a speech, not a magnificent one, but a speech of his interpretation and he gave an interpretation so I will just merely answer it by giving an interpretation of his question. It shows, as far I am concerned, the panic and the frantic nature of the hon. gentlemen on the other side to get them off the sticky wicket that they are on with respect to offshore ownership and they will try anything they possibly can including the Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and it again relates to the offshore situation. Could the minister tell the House exactly how many people are employed on the offshore, both onshore and offshore, and what the ratio is in terms of Newfoundland workers employed at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1039

DW - 3

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the offshore I have not got the latest figures and I am due to have an update of the figures this week. But I believe the last figures that I had on the offshore were something over 400 people employed on the offshore, on the drill rigs that are out there now and on the supply vessels.

MR. DINN: The last time I saw the statistics on the offshore I had the ratios broken down in the different areas. With respect to the supply vessels in the offshore, the ratio is about - I believe, ninety per cent on supply vessels are Newfoundlanders. On the rigs, I do not want to give the House incorrect information, but it is somewhere of the order of - it is over fifty per cent. And I do not know what the figure is right now. But I can get that for the hon. member. Onshore we do not have as detailed a breakdown as we would like to have because it is simply impossible to get. There are companies starting almost on a daily basis. So I would not have that figure anyway.

The Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Barry) may have it when he gets back Monday but certainly that is not part of the statistics that we collect because we are mainly concerned with employees in the offshore, although we do have statistics on employees on land with respect to the companies hiring for offshore.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this matter one would think that the minister would have such figures available at his fingertips immediately. I would like to ask the minister, what influence the government uses, if any, to get jobs for people on the offshore? The government has an employment agency within the minister's department and I am wondering if it is just a window dressing kind of thing or if it actually has any power with any of the oil companies in placing Newfoundlanders in jobs?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it is not this government's policy, either within government or outside of government in private enterprise, to force anybody to hire anybody. In the government service as an example, we have the Public Service Commission, which is an independent

MR. DINN: body that does hiring for government. And it is not my function to call the Public Service Commission and say, "You will hire this person or that person or the other person." With respect to the offshore, a procedure that is available is the following: number one, we get an application for a person to be registered for the offshore; that person's application is checked out, it is then put in a registry and all of the offshore companies are sent a copy of that registry. When they are hiring they will hold interviews and check the registry. If the person is not registered and is a Newfoundlander he is still not discriminated against, he is told to go to the Department of Labour and register. If he is registered then the company, if he has the qualifications, hires. But I do not call the company and say, "John Jones is a friend of mine, you will hire him." Then after the company does the hiring, actually does the hiring,

MR. DINN: a list of all the people that are hired is then sent to my department with the information that the company has received on them. That list is then checked with the registry and if the people are on the register then everything is okay. If they are not part of the register, then the company is called in and asked to explain why they hired John Jones from Connecticut. If they do not have a logical and reasonable explanation, if it is a job that a Newfoundlander can and should do, then the company will hire the Newfoundlander. That is the procedure.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House whether or not it is to the advantage of any Newfoundlander looking for a job to go to the minister's department beforehand to be registered in obtaining a job with the offshore or is it better for them to go directly to the companies from whom they are looking for a job, Crosbies or Harvey's or any other company? What do we recommend to them? A lot of us over here have been recommending that they go through the minister's department. Is that a waste of time as the minister indicates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not a waste of time. The fact of the matter is, if they are not on the register there is a good chance that the company for speed, just for expediency for them to hire the persons - if they are hiring Friday afternoon and they have -

MR. NEARY: What do you do if your name is not on the list?

MR. DINN: If they are hiring Friday afternoon, as an example, and a person goes into that office to be hired and he is not on the register it is quite possible that the company for the sake of expediency, if there is another individual that is qualified and is a Newfoundlander and

MR. DINN: is on the register, it is quite possible that the company may hire that person, because he is on the register, without going through the rigmarole. The fact of the matter is that we do not, by registering, push one individual over another individual but they are registered by means of job description. For example, a roughneck or a roustabout, if they have experience on the rigs in that capacity, or driller or messmen and so on. So they are registered in that capacity and when a company does not have enough applications of people with qualifications, they will often refer to the register and call up individuals that have applied for jobs or have registered for jobs on the offshore. So it is quite an advantage to register and I would recommend the hon. members opposite to have anyone who requests that they be registered for the offshore if they cannot get into St. John's, for example, at a particular time to register, we will send out the registration forms.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). In view of the answers that he just gave to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) I understand that Petro-Canada has announced their plans for offshore exploration off the Labrador coast. As those plans have been announced, is the minister aware of labour opportunities that will exist there and will Labradorians be given the preference to work on those oil rigs when Petro-Canada

MR. G. WARREN: begin their offshore exploration along the Labrador Coast?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not differentiate between a Labradorian Newfoundlander or a Corner Brook Newfoundlander or a St. John's Newfoundlander or a Labrador City Newfoundlander or a Makkovik Newfoundlander or a Conception Bay Newfoundlander - they are all Newfoundlanders to me and they all have the same opportunity to get jobs in the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I probably understand the minister's answer, but is the minister saying that if the oil rig is working off Hopedale, Labrador, that residents in Hopedale who qualify for a position will not be given a position because his name is not on the minister's list?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. G. WARREN: Is that the reason - because his name is not on the minister's list?

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: He is up in Hopedale, there is no communication, he does not even know anything about it, is the minister saying, 'You do not know about it, your name is not on the list so you will not get the job.' Is that the answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that kind of a situation does not exist, and if the hon. member knows a situation like that exists, he should make sure that his constituents are aware. I think it is possibly one of the responsibilities the hon. member may have.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. J. DINN: Now, we did a lot of advertising in the Province of Newfoundland, both on T.V. and radio, in the papers and so on, and we would hope that we got to most of the people in Newfoundland. But the fact of the matter is, if the hon. member knows of a person in Hopedale or anywhere else who wants to be registered for the offshore, it is a simple matter of him getting registration forms from me, and as a matter of fact, I will make registration forms available for as many people as are in the hon. member's district and make sure he can get them to everyone, so that they can register for the offshore. There is no problem there, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the hon. member has four or five mailouts a year and I will not take one of his mailouts away from him. If he wants me to do it for him I will gladly do it because I am so interested in making sure that we get people, especially in the locations. I would think that the companies hiring for the offshore may set up offices for hiring in, say, Goose Bay or someplace up in Labrador so that everyone has the advantage of being hired for the offshore.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

I thank the minister for passing along the registration forms and whatever he is going to pass along to me. I would like to advise the hon. the minister that along the Labrador Coast we have no television, we have no radio, we have no newspaper - those are three things we do not have, and very little do we hear from any hon. minister too. Therefore, I suggest to the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower that he make sure that his advertising goes out to all those communities. I will make sure that my constituents know it, but there are other places throughout Newfoundland and Labrador that are not aware of the opportunities that exist on offshore oil. My last question is,

MR. WARREN: could the minister advise if Petro-Canada will be setting up an onshore base anywhere in Labrador?

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to - I am delighted the hon. member is going to make sure that his constituents are made aware of the registry, and assist them in any way that he can to register and hopefully help them and assist them in getting jobs when Petro-Canada goes to Labrador and drills off the Labrador Coast. The fact of the matter is that we are currently having negotiations with Petro-Canada because we have a breakdown now, or somewhat of a breakdown, we have not got the total detail, we have a breakdown now of some of the drill rigs that will be coming into the Province this year. We are not totally happy with the number of Newfoundlanders that Petro-Canada wants to employ offshore. We think we have people who are qualified to do some of the jobs that they are not permitting. They are saying to us, at this point in time, they will not permit Newfoundlanders, for whatever reason, so that those negotiations will go on until we are happy. Because, indeed, we hold on this side of the House that we should control employment offshore as one of the things under the regulations, and, of course, I intend to do that job and do it as best I can.

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for one final question and answer.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: - Monday. (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: My question as well is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower and I was wondering if he could indicate to the House - as I understand it one should register, if one wants a job offshore one goes in and one gives his name and address, telephone number, etc., and presumably he indicates whether he is a Canadian or a Pakistani, or a Newfoundlander, whatever, when he -

MR. NEARY: A Philippino.

MR. THOMS: - a Philippino or whatever, and he -

MR. NEARY: Not a Jap. Do not call them Japs.

MR. THOMS: No, we cannot call him a Jap. But what I would like to know is what criteria is used by your department to determine who and who is not a Newfoundlander? What criteria is used?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, number one, I do not want to give or read for the hon. member the regulations or the guidelines - they have been available for four or five years now and the hon. member should know them. The fact of the matter is that, you know, it should not be considered as a matter of urgent public importance here in Oral Question Period here in the House. The fact of the matter is that there are registration forms and it is just a matter of the person putting down his name, address, his social insurance number -

MR. MARSHALL: His place of birth.

MR. NEARY: Your religion, your politics -

MR. DINN: No religion on there, no politics, but you know -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: I do not think we have - if the hon. members opposite continue with the position they have on the offshore we will have no need of having people register as to what political persuasion they are because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - the fact of the matter is there will not be a member left over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for the Strait of

Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, before we -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I have difficulty hearing the hon. member who wishes to speak. Order please! The hon. the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of

Fisheries has responded to Your Honour and is trying to behave, I would like to raise a matter. The members of the House, I think, are aware that in an accident in St. John's, I believe two days ago, a young lady was killed, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Harvey. Joe Harvey, of course, served in this House briefly. But, he was twice elected, in fact, to this House and might I suggest that perhaps the usual motion - I did not have a chance to speak to my opposite member, the gentleman from St. John's East (W. Marshall, but the usual motion might go extending the sympathy of us all to the family on the death of this young lady.

MR. W. MARSHALL

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had noted the death

in the paper and was not really aware who the parents - Joe Harvey, was described - were, in fact. Certainly we would want to be associated with it to extend our deepest sympathy on a very tragic happening and event in the passing of their daughter who, I believe, was only twenty years old.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

You have heard the motion. Those

in favour, aye, contrary, nay, carried.

NOTICES OF MOTION

- MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of Council.
- MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice, (G. Ottenheimer), I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Change Of Name Act."
- MR. NEARY: Are you changing your name or what?
- MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I am sorry, the hon. the Minister of Education.
- MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pension) Act."
- MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.
- MS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled - "An Act To Amend The Judgement Recovery Newfoundland Act."
- MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I am still having difficulty in hearing some of the ministers present their notices. I notice that some members are having conversations. Maybe it might be more appropriate to have them out in the corridor somewhere, but I have difficulty hearing what the hon. members are saying. The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.
- MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply on Head III, Executive Council, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

I would like to inform all hon. members that we have six hours and twenty-seven minutes remaining. We are on Head III, Executive Council.

Shall 302-01 carry?

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that Head III will carry approximately six hours and twenty-six minutes from now. As I understand it, Head III is the last of the Heads to be referred and that will leave the nine hours for the concurrence debates. Hopefully, by the way, we will be able to change the format of those debates and make them a little better than they were last year. And at the end of the six hours and twenty-seven minutes, or whatever that period is, we will carry the Estimates. Your Honour, is required by Standing Orders, if memory serves me correctly, to put them all without further question, in the delicate words of the draftsman.

And I may add, after the kind of performance we saw yesterday from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) at about a quarter - well, not a quarter to six, I am sorry, yesterday was Thursday so the House at 5:30 went into the Late Show. Having heard the Minister of Finance speak at 5:15 we ought to have gone into the Late Show at 5:10 and used our time a little more profitably. I was disappointed. You know, I like the Minister of Finance. Some of my best friends are Ministers of Finance. They need friends, they have few enough. And the way that this Province's fiscal and monetary - well, we do not have a monetary policy we barely have a fiscal policy and the way that the minister is running it he is going

MR. E. ROBERTS: to need, I can assure him, all the friends he can get. But that is another story. If ever we get the Budget debate we will talk about what we regard as some of the sins of omission and some of the sins of commission of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his capacity as the government's chief financial man.

But yesterday he went beyond that and he launched forth into uncharted waters and he came to grief. I understand from my friends in the medical trade that the hon. minister as a doctor had and, I have no doubt, has a good reputation. He is regarded as being a first-class pediatrician and that doubtless fits him to be a part of the present Cabinet. He is right at home with that. But really when it comes to this - Your Honour, does not know what a pediatrician is? Your Honour is looking quizzical, Your Honour is doing me the grave courtesy, which I much appreciate, of listening to what I say. I appreciate that, and I want to be sure Your Honour understands as well as listens.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am getting warning signals from my colleagues to the stern here, Sir, I do not know what that means. I am not, in my view, being the least bit disrespectful of the Chair and if I am I hasten to say I have no intention or thought of that. In fact, I think that the committee has never been more ably chaired than it has been in this House of Assembly. And heavens knows, as Your Honour, will be told by some colleagues, that I have had differences of opinion from time to time with hon. members who have sat in the Chair of committee.

Anyway, the point I was making is that the Minister of Finance - I am sorry?

MR. HOLLETT: I was telling 'John' to take a bow.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, I do not mind him taking a bow as long as he does not wave his arms, the waving the arms is - you know the time is not up yet, Your Honour. I mean, the nice thing about committee is that I only have to sit down for a little bit and I can come back again. But I do not want to have sport with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because really that is unfair.

MR. T. LUSH: You did not define what a pediatrician is.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My friend for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) does not know what a pediatrician is. A pediatrician -

MR. T. LUSH: No, I said you did not define it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I did not find it or define it?

MR. T. LUSH: You did not define it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: These teachers, Mr. Chairman, you think they really would be more precise. Well, I will take him outside and tell him afterwards what a pediatrician is, behind the curtain. But anyway I do not want to go on

MR. E. ROBERTS: about the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) because really that is quite irrelevant to the point.

Now, yesterday there were some quite splendid speeches made on this side. I regret that gentlemen opposite were not able to respond in kind but I suppose that is the way it goes. But I think that a very significant point is beginning to emerge and it is beginning to emerge quite clearly. It has taken a while for it to come out and hon. members opposite probably do not realize it has come out, and if they realize it is coming out they are reluctant to accept it because, of course, they have been posturing. Those of them who understand it-I suppose there might be one or two or three who understand the nefarious strategy that the government have adopted in lieu of being able to come to grips with the problems of the Province, two or three understand, the rest have just been posturing like a bunch of little tin pouter pigeons striding about in the square with their chests puffed out posturing. They have no more idea what they are about, Sir, than the hon. Minister of Finance's patients did. The children who were six months old and a year old would have had as much knowledge now of what is going on, Hon. gentlemen and I include in that hon. ladies opposite, although I am not sure either if the two lady ministers have graced the debate with their views, but hon. gentlemen opposite no more understand, most of them, what this whole debate this whole question of offshore is about. They are posturing, they are grabbing frantically on to what they believe and hope will be their salvation, the glory road that will enable them to be re-elected and so forth. But two things are coming through quite clearly, First of all, this government has no specific position on offshore. They do have the posture, they do have the empty rhetoric which they put up as an answer to everything. I was surprised the other day, My friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) raised a problem affecting the conditions of jails in the Province and he asked it of the Premier and the Premier made answer and for once the Premier did not say, well, we would have good jails if only we

MR. E. ROBERTS: owned offshore oil. But that has become their refuge. They are unable to cope with the problems of the Province, we are seeing that, we have seen it in the budget, we are seeing it every single day.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on.

MR. E. ROBERTS: And you know, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) taking refuge and he has only begun to get the heat that is going to come on him this year because his colleagues have given him no money, no money at all, to enable him to meet the needs, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) who is hidden behind the skirts of a property tax and that is beginning to come home to roost.

MR. G. WARREN: What a government.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But all that hon. gentlemen opposite have is 'we own it' and then they get on to this cheap second-class - you know, Dr. Johnson, a very wise old Englishman said that "Patriotism is a last refuge of the scoundrel." And we are seeing on the other side a group of gentlemen - I am not saying that they are scoundrels, if the cap fits they may wear it but I am not saying it fits - but we are seeing a group of men and women, a group of members of this House who are taking refuge in patriotism as if somehow that were an answer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the first thing. This government have a posture but a posture is not a policy. A posture is not an answer, a posture is not a firm means of coming to grips with some of our problems. Do you know the most important thing this administration is going to accomplish in this second session of this General Assembly, Do you know what it is? As incredible as it sounds it is something that is going to be done by the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) -

AN HON. MEMBER: The flag.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - whose record of achievements speaks for itself.

MR. WARREN:

Right on.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

His record of achievements speaks for itself, Sir, and in kindness I will not mention it - in kindness to him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS:

But he will accomplish the most important achievement of the Peckford administration in its first year in office and that is to give this Province a flag.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have only two minutes left.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Only two minutes left? I was just getting wound up but I will be back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

But, Mr. Chairman, that is all they have accomplished. So one thing I want to say, in phase one, is that all we are seeing is a posture instead of a policy. We are seeing the bitterness, the frustrated bitterness of the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) spewing out in the House, we are seeing the bile the political bile of my friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) spewing out.

MR. F. STAGG:

I felt you would get around to me.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Get around to whom?

MR. F. STAGG:

I felt you would get around to me.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I am bound to get around to the gentleman from Stephenville, Sir, when one is walking down the road and one sees a certain substance then one has to get around it, one has to get around it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Of course I get around to my friend. You know -

MR. F. STAGG:

The hon. gentleman is (inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to engage in banter with my friend, even when he loses his temper, as he is on the verge of doing now. I say to him, go back to reading about Anne Murray, it will do him more good and it will do the House more good.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will come back a little later, Sir, in this debate this morning. I want to talk about the fact this administration have radically changed their policy and they no longer are talking ownership, that is not the issue.

MR. G. WARREN:

Right on.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

They are no longer talking ownership. Ownership has never been an issue across this House. The government have finally realized, or finally admitted that they have realized, whichever is the more correct description, that ownership is not the issue on this whole offshore question, it is control. That is the issue. That is the heart of it, that is the guts of it - if that is a parliamentary word, and I think it is - that is the pith and substance of it.

MR. F. STAGG:

(Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS:

And I say to my friend from Stephenville that I say 'pith'. He may say what he wishes, but I say 'pith', Sir, pith and substance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Now, Your Honour is making a sign which I think indicates that I have come to the end of my brief - Is that a half-minute signal like on television? You know, the Chairman is new to politics, but how quickly he learns. You would think he was in a T.V. studio like this. Anyway, Your Honour, I take it I have used up my allotted ten minutes. It is just getting started, but somebody else will take up the cudgels and I shall come back, because there is much more to be said on this point. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague an opportunity to have another ten minutes.

MR. S. NEARY: It is so refreshing, Mr. Chairman, to hear that at last the great fraud that has been perpetrated on the people of this Province is being exposed for what it is. I am sure that all hon. members on this side of the House now will, for the first time - because we have sat here day in and day out, we have had our patriotism questioned, we have been accused of being traitors. Well, the name calling - the likes I have never heard in my eighteen years in this House.

MR. F. STAGG: Not all of you have been -

MR. S. NEARY: And now, all of a sudden, in a matter of twenty-four hours, the light is beginning to shine through. The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) got up yesterday and he ended up his speech by saying, 'I do not care how the control is confirmed - use whatever one of the five ways you want to use.' That is what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman gave us a sixth way to confirm the offshore ownership. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the handling of the offshore has been a shambles and we had evidence of that this morning when the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) got up and, much to the shock of members of this House, said that in order to get a job on the offshore service vessels or on the offshore rigs, your name has to be on a list. I can confirm that. That is a fact. I have had numerous Newfoundlanders parade into my office and call me on the phone and say, 'I went to Crosbie's Offshore, I went to this company or that company. I had a job, but because my name was not on the list, I could not be accepted.' And I am talking about Newfoundlanders. And they have given me instances and cited cases of where you had to be a Tory in order to get a job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Not so! Not so!

MR. S. NEARY: It is so. Mr. Chairman, we have one of the most dangerous and dastardly things right now happening in this Province, as far as the hiring is concerned, that I have ever seen in my life. And let me show members the difference between the hiring for the Upper Churchill and the hiring that is going on now.

MR. W. PATTERSON: You had to come to Confederation Building.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, no, you did not have to come to Confederation Building. The difference is this, Mr. Chairman - and the hon. gentleman knows what the difference is - listen to the difference.

MR. W. PATTERSON: It is written right into the BRINCO agreement.

MR. S. NEARY: The difference is this. In case the hon. member for Placentia is so preoccupied with making grates for the provincial government for provincial parks, let him listen.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Anything (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Let him go out and play with his grates, the contracts he has for the provincial - nothing but a little goody go out and play with that. I am talking facts here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: He has a contract for making grates for provincial parks - let him go and play with his little contracts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am laying out facts and if the hon. gentleman cannot take it, if he cannot stomach it, let him get out of the kitchen. Well we are going to start fighting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are going to start fighting back and I am going to tell the hon. gentleman the difference between the hiring for the Upper Churchill and the hiring that is going on at the present time. Granted, Mr. Smallwood, when he was Premier, asked people to write in, send in letters and send in your name so he could find out how many people were available for employment on the Upper Churchill. That was done. And that is what the hon. gentleman did. But the difference is this, that companies had the right to hire Newfoundlanders even though their names were not on that list.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And they do not have that right today. That right does not exist in this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: If your name is not on the list you do not get a job.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Companies cannot hire Newfoundlanders -

MR. MARSHALL: They can hire them.

MR. NEARY: They cannot hire Newfoundlanders. I have had them parade into my office and call me and come to my home to tell me they had jobs. They had jobs on the offshore. And they were hired. They were said, "Sure, you can go to work Monday morning." But on Monday morning they were told, "Boy, look, I am sorry to have to embarrass you, your name is not on the government list." My hon. friend said, "What is the criteria of a Newfoundlander?" Well, I would be interested in finding out of there is any - the hon. gentleman but I am more interested in finding out if there is any -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - I am more interested in finding out if there is any discrimination as far as these lists are concerned.

MR. DINN: None. Not any.

MR. NEARY: The minister says, "None."

MR. DINN: Not any.

MR. NEARY: What do we do? Do we take the minister's word for it? We were told by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that he is an honest man, he would not do anything wrong. He gets his legal fees from the Bank of Montreal while he sits in the Cabinet, but he stands up and tells us he is honest and he abstains from meetings that are held in connection with this bank. He would not do anything wrong. And nobody said he would. Nobody said he would. He went and took to the airwaves last night to say, oh, I made it up. I made it up. It is illegal, it is against the criminal code in other provinces to do it but it is all right to do it in Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, we have a similar situation with the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn). He says, "Oh, I would not do anything wrong. I would not discriminate against a Liberal. I would not discriminate against a man on religious grounds. I would not discriminate against a man because of his race, his colour or his creed. But how do we know that, Mr. Chairman? And how do we know that somebody else would not discriminate? Maybe the minister is honest and decent and on the level and fair and just. I would question it. The hon. gentleman has such a buttoned down mind, all he can think about is vested interests, the telephone company, anti-labour. We have in this Province a Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) who is anti-labour.

MR. PATTERSON: Who dished out (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should go out and play with his grates, play with his grates and forget it.

MR. PATTERSON: Do not worry (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: We know all about the hon. gentleman.

MR. PATTERSON: You are not going -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman manages to jump over seven years of Tory corruption to go back to the Smallwood era.

Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend will have his opportunity now to get up for another ten minutes but I want some more information on this hiring policy of this government. I want to find out if it is possible to get a job without your name being on that list.

MR. DINN: - yes.

MR. NEARY: It is not. It certainly is not. People have had jobs - Well, if the hon. gentleman says it is, let him stand up and say it. And I know people who have had jobs, Newfoundlanders, qualified Newfoundlanders, who have had to step aside for unqualified Newfoundlanders, by the way, and we are creating a bad image and a bad reputation in the offshore because the minister is forcing unqualified people when there are qualified Newfoundlanders available. But because their names are not on the list, they cannot get the jobs. Government members and ministers have heard the complaints from the various companies, saying, "We want qualified Newfoundlanders." And they cannot get them. They cannot hire them. I am talking about tradesmen who are unemployed.

Our tradesmen are forced to go out to Fort MacMurray, out to Alberta

MR. NEARY: because their names are not on the list. This Mussolini-like policy has to stop, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Newfoundlanders getting the first crack. The Premier had to go off the other day to the Empire Club and one of the main reasons he had to go, by the way, was not to talk about Newfoundland's offshore position, but to try and mend the fences, the damage that he had done up in Upper Canada, up in Ontario with the hiring practices of this Province. Every Newfoundlander up there - and I had phone calls and letters from Newfoundlanders saying, you are the next to go home. The Open Lines up there, letters to the editors in the newspapers, where there are so many Newfoundlanders, saying, send them all packing back home. I am for Newfoundlanders getting the jobs but I am afraid that there has been an awful lot of damage done with this dangerous hiring policy, this Mussolini-like policy that has been established by a minister who is so anti-labour, can think of nothing only the vested St. John's establishment, the vested interest in this Province. I would like to have a little more elaboration on this hiring policy and I want to know from the minister if it is possible for qualified Newfoundlanders to go to the various companies involved in the offshore development and get themselves a job? And, incidentally, as far as the Smallwood era was concerned, all the contractors at Churchill Falls had to do was to keep sending in a list, send in a list.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: I will come back again, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: If the minister is going to answer some of the questions I will certainly yield to him, if he will answer some questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to thank the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) for yielding because I think this is a fairly serious thing that we are talking about here this

MR. DINN: morning and I just want to set the record straight as to what the position is. Now the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) agrees with the position of the government with respect to hiring in the offshore. He says, a direct quote, he agrees with "Newfoundlanders having the first crack." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I agree with it. That is what this government agrees with, that Newfoundlanders have the first crack at any jobs in the offshore. Now, how do Newfoundlanders get the first crack? Somebody goes down to get hired in the offshore and he walks into the office when they are doing the hiring and he says, "I would like to have a job in the offshore." "What is your experience?" And they go through that. "Are you registered with the Newfoundland government?" That is one of the criteria. They have a list there and they go through it. "Now the easiest thing for you to do if you are qualified, if you are the kind of guy that we want, go into the Department of Labour and Manpower. Give us your name. We will call up for you. We will get a registration form. We will fill it out for you. No problem at all. Register. Make sure that we keep within the offshore regulations. Make sure we are within the guidelines because we want to co-operate." The companies say to them, "We want to co-operate with the Newfoundland government. We want to give the Newfoundlanders every opportunity." They understand. It has been explained to them very clearly that we have a basic social and economic problem here in this Province. When I have to stand up here in this House and attempt to defend a 15.7 per cent unemployment rate in Newfoundland which, to my way of thinking, is deplorable - albeit it is better than last year. At this time last year we had a 20.1 per cent unemployment. This year it is 15.7 at this point in time and I think it will get better as the year goes on. For me to have to stand up in this House and try to defend it is almost impossible. We have a very serious problem here in this Province and we want the companies, we have asked the companies to co-operate. Now, hon. members opposite make great to-do's about the super depletion allowance and the oil companies would not be in here if they did not have it. Well, the fact of the matter is that they do not have a super depletion allowance right now, that has been cancelled, and they are still in here. As a matter of fact, the drilling programme

MR. DINN: offshore this year is way ahead of what it was last year. We have Petro Canada now telling us how many drillings they are going to make this year and the locations and how many ships they are going to have in. And we are discussing with them how many Newfoundlander's should be employed in jobs because we have lists of cooks and electricians and roustabouts and roughnecks and drillers and mess-men that we want to see get jobs in the offshore where at all possible.

Some of the companies have come to us and said, "Look, just to upgrade, just so we do not have friction develop in the offshore. We will take some of the cooks that we had last year and upgrade them. We will send them here or send them there. We will send drillers out to Alberta for a few weeks experience so that they understand the lingo, and they understand what they are getting into." And this kind of co-operation we have as a result of the companies accepting the legislation that we passed in this House of Assembly, and the regulations. Now, what I said to hon. members this morning and their want is always to misinterpret, for whatever reason, I do not say deliberately misinterpret, it may very well be that way but that is not what I am saying, I am saying that the regulations are such that what we want the oil companies to do, the procedure is this, and every month we update our registry. We send it down to them. We have a list of people who come into - maybe into the Department of Labour and Manpower this morning. We attempt to inform these offshore companies who came in this morning so that they have a crack at the jobs in the offshore. There is nothing on that registration form that asks whether you are a PC, or a Liberal, or an NDP - born in Newfoundland, you are living in Newfoundland, and you have certain experiences. You have worked as a roughneck. You have worked as a driller and we want to make sure that that Newfoundlander is hired. If he has the qualifications we want to make sure that that Newfoundlander is hired.

I am surprised that another Newfoundlander would get up in the House and call that a Mussolini tactic. That is not what it is all about. We are attempting to solve a very difficult social and economic problem in this Province. As I said, we have a 15.7 per cent

MR. DINN:

unemployment rate in this Province and it is intolerable. And we have to do things to make sure that that does not continue. That does not mean we make jobs for jobs sake.

I am totally opposed to, for example, just making jobs to take people off welfare, give them jobs that are reasonable,

MR. J. DINN: give them jobs where they will be paid, where they can stand up as Newfoundlanders and stick their chests out like they are used to doing. It is not a Mussolini tactic, Mr. Speaker, to lay out a procedure. I do not think I have ever sat or ever stood at a counter over in the Department of Labour and Manpower when a person was registering to ask him if he was a Liberal or a Tory or an NDP or whether he was a member of the SIU or a member of the Steel work industry. That is not what it is all about. That is not what it is all about at all. It is a procedure laid down so that number one; we have a list of qualified people and we give those qualified people- and the hon. the member for LaPoile (S.Neary) agrees with it - give them first crack at it.

If they have the qualifications, we are attempting to insist that these oil companies hire our qualified Newfoundlanders, people whom we have trained in our Trades Colleges, people who have had to go to Alberta, have had to go to the Beaufort Sea. And if that is wrong, then I stand accused of attempting to solve a very serious social and economic problem in this Province.

Now, as I said before, the unemployment rate last year at this time was 20.1 per cent. This year it is 15.7. Next year, please God -

MR. S. NEARY: The fisheries.

MR. J. DINN: and it is not just fisheries, it is not just fisheries. The hon. member, if he just took Statistics Canada data and had a look at it, he would see that the Linerboard mill construction and fisheries on the Northeast Coast, and fisheries in the St. Barbe district and in St. Anthony that stayed open in the winter -

MR. STAGG: Confidence in the economy.

MR. J. DINN: Confidence in the economy is what we are seeing on the West Coast.

MR. THOMS: \$35,000 for fishing. What are you talking about ?

MR. J. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, it is going to get better. Hon. members opposite may not like it, but it is going to get better. And I will say why it is going to get better.

MR. STAGG: They are deaf now, they are deaf now.

MR. J. DINN: It is going to get better because the linerboard mill is going to go into production -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: - On schedule, October 1, Mr. Speaker, we will have loggers in the woods and we will have people working at the Linerboard mill. And we will have more fish plants opened next winter - more fish plants opened next winter, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members opposite may not like it but that is the way it is going to go.

MR. STAGG: They are all becoming P.C.'S

MR. J. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, two up in Harbour Main, the hon. member says. Well, if we can do it if we can provide that, if we can provide that kind of stability, if we can provide that kind of climate so that people will move into Newfoundland, so that finally Newfoundlanders start sticking out their chests again like I like to do as a Newfoundlander, stand up anywhere in this Dominion, anywhere in this world and say 'come to Newfoundland, you have all kinds of opportunities, but you will do it under guidelines.' It is not going to be 'develop or perish'. It is not going to be 'come in we will give you all the money and you develop on your basis'. Mr. Speaker, from now on, entrepreneurs will know, oil companies will know that what we are doing here in Newfoundland is going to be done on a very well-planned basis. And we are going to give Newfoundlanders first crack and we are going to tell the companies how that first crack can be gotten, that you have a registry of Newfoundlanders with experience who can do the job on the offshore and Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock) - I will assist him in any way possible or the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (G. Warren) or the hon. member for St. Marys - the Capes

MR. J. DINN: (D.Hancock). I will do anything within my power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. J. DINN: The election is over. The election was over in June. We all know the result of that. Well, I am not here to fight an election right now. I will fight an election when the next election day rolls around. But, right now, we have to co-operate with hon. members opposite and with people on this side of the House to make sure that Newfoundlanders get their just rewards, get the opportunities for jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: And I am not apologizing to anybody in this House or anywhere else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on, right on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of things I wanted to speak on in relation to some of the comments that were made -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) piece of rubbish.

MR. L. THOMS: - yesterday and some of the comments that were made today.

MR. NEARY: Who built the linerboard mill? The Liberals.

MR. L. THOMS: There is one thing that bothers me, whenever we talk about offshore oil and gas, the attitude that is taken by some members whenever we talk about a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. Now, I realize - I do not think my friend, the President of Council, holds this particular view but I heard several members across the floor of this House yesterday cast aspersions on the Supreme Court of Canada and the judges of that Court

MR. NEARY: Right on !

MR. L. THOMS: For anyone to suggest in this House that Newfoundland would not get a fair hearing before the Supreme Court, I think, is scandalous. I really believe it is scandalous. I have not heard it from the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall). I am not quite sure whether I heard it from the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) or not. I believe that Newfoundland would get a fair hearing. I am not saying it is the proper route to go.

MR. HISCOCK: It might be the only one to go.

MR. L. THOMS: It might be the only one to go, yes. Maybe we can negotiate an agreement with Ottawa. For sure, there is one thing I do think - I think, instead of the Premier of this Province being in Halifax speaking on Canadian unity, he should be in Ottawa trying to find out what the present government's position is on offshore oil and gas. But that is not the strategy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: If Pierre Trudeau were to say to the Premier of this Province, 'It is yours, you own it, you can do what you like with it. You can develop it, you can bring it ashore, you can leave it there - it is yours, the most disappointed person in this Province would be the Premier of this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on, he would lose his image.

MR. L. THOMS: He would lose his image as being the great fighter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pierre is not about to do that.

MR. NEARY: You will not know if you do not ask him.

MR. L. THOMS: He would have nothing any longer to wave his arms about and look like a raving maniac. He would have nothing else to shout and scream about in this House and everywhere else. He would have nothing else to do.

But for ministers - I heard this from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) yesterday - to suggest that if we should go to the Supreme Court of Canada that we have lost before we got into court because we have a bunch of bigoted, prejudiced judges on the

April 23, 1980

Tape 1051

EC - 2

MR. L. THOMS: Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: Bora Laskin would be interested in hearing that.

MR. L. THOMS: Indeed, Bora Laskin would be interested in hearing it. I think it is something that is being said in this House by members on the opposite side that is scandalous and should be pointed out. I do not want to hear any more of it, and I certainly do not want to hear any more from the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we have seen a situation - I will tell you what the Premier of this Province is doing for Canadian unity. He was speaking in Halifax yesterday or today on Canadian unity. On May 20th in Quebec there is a vote, a very important vote dealing with whether or not this Canadian federation remains as one family. Now, do not tell me, Mr. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. R. Dawe), that the caribou situation in Labrador could not have waited until after May 20th.

MR. F. STAGG: All the caribou were taken.

MR. L. THOMS: Do not tell me that the Premier of this Province could not have waited until May 21st to break off negotiations with Quebec.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

MR. L. THOMS: Because what is happening in Newfoundland today - maybe the member for Menihek (Mr. P. Walsh) wants Quebec to separate thereby giving more fuel to separatists in Labrador. And you heard them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: The Minister of Rural Development denies it exists.

MR. L. THOMS: But you heard it in meetings in Goose Bay because you and I were sitting on the same Select Committee and we heard the Executive Director or President, whoever he is, of the Labrador Resource Advisory Council. You heard him and he was openly advocating the separatism and a separate Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. L. THOMS: I believe my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) who was at the same meeting brought it up in the House a couple of days ago. And what is this government doing? Funding that movement, funding it.

MR. S. NEARY: Funding it, that is right.

MR. WARREN: \$120,000.

MR. L. THOMS: \$120,000 is the figure that I have heard. What - so Bill Flowers can go around Labrador advocating separatism. I think it is an irresponsible act of this administration and this Premier, what he has done in the last few days in this Province. We have been negotiating with Quebec on the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill and the caribou herds for years now, another twenty or twenty-five days would not have cost us anything. And I understand that René Levesque is having a ball with this in Quebec.

MR. WALSH: Oh, sure (inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: He is having a ball with it.

MR. WALSH: That is what the rest of Canada says to him.

MR. L. THOMS: He is - look what Newfoundland is doing to us.

MR. S. NEARY: Ruined.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: Maybe you do not care what happens to this nation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. THOMS: - but I do care what happens to this nation.

MR. NEARY: They do not.

MR. L. THOMS: No person in this Province disagrees more with the garbage that I read from my own brother this morning in the Daily News.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: Triple! I do not want to become the fifty-first state of the United States. I do not want this Province to become the fifty-first state of the United States. And I will fight against it and I told this to a very close friend of the Premier's who was advocating the separatism of Newfoundland from the rest of Canada with an eye to joining the United States.

MR. J. HODDER: He wants to be King Brian
(inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: He wants to be King Tut

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. L. THOMS: And I will fight it while I have a last breath in me to prevent that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: He wants his own flag - do away with the Union Jack, his own little kingdom, his own army.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, ten minutes go awfully quickly, I would like to have a few brief words. In a committee meeting, I believe it was only yesterday, I made a statement to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) that I found our Newfoundland first policy repugnant. It is repugnant to me. The minister agreed and he said, "It is repugnant to me," "But", he said, "They are necessary." And well may they be necessary but they are not easy to swallow. You know, the most ridiculous statement, I think, I have heard in connection with that was the Minister of Labour and Manpower who said, "When we get total employment in the Province of Newfoundland," he said, "I am going to get aboard the plane and I am going to go all across Canada, I am going to Toronto, I am going to Calgary, I am going to go down to Boston, I

MR. L. THOMS: am going to knock on every door of every Newfoundland who has left - all 500,000 or 1,000,000 or however many there are out there, and I am going to bring them all back to Newfoundland." Of course, he may get a surprise, he might find that an awful lot of them do not want to come back, they are settled away.

MR. F. STAGG: We do not want them.

MR. L. THOMS: I do not know who the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) wants, I really do not know and I do not particularly care. But what has gone on here these last couple of days, the comments about the Supreme Court, what has happened in our breaking off the negotiations with Quebec at this crucial time, I do not like and I will continue, and I do not care how many people say that I am unpatriotic, I will continue to speak out on these matters, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) has gotten up in his usual way with nothing to say and has expanded nothing in the ten minutes but I must say he is getting quite good at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. STAGG: He is getting quite good at saying nothing but stretching it over as long a period as possible.

MR. L. STIRLING: Which is your domain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling) has not been in the House for the past two weeks, he has been on the mainland making money or whatever, dealing with his business, on vacation or whatever, he has not been dealing with the affairs of the House so he thinks that if he comes back here

MR. STAGG: and he interjects in somebody else's speech that he can get some coverage and make people, his constituents, forget that he is not attending to the business he was elected for. But maybe he will have a chance a little later on.

MR. STAGG: Now, I want to deal with the Supreme Court of Canada again. This is probably as close as I am ever going to get to speaking to the Supreme Court of Canada, probably similar to my learned friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms). But I am of the opinion -

MR. THOMS: Speak for yourself.

MR. STAGG: - that the Supreme Court of Canada recently is showing a distinctive bent towards the federal centralists view and I am not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. STAGG: Yes, the BC reference case is -

AN HON. MEMBER: A long time ago.

MR. STAGG: - a long time ago. It is the latest. It is the latest. And I am not assured in the least that a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, as our friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) had distributed to the media on the West Coast recently, his position on offshore oil and gas, he says that the Prime Minister of Canada would not oppose a reference to the Supreme Court. Well, I do not suppose he would oppose a reference to the Supreme Court. But if it got to the Supreme Court would he then not appear? Would the lawyers for the federal government not appear? I doubt it. I doubt it very much. What we have in Ottawa, gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, what we have in Ottawa is a centralist Prime Minister. He told the students of Memorial University in January of this year - the students of Memorial University, by the way, who will be the people who will be sitting in this Chamber in ten years time, ten or fifteen years time - the students he was talking to there are the politicians of the 1990s. Some of them might even get there in the 1980s. But they are the people he was talking to. And it was the

MR. STAGG: view of the Federal Liberal Government that we have for another five years, because there is no way he is going back to the people until 1985.

MR. THOMS: No way.

MR. STAGG: It is a centralist government. He said, "You would be fabulously wealthy. Fabulously wealthy." Could you not just see him and the scorn that he was heaping on us Newfoundlanders at that time, scorn!

AN HON. MEMBER: We will see if he is bluffing.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Trudeau is only interested in what history has to say about him, and how he dealt with Quebec and what a great citizen of Quebec he was. That is what he is worried about.

AN HON. MEMBER: He elected five out of seven.

MR. STAGG: Yes, you elected five out of seven on a charade and a sham, on eighteen cents on a gallon of gas and now you have the very budget -

AN HON. MEMBER: With your help.

MR. STAGG: Yes, with my help to some extent -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - the hon. member was able to misinterpret some things that I said, because I was standing up for what was correct and hon. members are able to twist and turn and deceive the public on many occasions, just as the federal government does regularly. It is de rigueur for the Federal Liberals to change their minds. Price and wage control, have we forgotten price and wage control and the promise not to invoke it and to win an election on the basis of it and then come in and invoke it? And the budget that they were slavering at the jaws to defeat in December of 1979, major portions of that budget have been introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: And the Prime Minister, he was then Leader of the Opposition, down here telling the youth of our Country, telling the youth of our Province, and the youth of Canada, what he thought of Mr. Peckford, as he said, and he almost spit the word out.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have difficulty -

MR. STAGG: What he thought of Mr. Peckford's position. Well, what is the position? What is the position of Mr. Peckford and Mr. Clark? There are four principles that they enunciated, four principles that they agreed on, and here are the four principles. I am going to read them.

Basic principles concerning offshore mineral resources. And I have to read from my copious notes here, Mr. Chairman. I hope I can get through them within the allotted time. How much time do I have?

Seven minutes left? Five minutes left.

First principle, the Province of Newfoundland should own the mineral resources of the Continental Margin off its Coast insofar as Canada is entitled to exercise sovereign rights over these resources in accordance with international law. Such ownership should be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Shut up will you? I am trying to read. I cannot read well when somebody is interrupting me. Such ownership should be -

MR. THOMS: - your own party.

MR. STAGG: - to the extent possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: This is our position. This is our position. We agree with this position.

MR. STAGG: Such ownership should be to the extent possible of the same nature as if these resources were located within the boundaries of the Province. The legislative jurisdiction of the Province should, to the extent possible, be the same as for those resources within the boundaries of the Province. Can anything be clearer than that? That is the position of Peckford. That is the position of Clark. And the position of Prime Minister Trudeau was enunciated at Memorial University, he does not believe in any of that. He believes that if you get some money, yes he will bring you up. He says he will give you some money and he will bring you up to where you are a have Province. We will determine when you are a have province. Statistics Canada will probably do that. Number two principle; Such ownership of and legislative jurisdiction over offshore resources by Newfoundland will be consistent with and subject to the division of legislative competence as between parliament and provincial legislatures under the Constitution of Canada agreed to by this government and the previous government. The third principle; The legislative jurisdiction and responsibilities of the Government of Canada in areas such as the protection of the environment, national defence, customs and excise, shipping and navigation, external affairs, the management of international interprovincial trade and pipelines will continue. The fourth principle; The above principles will be further confirmed and implemented by the signing of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and by appropriate legislative action and constitutional change.

Now, that is the will of a great patriot, a great Canadian, the great Joe Clark and a great Canadian, the great Brian Peckford. That is the position of the Government of Canada and that is the position of the Government of Newfoundland as enunciated last Fall. What is the position of your leader? The position of your leader is that he does not want to say anything because he might want to be an ambassador or whatever. My understanding is that he is not going to lead you much longer and what are you doing? And what is the position of the present Prime Minister of Canada, the centralist Prime Minister of Canada? Why do

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1054

AH-2

MR. STAGG: we have to ask him? The man has said on any number of occasions that he does not want the regions of the country to be powerful. He does not agree that Newfoundland should have control and ownership of its offshore resources. That is what he said. He said it at Memorial University. If he has changed his mind and wants to confirm what is in these exchange of letters and to confirm the basic four principles that we have here all he has to do is say it. He does not exist outside of Canada. It is something that is most important to all the provinces of Canada. It is becoming important to Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia is saying much the same thing as we are. As a matter of fact, there was an editorial in the Evening Telegram yesterday, I wish I had here, saying Nova Scotia has even gone further than us, they are claiming out to the middle of the Atlantic.

MR. NEARY: Halfway to England.

MR. STAGG: Halfway to England. Well, that is certainly a change from the Regan formula, the Minister of Work and Play, as he now is. The Regan formula would take whatever Ottawa would give him and he tried to slither and slink his way back into power in Nova Scotia but the people of Nova Scotia did not believe him and now they have a PC government in Nova Scotia. Thank God for Nova Scotia. They are taking Newfoundland's lead. Read Atlantic Insight. Read the editorial in Atlantic Insight about Nova Scotia's position vis-à-vis Newfoundland. Nova Scotia is ten years behind Newfoundland. And Brian Peckford and Joe Clark were the wave of the 1980s, the wave of the 1980s and Trudeau is back in the 1960s. He is still fighting the battle that he is more responsible than anyone else, losing to Rene Levesque. It is his fault. It is Pierre Trudeau's fault that we have the separatist problem in Quebec. He gives rise to people like Rene Levesque. He is a confrontationalist. He would prefer to go to war, at least in the argumentative sense, I think he is a pacifist in the military sense.

AN HON. MEMBER: Chicken.

MR. STAGG: My hon. friend says, chicken. Well -

MR. STIRLING: Your time is up.

MR. STAGG: Well, gentlemen, I would like for you fellows

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1054

AH-3

MR. STAGG: to suggest to -

MR. NEARY: Fellows?

MR. STAGG: Yes, you fellows over there because you do not have any females on your side.

MR. STIRLING: You may have more than one on yours.

MR. STAGG: I would like for you fellows to address yourselves, hon. gentlemen opposite, to address yourselves to these four principles and where does the Leader of the Government of Canada and the Leader of the Liberal party, to whom all you people

MR. F. STAGG: aspire, perhaps, because you want to escape to Ottawa, a lot of you. You had better escape to Ottawa fast because the means of escape is being cut off for you here in Newfoundland because you are all going down the drain in the next election. I might even run against two or three of you myself- we will have to amend the House of Assembly Act for that. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have another crack at them a little later but I understand my time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are only discussing two major problems, or it seems like the government side of the House can only find two major problems to revolve a discussion around. To me it seems that nobody over on that side of House recognizes that we have other problems like a third and a fourth and a fifth and a sixth and a seventh and a eighth and many, many more. It seems to me they have only two problems, one seems to be revolving around oil offshore and one seems to be revolving around hydro. It seems to me that they forget we have other problems like fishery, like farming, like timber, like highways, like transportation, like everything else in the Province, like the people who are unemployed, and like Air Canada who are making all the money employing our unemployed people up on the mainland subsidized by the Federal Government. It seems to me like some of these things are being forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that Air Canada is making the money from the unemployed. I think it is about time we started talking about some of the unemployed people we have here and what are we doing with them, what we are doing for them.

MR. T. BENNETT:

I happen to be fortunate enough to represent one of the better districts in the Province and unfortunate enough to represent among the highest unemployed in the Province. Last Winter sixty or seventy per cent unemployed is a disgrace to any province. A disgrace to any government! We have in the balcony a man who went out and worked very hard toward the fishery and from what I understand not from him, but from others who aspired in the same direction as he down through the years to develop our fishery, never could get to first base in the district of St. Barbe and, indeed, in most of the other parts of the Province. They have worked their hearts and souls out and what do they get from government apart from red tape and stumbling blocks? And I was involved in business myself and this was all I got. I am out of the business now, I am just in here now trying to talk on behalf of the Province and on behalf of the people in the district I represent.

Having been in that district and having worked there in the last - it is ten years ago I remember some great explosion took place up in the Flowers Cove area. We were then talking about - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could probably tell us exactly how many dollars of the taxpayers' money went down the drain with that explosion to bring hydro across the Strait of Belle Isle. And here we are today still wondering if we are going to be able to finance the Lower Churchill. We are still wondering. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen across on the government side have all the clean linen to hang on the lines that run down through Quebec and we have all the dirty linen.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that way back in the sixties, or whenever negotiations took place with Quebec to put that power line down through to the U.S., somebody had brains enough then to enter into negotiations at

MR. T. BENNETT: that time. It may have been a bad deal but today we cannot even find people on the government side who seem to have the ability, Mr. Chairman, to go and negotiate to get power lines or even hang their clean lines on existing power lines. We continue to cry over spilled milk, we continue to cry over it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wasting the people's time.

MR. T. BENNETT: Wasting the time of the House of Assembly when we have so much to do, so much work to be done, so much more important things to do and every time that anybody in this House of Assembly tries to present

MR. BENNETT:

anything a little bit constructive,

they go back over the twenty-five years ago - the Smallwood era.

Well, I am glad to have lived in that Smallwood

era. and I am glad to have known some of the politicians who governed

the Province at that time. I am also happy and glad to be able to look

into this Budget Speech, Mr. Chairman, and on Page 138, realize in the ten

years from 1960 to 1970, there is an obligation still outstanding on the

part of the government for something like \$200,000,000 but if you go on from

1970 on down through to the present day, you will find that it is something

like one and a half billion dollars.

You know, to me, it is non-sensical.

We do not seem to have money for - what have we done? What has this

government done in eight years? Where have they built the high schools?

Where have they built the universities? Where have they built the trade

schools? Where have they built the Trans Canada? -

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Hospitals.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Where have they built the hospitals?

Where? Where has the one and a half billion that these bonds display -

where have that one and a half billion, where have the \$4,500 per capita

for every man, woman and child, where have the \$4,500 gone in the last

ten years?

MR. WALSH:

(Inaudible) district.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Mr. Chairman, the road up to the North-

ern Peninsula was built before 1980. I will agree there is a fair amount

of paving done now with the Federal dollar gone up in that direction and

I can see right here in front of me, today where, in a newsclipping,

the park authorities - the Gros Morne park authority are aspiring to

spend something like \$7,000,000 within the park area.

Our Minister of Transportation (C.

Brett) cannot find fifteen or twenty or - I can find money enough to put

a Ramp in Woody Point. But our Department of Transportation cannot find

it. They have not got it. Or, at least, I am led to believe that they

MR. T. BENNETT: have not. Perhaps, they have it:
I hope they do have it, because that is going to be a disaster. -

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible) irrelevant.

MR. T. BENNETT: Okay, so it is not relevant. But it is still the taxpayers' dollars. You keep talking about the government not jumping into things without knowing what they are doing. And to me, it seems like they - this suggesting that we jumped into confederation and right now, after only thirty years, a short time, they want another jump, in which direction, I wonder? You know, to me, it does not make sense. They say that they want to jump into things. I do not see them jumping into anything. I do not see them jumping. I just do not see them jumping. I do not see them jumping. They are jumping into debt. They are jumping into forever and ever and ever increased and escalating debt without producing or without displaying anything to the taxpayers of this province. What is really happening to the dollars? That is what they are jumping into, Mr. Chairman.

With a provincial debt that has more than tripled in eight years of disaster-the government trying to blindfold the news media and the Province. Oil- hydro- oil- hydro, the only two things-blindfold-and neglect everything else that will employ people, the basic industries, the basic jobs, the things that will create jobs.

AN. HON. MEMBER: \$35,000,000 (inaudible).

MR. T. BENNETT: We are going to have to wait another seven or eight or probably ten years for any revenue coming from offshore oil, if we ever get offshore oil revenues. And what do we do in the meantime? What are we going to do? Are we going to develop secondary industries rather than ship everything out of the Province, like the present government condemned the previous government for before the previous

MR. T. BENNETT: government even had the chance to build the highroads and plants and fishplants and things to accomodate the resource of the Province that we had, the raw materials, before we even got in place to harvest? And now, we are in place to harvest a lot of the resource and I think we should very hastily move in a position to create secondary resource.

They keep on suggesting that we should go talk to our counterparts in Ottawa. Have you people not talked to Ottawa yourselves? Why? We are not the government. You people are the government. I wish you would go to Ottawa, you as the government. Talk to Ottawa -

MR. S. NEARY: Right on. Or get out (inaudible)

MR. T. BENNETT: Talk to Ottawa. Look, you are no further away than the telephone. We can make the appointment, sure we can. You are no further away than the telephone. Call the Prime Minister. Tell us what the Prime Minister's policy is. We will let you know if we agree.

MR. STAGG: The Prime Minister told us what his policy was.

MR. T. BENNETT: And I suspect you do not understand what it is, and that is why all the schmozzle and all the discussion revolves around it.

MR. THOMS: Right on.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time we came back to reality. I think we have a lot of things in this Province going for us, and I think it is about time that we realized it, recognized it and went to work on it instead of pie in the sky. Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1056

EL - 4

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I suppose a response is required to some of the addresses given by members opposite. I have tried to make some notes, Now, they are rather skimpy, because really there have been

DR. J. COLLINS: very few points made and I have tried to keep track of ones that did require an answer. And there really was very little. For instance, the hon. House Leader opposite, last night when the House rose, I thought he was going to rebut what was said on this side earlier in the day and in particular, as I was the last speaker, he was going to rebut what I said. Well, I listened for a full five minutes - and I timed it on the clock up there - I listened for a full five minutes and he did not make a single rebuttal, he did not make a single point. As a matter of fact, it was all total drivel. He was more or less carrying on a conversation with his companions behind him. There was almost a total absence of anything to put your teeth into. And that seems to be the tone that is coming across from the other side of the House. There is a lot of wind and a lot of rhetoric and a lot of flapping, but really, on this very important issue which we seem to be getting into in discussing the Premier's Estimates, that is the implications for the Province of our offshore resources, this very important issue we are getting into is being downgraded into a lot of wind and a lot of flab. However, I did make some effort to pick a few points that I thought should be responded to.

Now, the House Leader opposite (Mr. E. Roberts) said this government has no policy with regard to offshore. He called it 'posture'. I would say that we do have a very clear policy. Our policy on the offshore is that we own the resources on the Continental Shelf and on the Continental Slope. That is one aspect of the policy. The other part of the policy which is extremely important -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: - and which our members opposite do not seem to be able to accept - because it has been traditional Liberal policy never to accept it - and that is that not only ownership, but exercise of ownership, members opposite cannot understand that. They cannot understand that when you have ownership you must also exercise it

DR. J. COLLINS: or that is a total negation of ownership. And that is our policy. That is what we are trying to do. That is a primary consideration. The thing is always put up that this government has no policy because it only talks of ownership. This government does not talk only of ownership. It talks of ownership, undoubted, indubitable, cannot be alienated, but it also talks about exercise of it. We will exercise the ownership because we have the right to exercise it, we should exercise it, we would be irresponsible if we did not exercise it.

Now I understand from members opposite that they cannot understand that and they do not wish that to happen. They wish us to say, 'Yes, we own it, but let us negotiate with you to see who will exercise it. And if you say, 'We want to exercise it,' they probably would go along with that. They certainly would say, 'If you want to exercise it as much as we will,' they will go along with that. That is a total absence of deep thinking, I would say. It is the most shallow way of thinking, that you just say, 'I own, but I do not do anything about it.' You have to do something about it to have a valid thought in this matter.

Now, the members opposite really are taking a new tack in this whole thing. I think it has become clear in the last twenty-four hours that they cannot respond to the question we pose, that is, What is your policy? We have stated our policy, quite a clear one, quite a defenceful one, one that the people of Newfoundland recognize -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: - and one that the people of Newfoundland support - because they are supporting the position that this government is taking - and when we have asked the members opposite to state their policy, they finally have given up. They have finally said, 'No, we cannot answer that question because we do not have a policy.' So they have now changed their tactic, and their change of tactic is that they will not say what

DR. J. COLLINS: their policy is, they will now merely say, 'We know that you have a policy over there. We will now, first of all, question the mechanics of your policy.' They bring in that point, they will say 'the mechanics of your policy' and in questioning the mechanics, what they are bring up are unsubstantiated points, - unsubstantiated charges such as that we are trying to have people hired for purely political considerations - totally unsubstantiated. And, also, they are bringing up various other innuendoes. There is not a single, solitary concrete point that the way we are pursuing our policy, the mechanism, in other words, of our policy, is anything but the best in the circumstances they are presenting to us. They are merely questioning us on the basis of unsubstantiated charges and innuendo. I would like them to bring forward a fact, a concrete fact that one can look at.

Now, having really worked that one out and not getting anywhere with it - because they do not have any facts at hand - they are now saying, 'Not only have we' - that is the members opposite - 'no policy, but we are going to question if you have a policy.' But then, having gotten nowhere with that they then say, 'Well, you do not have a policy anyway.'

There are a number of things that have come out, though, that I think one can say, even though members opposite do not recognize it or do not state it, there is in actual fact a Liberal policy in terms of the offshore. If you listen carefully and piece it together, you can actually come up with the policy opposite, and I think it was said by a number of people this morning, various aspects of it. For instance, the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) said, 'Newfoundlanders first, are repugnant to me.' In essence, he is saying that the -

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: I think the record will show that I said that the policy of Newfoundlanders first, the policy itself, was repugnant

MR. L. THOMS: to me. And not only that, but the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) agreed, the fact that we had to have that regulation was repugnant to him. I did not say that Newfoundlanders are repugnant to me, which is what you just said.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order; the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: To that point of order. The hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) in his rebuttal, in his indefensible position, has brought up the policy of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. The policy of the Minister of Labour and Manpower

MR. DINN:

is that we have a social, economic -

MR. NEARY: If your name is not on the list you do not get a job.

MR. DINN:

- problem here in this Province,
and that we have a 15.7 per cent unemployment rate and that we have
a policy of Newfoundlanders first. Whilst I would like to open the
flood gates, if I were in the same position as Alberta -

MR. THOMS:

Be relevant on the point of order.

MR. DINN:

- If I were in the same position as
Alberta is in -

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) them all.

MR. DINN:

- we could open the doors and allow anybody
to come in and take the jobs. But we have qualified people here in
Newfoundland -

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

- whilst we have those qualified people
here in Newfoundland we are going to have the companies hire Newfoundlanders.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

And Newfoundlanders first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!
To the point of order I will have to take this
under advisement right now and check Hansard before I make my ruling.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, in case there was any offence
given it was not intended. I was merely trying to say what the hon.
member said. If it helps I will say that the hon. member's point was that
employment then of Newfoundlanders first is repugnant to him. He was referring
to the policy in terms of the employment of Newfoundlanders.

MR. THOMS:

A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. member for
Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is still misquoting and I can only come to the conclusion, deliberately misquoting me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Shame! Shame!

MR. THOMS: This is not what I said.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is misquoting himself.

MR. THOMS: This is not what I said. I said I find that a regulation which says Newfoundlanders first, or Quebecers first or anybody first, the concept, the idea, the principle is repugnant to me. I also went on to say -

MR. COLLINS: In regard to what?

MR. THOMS: I also went on to say that this policy may be a necessary policy. But again you are twisting my words by saying that in somehow or other I am casting an aspersion on Newfoundlanders. Why would I do that? I am a Newfoundlander.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I believe, Your Honour, if the minister persists on attacking my friend and misquoting him, I believe Your Honour has to give a ruling because we just cannot have that sort of thing going on. He is deliberately doing it. So maybe Your Honour would like to take five minutes and give us the ruling so we can dispense with this matter. Otherwise the hon. gentleman cannot carry on.

DR. COLLINS: I want to speak, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order?

DR. COLLINS: To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) was clearly referring to our employment situation, our employment policy, the employment of Newfoundlanders on a preferential basis and I was making

DR. COLLINS: the point that he finds this repugnant to him. That is all I am making and if he wishes that I phrase it in some other way, as long as that meaning comes through, I will do it. I will do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: The point I was making, Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the point of order, was that in terms of the Newfoundlander first in employment situation, the hon. member was making the point that this was repugnant to him.

MR. THOMS: Withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, I will check with Hansard and just see what had transpired because when the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) was speaking I was not in the Chair so I will take it upon myself to check Hansard and give my ruling later.

The hon. Minister of Finance's time has expired. The next speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I only wish that Your Honour had rose the Committee and looked into this matter. But Your Honour will choose another course and I cannot question that. I mean that is Your Honour's prerogative. But I do want to comment on a number of matters that were raised by previous speakers on the government side of the House. At long last, Mr. Speaker, in this session of the House we finally got the ministers and the government in the position they should be in and that is defending their policy. We finally got them, they are up one after the other defending their policy. And I do hope that the press will forgive us, will forgive us that we cannot go down item by item of the Executive Council and the Premier's salary and so forth. We will get around to that. We still have five hours left. But we finally got them in a position that they should be in.

The Opposition's job in this House is to zero in on the weaknesses in government policy and make them get up and explain and defend themselves. And that is what they are doing and they are making fools of themselves in the process.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

We just heard from the baby doctor.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1058

NM - 4

MR. NEARY:

We just heard from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), we just heard from the buttoned-down mind, the Acting Premier, and what he was doing, Mr. Chairman, what he was doing, he was trying to make up to his colleagues for a blunder for putting his foot in it - He

MR. S. NEARY: obviously has the hoof mouth disease-for putting his foot in it yesterday by saying -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Wait until the Premier sees his answers.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. By ending up his speech when he said, "I do not care which one of the five options we choose to confirm the offshore management, let us use one of them."

DR. J. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: A point just came up about quoting properly and I would just point out that the hon. member for LaPoile, if he is going to quote me I would like

him to read Hansard or read from Hansard if he is going to quote and not put his interpretation on it, which is totally inexact.

MR. E. ROBERTS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, of all the inane and ineptly stated points of order I ever heard that has to be the prize. My hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), indeed, was not quoting the hon. gentleman and to finish with, all he was doing was debating. I would not even say it was a difference of opinion between two hon. members in that time honoured rubric because I am not so sure that when the Minister of Finance spoke yesterday he even expressed an opinion. But I mean, there is no point of order there at all and my friend from LaPoile ought to be allowed - he has only got ten minutes, this deliberate strategy or what appears to be a deliberate strategy of harassing him ought really to be stopped so he can carry on with some very interesting stuff.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (BUTT): To the point of order I would rule that there is no point of order but obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I was merely summarizing what the hon. gentleman said. And in summary what the hon. gentleman said yesterday when he concluded his remarks was that he did not care, he did not care which one of the five options, what route the government chooses to confirm -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which government?

MR. NEARY: The provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The federal government.

MR. NEARY: Ah, that is what the hon. gentleman indicated to the House. I am summarizing -

DR. COLLINS: The federal government.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMS: Read Hansard.

MR. NEARY: It does not make any difference, it is still just as bad if he says he does not care which route the federal government chooses, that makes it worse. I mean, that is going to get him in more hot water with his colleagues. The hon. gentleman is suffering from hoof in mouth disease.

MR. WARREN: Two hooves in one mouth.

MR. NEARY: And what he was doing today, he was trying to remedy and trying to correct and rectify the damage that he had done and I am sure that his colleagues must have sailed aboard of him yesterday when he went out of the House and his new-born colleague probably trying to prop him up, the expert on offshore oil and gas who has all the answers and a policy of his own, tried to prop him up. But, Mr. Chairman, what is unfolding in the two days of debate that we are having on this matter, and it should be trashed out thoroughly, laid on the Table of the House so that the members can see it. The people of Newfoundland will see it if we can ever get the message to filter through to the eyes and ears of the people of this Province. If we can get that message to filter through surely they can see the weaknesses in the government's argument. And if they can see it the people of Newfoundland will then

MR. S. NEARY: see it - the weaknesses. And the number one weakness in this, Mr. Chairman, and we heard it again today, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), a senior minister in the administration, with his buttoned-down mind, in his narrow-minded way stood up and said, "What is the Opposition's position on offshore?" You would not know but we were the government. Have they forgotten that they are the government, they are governing this Province? The real question - -

MR. WARREN: They do not act like it.

MR. S. NEARY: - the red herring he is trying to create to hide the real question is, what is the government's position, what option - we are asking the government now for twenty-four hours - what option are they going to use to confirm the offshore rights because obviously they are uncertain about it. If they felt in their hearts that they own it, as they obviously do, they would proceed and ignore everybody in the world; ignore the Government of Canada, ignore the Opposition, ignore the oil companies, ignore everybody if they are so sure. But the word is coming through to me, Mr. Chairman, that they are not sure, they are uncertain, they are asking the Government of Canada -

MR. WARREN: They have not got a clue.

AN. HON. MEMBER: To make the decision.

MR. S. NEARY: - to make the decision for them, that is what they are up to and they are camouflaging the issue

MR. S. NEARY: by saying, 'What is the Opposition's policy?' What difference does it make what our policy is?

MR. L. THOMS: You will soon want to know what the United Church policy is.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, you will soon want to know what our policy is on marijuana; what is our policy on marijuana, what is our policy on the fishery, what is our policy on this, what is our policy on drinking, alcoholism!

MR. L. THOMS: Maybe they will get us to bring down a Budget.

MR. S. NEARY: I mean if that is what they want, why do they not just remove themselves from office and let us run the affairs of this Province. It is a phony argument, the myth, the fraud has been exploded and they are over there now trying to weasle their way out of it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Oil and gas. There is a lot of gas over there anyway.

MR. S. NEARY: We have been hearing so much about oil and gas, the gas, I am afraid, is on that side of the House, there may be oil on the Grand Banks but the gas is over there. And then we heard the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) get up and do some fancy figure skating on thin ice regarding the government's hiring policy. And I say to the minister right now, and he cannot deny it and he cannot contradict it, that unless your name is on that list there is no job. I called the manager of Canada Manpower a few days ago and I said, 'Do you do any hiring for the offshore?' He said, 'No, we are not allowed. We cannot even refer they said, 'because you cannot get a job offshore unless your name is on the government list. Unless your name is on the government list you cannot get a job. The same way with these people who came to see me who had jobs

MR. S. NEARY: secured, who went to the companies and got their jobs and then when they reported for work they were told, 'I am sorry, boy, look you have the qualifications, I wanted you in the worst kind of a way because you are qualified, but I am sorry I cannot hire you because we have been informed by the Department of Labour and Manpower that your name is not on the list. And can you blame these people for feeling that they were discriminated against on political grounds because they happened to be Liberals, by the way.

MR. J. DINN: Table it, table it.

MR. S. NEARY: I will table the hon. gentleman before I am finished with him with that kind of a Musso- lini policy, the anti-Labour Minister. Here we are in a Province with a minister who is anti-labour and then he says, 'Oh, Labrador Linerboard he told us, 'is going to employ a lot of people'. Well, how many times did we hear from the representatives of the telephone company? How many times did we hear Labrador linerboard is in the wrong place? It is impractical, unrealistic, it will never work it is in the wrong place. And now all of a sudden it is the Saviour it becomes, the Saviour of the unemployed in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I did not have an opportunity when I rose last time to finish answering all the points that were raised. But one of the points I was trying to get through is that the interpretation I have of the remarks made opposite, in particular by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), was that he finds repugnant our policy of ensuring that Newfoundlanders have first shot at employment offshore.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now, that is the first point. And I make that point in trying to decipher what the policy opposite is in terms of the offshore. Because as the hon. member who just sat down said, 'We are not going to say it, we are not going to reveal it, we are going to keep it secret.' He is implying that he has one but, I mean, one can only say that if they do not reveal it you have to wonder if they have one. But nevertheless, one has to try to see, if they have one from the remarks they made, what would that be? And that is the first point in their policy, that they would be against our local preference first. In other words, say in terms of the creditors, shall we say, for Come by Chance, they do not want local preference put in there. Just that sort of example.

Now, that is the first point in their policy. Now, the second point of their policy is that they would wish to -

MR. L. STIRLING: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: It is one thing for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to make a mistake and interpret and misinterpret something, but then the member again brought up a point of order and Your Honour is going to check Hansard, but he has now brought in a completely extraneous piece of material which is absolutely

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1061

AH-1

MR. STIRLING: a distortion by saying that this party does not support the position of supporting the creditors on Come By Chance. That is an absolute distortion of the worst order.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The big lie does not work any more.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: In bringing that in I was making the point -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance is speaking to the point of order and I would ask all hon. members to be quite. The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I brought in that point to illustrate what the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) said when he says, "I am against the policy, the implication of local preference." This is what he said in speaking a little earlier. I am against the whole policy of local preference and this was an example that one has to arrive at if you are against the policy of local preference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order. I would rule that in this particular case, since it does - it is in line with the first point of order that was raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) so I would rule at this particular time that the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who raised this point of order has no point of order but he rose on a point of clarification of remarks that were attributed to his party.

MR. STIRLING: A point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bonavista North on a point of privilege.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on reflection it was not simply a point of order. What the Minister of Finance has done (Dr. Collins) and persisted in doing in explaining the point of order, is really a breach

MR. STIRLING: of privilege of this House and I would ask you to examine the total context. That complete misinterpretation was a breach of the privilege of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge you to give it the consideration that it deserves.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of privilege. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has risen on a point of order and a point of privilege and it is my understanding that the nature of his complaint was the fact that he disagrees with what the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is saying and that he is stating that the hon. gentleman is, at the very least, stating something that in his view is incorrect or he makes the blanket statement that it is incorrect. Now, I suggest to Mr. Chairman that this is the way that the whole committee, the whole House can get out of order. A point of privilege, I will quote to you Beauchesne, page 11, paragraph 17, "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation." So there is obviously no point of privilege but farther than this, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that when a member rises and interrupts another member it should be on a genuine point of order and a genuine point of privilege. Because if the hon. gentleman - I do not doubt his right to disagree with any hon. member in this House but the time for him, the time and place for him to disagree is when he gets up to debate himself. This is the purpose of the whole debate. So, in effect, by interrupting the hon. gentleman what he is doing - I know unconsciously and not deliberately, but he is contributing to a state of disorder in the House itself by in fact raising a point of privilege. There is no point of privilege. There is no point of order. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is getting up and making a point. He is the member for St. John's South and he should be able to make his point. Afterwards, if the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) gets Your Honour's eye, then it is up to him to get up and refute it if he will, so we will have some order in the Committee and not disorder.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1061

AH-3

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of privilege. The hon. member
for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the point of order has been
disposed of and there is no more - I am sorry, I was not sure if Your
Honour was speaking to me or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am listening.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. No, no. I was not sure if Your Honour was speaking.
Whether Your Honour listens or not, I cannot - I can

MR. ROBERTS: only speak. I can lead a horse to water, I cannot make him drink, you know.

Mr. Chairman, the question raised by my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) is a matter of privilege, and I suggest the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Finance, was breaching the privileges of the House and I have no doubt was doing it inadvertently. I do not suggest for a moment he was trying to.

You see I agree it is a serious matter. I mean that citation is in Beauchesne and even if it was not it is common sense. But let me read citation 21, Your Honour, which is found on page thirteen. Let me read simply the first sentence thereof which says - if my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would do me the favour not to speak so loudly -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order!

MR. ROBERTS: - I would perhaps be better able to try to make the point. I do not mind the gentleman having a conversation, I do mind him having it so loudly that it interferes.

That sentence reads, "The most fundamental privilege of the House as a whole is to establish rules of procedure for itself and to enforce them." And I think what the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) was doing inadvertently, and I think unknowingly, I do not suggest anything to the contrary, was what amounted to a contempt, or quasi contempt of the Chair. Because you see this precise point came up earlier with reference to some quotations or citations of what - and my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) raised it, and there was some argument backand forth, and I only heard part of it because I was out of the House for a few minutes. Your Honour has reserved a ruling on it. I understood Your Honour - I did hear Your Honour say you were going to check the tapes, or the Hansard, whatever it is, and in due course give a ruling.

Now, that is the precise matter on which Your Honour has reserved a ruling, this question of repugnant or not

MR. ROBERTS: repugnant or whatever the heck it is all about. So in effect that becomes, to use a legal term that is not inapplicable, sub judice. Until Your Honour disposes of that particular question there should be no further mention here in this House, or in the Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), by raising it is in contempt of the House. I do not think he means to be, I do not think it is a very serious contempt. I think the way for him to purge it is simply not to refer to the matter further until Your Honour brings in a ruling which will doubtless be as quickly as can be done. Then depending on Your Honour's ruling we can debate it. I am quite willing to debate it, but that is not the issue. The issue is that he is raising a matter which, in effect, has been taken under advisement by Your Honour and I think that does constitute a breach of the privileges of the House and I think that the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) should simply be asked to refrain from dealing with that aspect of the matter until Your Honour has made a ruling and then depending on Your Honour's ruling it can be dealt with in the normal way.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), I would rule that there is no point of privilege in this particular case but merely the hon. member wanted to clarify his position. And now that the hon. Minister of Finance's time has expired again I will recognize the next speaker.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not feel we are cutting off the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because, of course, he can come back into the debate at any time. And there is time. We have got forty minutes before we break for our lunch and we have got at least four hours, and then we have the budget debate.

MR. NEARY: Right on. And then we have the concurrence debates.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1062

NM - 3

MR. ROBERTS:

Sooner or later the government are going to have to call the budget, and we will have a crack. And then there are the nine hours on the concurrence debates and then, of course, Sir, there are the Estimates Committee. I mean, there will be ample opportunity for the minister to state what, if anything, he has on

MR. E. ROBERTS:

his mind about this particular point.

Now, I want to come back to this question of control as opposed to ownership because I think the heart of this issue is not simply ownership. I do not want to say, and I know the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has an ability either to misunderstand, miscomprehend or to twist for his own purposes. That is not improper. I think it is foolish of him. I think he should face up to the issues man fashion and debate them straightforwardly and with integrity and I do not think he or his colleagues are. but that is up to them. As long as they are within the rules they can say what they wish and in due course we will have it out. The most recent on this issue, of course, was not last June when the issue was not particularly well argued out. It was not really the issue in the minds of most people in this Province when they elected the present administration, as they did, to be the government. The most recent issue of this came just two or three months ago in this Province when, by design of the Tory Party, the then government in Ottawa, and by the overt and deliberate and proper act of the minister opposite and his colleagues, they made the whole issue an issue in their eyes and I would simply point out that on that the Liberal Party in this Province, the Liberal candidates, there were more of them elected than at any time since 1965. The percentage of the popular vote given to the Liberal Party was the highest at any point since 1965 and there have been six-is it?- 1965, 1968, 1972, 1974, 1979 and 1980- six general elections. Now, if want to talk about referenda or the feelings of the people of this Province that is as much an effective argument and as much a truthful analysis as any references to last June.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The only way we will really know is to have a dissolution and that is in the hands of the Premier. At any time the Premier may get in his automobile and go down to wait upon His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, request a dissolution and I have no doubt he will be granted it, at any time. And any time the Premier wishes to do it I, for one, would welcome it and I know my colleagues would too.

MR. F. STAGG: (inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am sorry, my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) erupts again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Sort of like a hemorrhoid.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I love elections and I have won some and I have lost some and, unlike the gentleman for Stephenville, I have the courage to go back and face my constituents, to date he has not. Maybe he will next time and we will abide the result.

MR. STAGG: I may go down to your constituency.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I would love nothing better than have the hon. gentleman come down to my constituency as long as he did not hold himself out as a Liberal. I mean I am proud to be a Liberal and as long as the hon. gentleman did not hold himself out to be a Liberal he is welcome as a Newfoundlander anytime in my district, people would love to see him.

MR. STAGG: (inaudible) love to elect me.

MR. E. ROBERTS: He might feel they would like to elect him. All the hon. gentleman needs is four names and \$100 to get his name on the ballot and if he has trouble getting either I would be delighted to provide the \$100 for him, he will lose it, but I would be delighted to provide it and delighted to provide the four names and we will let the citizens of the district of the Strait of Belle Isle decide. Your Honour is going to say I am a little ways away.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

I think we are straying somewhat from 302-01, the Premier's salary.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I think Your Honour is being wise to say that the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is a stray, he is sort of a waif and I quite concur with Your Honour's ruling. Now what I wanted to say - I have heard of bringing the House down but, I mean, not the glass.

Mr. Chairman, the point -

MR. F. STAGG:

(Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Chairman, I should not allow myself to be distracted should I? When you are dealing with elephants you should not worry about rabbits so I will pay no more attention to the gentleman for Stephenville for this particular debate.

Now, Sir, I want to talk about control and ownership because I think that is an important feature of the issue. You know this House has been on record since 19 - I had the resolution out - since 1975, March. That was when the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was in his earlier reincarnation as Minister of Mines and Energy, before he had had his date with destiny in the district of Burin - Placentia West, before he ran for St. John's figuring that he had a better chance of being elected, as he certainly did, because he was elected in St. John's and he was not re-elected in Burin - Placentia West. But there is a motion in the House that makes it quite clear where we all stand on ownership and that was a recorded vote. In the very few minutes I have I am not going to go into it, you know, the circumstances behind it, the words are there and hon. gentlemen can look it up in the journals if they wish.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

What I want to say is that ownership and control are two entirely different things and I would like the government to address themselves to this question of control. I believe we own the stuff, I believe we own whatever is under the seabed out there and I have no problem with - right out to the edge of the margin, in fact, that was the specific point of the resolution which I moved and which the gentleman for - well, he is now from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry)- and I afterwards cobbled together too, most of mine and part of his, and it became an agreed resolution with both sides and a private member's resolution in my name, became a resolution debated in government time and was adopted unanimously by all of the members in the House at that time. That was before the 1975 election and many of the hon. gentlemen opposite had not surfaced politically at that time.

Now, I want to talk about who controls what because I think that is the heart of the issue and I am not going to get into the constitutional

MR. E. ROBERTS:

debate, although I will say that the Constitution of Canada specifies who controls what, and in that sense it does not matter whether we own it or not. And hon. gentlemen opposite can posture, can parade, can prate, can prattle as they wish, but it does not change one jot or one tittle, the fact that ownership, in itself, does not change the questions of jurisdiction or of control.

The government have changed their position completely these last few months. Originally, they only talked about ownership. And I was saying to our people and they were saying to me, we were all saying to each other, Do the government really understand the difference between ownership and control? We had very real doubts whether they did. I think they have finally realized that they did not and they are now admitting it because they are now beginning to talk about control, and I think that is coming closer to reality. Control is going to be shared. That was made obvious by the letters tabled today by my friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) that the government have deliberately withheld from the people of this Province since 1978, when they came out. But anybody who reads those letters will realize what we have been saying all along, that the only reason drilling is now going ahead is by virtue of a joint agreement between the two ministers, and it is clearly embodied in that correspondence. I would like to hear somebody gainsay that. I would like to hear any hon. gentleman opposite say anything else. I will say it again, that the drilling going ahead on the Grand Banks now, Hibernia and all the other offshore drilling, is going ahead simply because the Government of Canada, represented by Mr. Gillespie, and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, represented by the present Premier, who was then a minister in the Cabinet - he was then quite proud to be part of the previous administration that he now declaims at every opportunity - that the two ministers speaking for their respective governments made an agreement.

I have hazarded the view - the more I hear and see, the more I think it is a good view - that that is the route we are going to have to follow in all practical senses to get development

MR. E. ROBERTS: in the offshore. It does not matter in that sense who owns what. Now, I expect the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) to get to his feet in due course and try to twist that to say it does not matter who owns it. Well, he is quite capable of that, or quite incapable of it. But I will say it does not matter in the sense of control, who owns what. Ownership carries with it only one element of control, the negative control. You can say, 'We are going to sit on it and we are not going to develop it at all.' But the real issue we ought to be concerned with in this House and in this Province - and if the government want to address the matter with some integrity and some intelligence, both of which have been conspicuously lacking in their presentations, they will come to grips with this question of who controls what, and what controls do we need. The environmental matters - we were on it in Question Period today - of crucial importance. A letter from the Premier, signed, A. Brain Peckford - I do not know if that was a misprint or whether it was really the truth coming out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, it is. It is there, 'A. Brain Peckford', December 2, 1977 to Mr. Gillespie in Ottawa, talked about this, talked about the importance of the fisheries, and well it should, because that is the crucial thing. The letter was written by ABP where most of them are written by CM, whoever CM may be - the ghost writer, the ghost writer in the sky or in the background.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two minutes, my friend.

MR. WARREN: CN or CM? I wonder who that is?

MR. E. ROBERTS: CM - I do not know who CM is and I do not care who CM is.

MR. WARREN: I wonder if it is Cabot Martin?

MR. E. ROBERTS: The Premier signed the letter, so it is his letter.

Only two minutes? Well, I will have to come back at it again and I will. Because we talk about the environment - the environment is a shared jurisdiction and until and unless we get an agreement with the Government of Canada it does not matter who owns what. It does not matter whether we are in

MR. E. ROBERTS:

the Supreme Court or whether we have got the phony, fake letter of Joe Clark, Mr. Joe Clark, formerly Prime Minister of Canada. That letter is not worth the paper it is written on in any substantive sense and I say Mr. Clark knew it when he wrote it.

We have heard talk of hiring. That is ours no matter who owns what. The ownership does not resolve the question of our control over who works out there. That is a matter that is ours because of the jurisdiction conferred upon this Parliament, this House by the British North America Act.

We heard talk of controlling land speculation. We do not need to change anything. If this government want to control land speculation in this province, and it is going on today, then they can bring the necessary legislative controls before this House and I would venture to say those controls will be given quick and speedy and unanimous passage. If our people are being shafted, as many feel they are, by the speculation going on, then the remedy for it lies in this House, at the hands of this government today.

We control rents in this province. We can do the same with lands and with housing if we want. We do not need any changes in anything and it is a lack of integrity or a lack of intelligence on the part of this government to pretend anything else. And I am getting fed up, Mr. Chairman, with this posturing - this posturing by this government that the answer to everything is somehow in a magical letter from Mr. Joe Clark. Well, I will say that Mr. Joe Clark - and I will finish on this because I suspect my two minutes are up - that Mr. Joe Clark's letter was not, in a substantive sense, worth the paper it was written on and secondly, and most importantly, that the question of ownership, where I feel we own it, and I would put it to the test in

MR. E. ROBERTS: the Supreme Court and I believe we would carry the day on our efforts, but the mere fact of ownership in itself does not meet the needs of this province. It does not give us environmental controls which are so crucial. It does not give us the controls over the type of development we want.

Mr. Harold Duffett, or a company he controls, or is involved in I do not know, who owns what - owns a bit of land down on the corner of Prescott and Duckworth Street here in St. John's, but that does not give him any control over it. I do not know if I can hammer that through to the government opposite.

MR. WARREN: It is pretty hard.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Some of them do not want to believe it. Some of them cannot. Anyway, Your Honour is going to tell me my time is up. I will come back at it again because I think it is a crucial issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I am having difficulty making the case I want to make here. I have been on my feet three times now. I have consumed of the time allotted me, consumed twenty minutes, and I am now into thirty minutes and I have really only come to the first point. The reason for that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

DR. J. COLLINS: The reason for that are the interruptions opposite. I must be touching a very sensitive nerve for these interruptions to be so persistent ranging from heckling, from interference, from points of order, from points of privilege. There is a very desperate attempt to prevent me from making my case and I can only assume that I must be getting very near the bone.

MR. NEARY: You are getting towards the (inaudible)

DR. J. COLLINS: I will now go on to the second point I wanted to make. I will leave the one where I gave my interpretation

DR. J. COLLINS: because I am trying to define what the case opposite, what the policy opposite is in terms of the offshore. The hon. members opposite said they will not state it, they will not reveal it. I am trying to define it from the remarks made and I will leave the first point, that is, that my interpretation of their case is that they would not pursue Newfoundland preference in terms of employment.

Now, I will go to the second point which was made by the hon. member who just took his seat and that is in terms of the exercise of ownership. They have already stated that we believe in ownership and this is as far as they will go. Our position is that ownership is not the full case. It is the

DR. COLLINS: exercise of ownership. Now, the hon. member opposite tried to make the point, I believe - this is my interpretation, I state that in case there is another spate of points of order and points of privilege, my interpretation of what the hon. member opposite said was that Newfoundland really has no particular stake in having ownership confirmed. That is an irrelevant point. That is not the big point.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) - misinterpreted.

DR. COLLINS: I think that that clear impression came across, that the concentration on ownership is an irrelevancy. There is more to it than that. I say that that is either naive or really very misinformed and I have difficulty in even accepting both those because I know the hon. member is a very intelligent man. That is so naive. If one would think that Newfoundland, to stand up against the power of the federal government, does not have to have its ownership confirmed to win the day, that is incredibly naive. Now, granted the federal government - the federal government may not need ownership to get its way. That is quite clear. There is a repository of power in the federal government that can overcome many things that smaller jurisdictions cannot overcome. We only have to look at the British North America Act for that. The federal government is always getting into areas of provincial jurisdiction. It is doing it all the time, in education, in health, in social services. All these are in the provincial jurisdiction and the federal government is always getting in there. It does not need to have its jurisdictional powers established to get into these areas and the reason for that is that the federal government has a tremendous power within its grasp.

Now, the Province of Newfoundland has not got one iota of that power. It has very subscribed limits of power and for us to be able to exercise our very subscribed limits of power we need to have

DR. COLLINS: our ownership confirmed. It is totally misleading. It is totally, I suppose, naive. It is incredibly naive to think that we can ignore ownership and exercise our power. We have to confirm the ownership and then get on to the very important point, exercise our power.

MR. MARSHALL: Well said.

DR. COLLINS: Now, the hon. member opposite, in the exercising of power, tries to direct attention towards environment and control. He tries to direct it to that in an almost total way. And I think that also is misleading and naive. The environmental control exercised by the hon. member is incredibly important. And this government does not dispute in any way that the federal government has a very large stake in that, perhaps even a paramount position in that. We do not dispute that at all. But environmental control is only one aspect of control. The operational control, the control of the results from the resources, these are, in our view, from the provincial point of view, only more important because we know the federal government have such a large position in the environmental and we will support them up to the hilt.

So it is totally misleading and totally naive to say the exercise of control must be narrowed down merely to environmental control which the hon. member opposite tried to do. So this is another aspect of the Liberal Party policy, if it ever does come out, that their exercising control will only be in an environmental area and not in those other very important areas -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - and the environmental area is not even ours in a paramount way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Well. Well. Well.

DR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) made much about the centralist position, that he makes much of Canada in terms of our situation in regard to the offshore.

DR. COLLINS: He is trying to establish the point, this seems to be another thread in Liberal policy, he is trying to establish the point that the exercise in control offshore must be predicated on what was traditionally the centralist aspect of the way the Canadian Federation is working. And we all know the Province of BC, the Province of Alberta, the Province of Saskatchewan, certainly the Province of Quebec, they all know that that old way is fading away, that the old concept of the Confederation is fading away. The

DR. COLLINS: Confederation is not an immobile thing. It is not something cast in stone. It is not something immutable. It has to be living, it has to be a developing, it has to be a devolving mechanism if it is to fit into this modern world that we live in and fit into this modern Canada that we live in. The old-fashioned ideas of the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) whereby he says that our offshore resources have to fit in with the previous concept of Confederation, the centralist concept of Confederation, is another thread in offshore policy in terms of the Liberal party. That our offshore must be exploited in such a way that the centralist view of Canada that was traditional and pretty widely expected up to a few years ago, that that must still be the case. Well, we certainly disagree with that and I think that any modern Newfoundlander, any Newfoundlander in the modern idiom will also reject that we have to be supporters of centralist Canada, the way that things have always been in the past.

Now, the final thing that seems to me to come out of what I am hearing opposite as the outline of Liberal policy is that no matter what the federal government decides to agree to, that this can be changed at any time. The hon. member who just took his place said that a letter written by the Prime Minister of Canada, an official act by a man in an official position as Her Majesty's Prime Minister in Canada, that this is totally irrelevant, that this can be torn up, that this can be ignored. Now that, I think, does fit in with the Liberal philosophy. The Liberal philosophy has been that you establish a point at a point in time which is beneficial to you and at another point in time you disregard it no matter what statements you made to the opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: So just to summarize the Liberal policy on the offshore. Firstly, they would not protect the primacy of Newfoundland employment in the offshore.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is using the Hilter technique, the big lie technique. If you keep repeating a lie long enough somebody will believe it. The statement he just made is completely untrue and false, Mr. Chairman, and I would submit that the hon. gentleman is completely out of order. If he is going to deliberately attribute motive and so forth to the opposition, then Your Honour knows that that is completely out of order. The hon. gentleman is unparliamentary. He is using the Hilter technique of repeating the big lie and the big lie is not allowed in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! Before I recognize the next speaker, to that point of order I would have to remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that, indeed, he is using unparliamentary language when addressing himself to the point of order in the words Hilter and so on that are spelled out in Beauchesne.

MR. DINN: He does not know what parliamentary is.

AN HON. MEMBER: A well known technique.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Attributed to the hon. minister so -

MR. NEARY: If Your Honour says it is unparliamentary I will withdraw it. I will just say the hon. minister is using a well known technique that Adolf Hilter used to use and if I am not allowed to use , the big lie, I withdraw it and I apologize for embarrassing the Chair.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: There is clearly no point of order there. It is the same tactic as before, it is a delaying tactic. If the hon. member wishes to stand up and merely say that he totally agrees, as this side does, to local

DR. J. COLLINS: preference in terms of employment;
I will certainly make a withdrawal.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I may -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, further remarks?

MR. S. NEARY: No, I have been invited by the hon.
gentleman to say a few words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Not invited by this side.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I understand leave is granted?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it is granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave has not been granted.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has taken his seat.
Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: To the point of order (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will make my ruling and then I
will recognize the hon. member.

MR. S. NEARY: What is the ruling.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (inaudible) making a ruling on the
point of order you raised.

MR. S. NEARY: I have not raised any point of order.

MR. J. DINN: You just raised a point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I withdrew it and I said, "Your
Honour, that if it is unparliamentary I withdraw it." So there is no point
of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I do not have to rule on what
is not a point of order.
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to, before
my hon. colleague gets on his feet and he is there bursting at the
seams anxious to get up and lash into the hon. gentleman and expose
the phony arguments that the hon. member was using, the counter-
arguments but I do want to clear up one matter, one matter that the

MR. S. NEARY: hon. gentleman attributes to me and that is in connection with the local preference.

What I said, Mr. Chairman, was this and I hope this will sink into the hon. gentleman's head, what I said was this, that we approve of Newfoundlanders first, Newfoundlanders getting the first crack at the jobs but I personally do not approve of the government having a list and saying to Newfoundlanders who are qualified for these jobs that 'your name has to be on that list in order to get a job' because that is what the minister confirmed this morning. Your name has to be on the list. If you were were out in Fort MacMurray when that list was prepared and you did not get your name on it, you can not now come back and get a job, you can not go to Canada Manpower -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who got the (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - and say, "Can I be referred for a job", you can not go to an employer -

MR. L. THOMS: There is a register.

MR. S. NEARY: - you can not go to one of these companies - it is not a register. Mr. Chairman, it is not a register. The government dictates, the government says, "Look, - I used an example of three or four men who came to see me, who said they were given jobs by a company who was supplying the offshore oil rigs, they were given jobs by the company.

MR. H. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, you should never speak ill of the dead.

MR. E. ROBERTS: We speak ill of the gentleman (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, well, maybe when we are talking about the government we are speaking ill of the dead.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is this, that these three men who came to see me said they had jobs, they were given jobs by a company involved in the offshore development and they reported for work and when they reported for

MR. S. NEARY: work on Monday morning they were told,
"Well, we are sorry, we wanted to give you the jobs, you are qualified.
We wanted you in the worst kind of a way but we are sorry to have to
tell you that we can not hire you, you can not go to work because your
name was not on the list."

MR. H. YOUNG: Were they card carrying Liberals?

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was once a card
carrying Liberal -

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - and probably still is

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: I hope now, Mr. Chairman, I have
made my point. We are all for Newfoundlanders getting jobs on the
offshore, in the Linerboard mill, the development of the Lower
Churchill but I am opposed, I am against, this Mussolini-like policy.
of having to have your name on the list before you get a job.
Newfoundlanders should be able to go to Canada Manpower and be
referred to these companies. They should be able to go directly
to the employers and get jobs. Why can they not do it? They
can not under the government's policy. That is what I am saying,
your name should not have to be on that list. If you are a
Newfoundlander get a job the best way you can, If you are qualified
and you can prove to an employer that I am the best man for that
job, I have got the qualifications, why should you not get it? Why
should you have to depend on the Minister of Labour and Manpower
(Mr. J. Dinn) to lay on his hands and

MR. S. NEARY:

say, 'Oh, hire this man.'

MR. L. THOMS:

Because he wants all Tories out there.

that is why.

MR. S. NEARY:

And he cannot get the job because his

name is not on the list. It is a very dangerous policy and one that can be abused. Now, having said that, I hope I have gotten the message through to the hon. gentleman. I now yield to my hon. friend if the Chair would recognize him and let him have it out.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance,

the Chair recognizes both sides.

MR. ROBERTS:

My friend yielded to him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He does not control the House.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, -

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I do not question the Chair.

If the Chair recognizes the Minister of

Finance that is fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The Chair recognizes the Minister of

Finance.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Well, that is fine, But I hope you

recognize him for what he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am now - I would be

proud to be recognized for what I am. I am now going into, I think it is my thirty-first minute trying to make my point. The interruptions are making it difficult but -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please.

DR. J. COLLINS: - I was doing a summing up to try to make sure that I did establish the case before the end of the day. I was summing up. Now, just to reiterate my objective - I am trying to decipher because it will not be resolved. I am trying to decipher the policy opposite in regard to the offshore and it is not easy to do. The first point I was trying to make was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

DR. J. COLLINS: - in terms of unemployment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now, it is not easy to do because, of course, they keep fudging. It is like hitting a moving target. The hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms) stated his term in regard to offshore unemployment for Newfoundlanders in terms of repugnance. The hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) states his term in regard to whether there should be anything done about it, whether it should be just a statement. But government does not take any action, it just says we want local preference toward Newfoundlanders but we do not do anything about it, we just leave it up in the air. We let someone else do it. We let Canada Manpower do it. You know, we let whatever. Well, that, of course, is a totally indefensible position.

If you make a policy, and this is what seems to be difficult to understand in the remarks made opposite, if you make a policy, surely you must carry it through. You just cannot let it hang there and hope that it will be grabbed out of the air in some way. Now, then, at the same time, the hon. member for St. Barbe (T. Bennett) he seems to take an entirely opposite view, because -

MR. E. ROBERTS: The member from where?

DR. J. COLLINS: For St. Barbe. He was making the point when he stood that he was objecting to Air Canada obtaining some profits from carrying out its trade in Newfoundland. Presumably, he was implying

DR. J. COLLINS: that EPA should get it all. So, you know, he is almost on our side in this. So it is very difficult to keep on the point, there is such disarray in the points being made across the way. But, all one can do is try to get the consensus of what is coming out of the remarks there. And in terms of employment, the consensus seems to be that they will not take the vigorous stand that this government has taken in making sure that Newfoundlanders get the employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now, the second point -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: The second point was the ownership. They would just make a claim for ownership and again not do anything about it. They would not exercise the ownership. They will not make sure that-

MR. S. NEARY: You are governing the Province.

DR. J. COLLINS: - our case is nailed down by making our ownership indisputable. Because the only way we will exercise control is to have indisputable ownership and the members opposite apparently are not willing to go that far. They are either not willing to make our ownership indisputable or if it is accepted by them, they are not willing to exercise it. They will have someone else, presumably, the Federal Government, exercise it.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Contrary to the interests of the people of Newfoundland -

DR. J. COLLINS: This is quite contrary to the interest of Newfoundlanders, as my hon. friend has just remarked. Now, in terms of the economic returns from the offshore, the hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms), I presume, is the spokesman for members opposite in this, when we say that the returns from the offshore will be predicated on what central Canada wishes, the centralist aspect of Canada.

MR. F. STAGG: The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has (inaudible).

MR. L. THOMS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, you know, unless my memory is completely and absolutely gone, I did not make any statements even similar to the one just attributed by the Minister of Finance. (J.Collins).

MR. W. MARSHALL: You certainly implied it.

MR. L. THOMS: I doubt if I even used the word centralist in-

MR. S. NEARY: The minister is getting senile.

MR. L. THOMS: anything that I have said in this debate. I mean, it is so completely - there is just no question between anything that I said and what the Minister of Finance has just accused me of saying.

MR. W. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) Liberal policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Does the hon. Minister wish to speak to the Point of Order?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The hon. member does not wish to recognize the implications of the remarks he has made. I am merely taking from the remarks he has made what they imply. Now, if wants to make remarks in here and does not want hon. members

DR. J. COLLINS: on this side to interpret what he is saying, well, he had better preface his remarks his way and we will totally ignore his remarks. But if he wants to make remarks and he wants us to take some meaning from them, he has to abide by them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Oh, he has not withdrawn it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the hon. the member for Grand Bank's (Mr. L. Thoms) point of order, I would rule in this particular case there is not a point of order, but the hon. member has risen to clarify his position on the remarks attributed to him.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, pressing on valiantly - the hon. the member for Grand Bank, in talking about the exploitation of the offshore, clearly made the case that we have to be very conscious of Canada as it is now constituted in the results coming from this exploitation. He made his case clear and unmistakable that this would be his prime consideration, his prime concern, that the benefits from the offshore should accrue to the Canadian Confederation as it is now constituted. Now, there is a cross-the-country move to adjust the terms of Confederation. The terms of Confederation that the hon. member clearly grew up with - he learned them in school and he did not evolve them beyond that, he did not think them through beyond that - those terms of Confederation, everyone agrees now, are old hat, there has to be a new Confederation. This is what the debate is all about in Canada. And if the hon. members opposite are not aware of that - and I suspect that the hon. the member for Grand Bank, clearly is not aware of it - they had better get out the old newspapers and see what has been going on since at least the early 1960s, that there has to be a new Confederation, that Confederation cannot stand the way it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: Out of the new Confederation - although it is not yet agreed what the outline would be - but the hope that will come out of the new Confederation is that there will be a clearer

DR. J. COLLINS: benefit of Confederation to those provinces other than just the two major central ones. This will come out of the new Confederation, hopefully. This is what everyone is expecting. If this were not to be so, there would be no point in changing Confederation. So, therefore, the benefits from our offshore resources must accrue to the periphery and we are certainly on the periphery.

Now, apparently, the Liberal Party do not want to do this. They want, still, the old Confederation to stay in place, the old mechanisms to stay in place - that is, where the resources from the periphery by and large accrue to the two central provinces. That is another point.

The fourth point that members are making as they try to hide their policy - but it has to come out as they say some words - is that no matter what the federal Liberal Party enters into in terms of an arrangement with Newfoundland that this can be torn up at the drop of a hat.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A fake agreement.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Yes, it would just be a fake agreement.

If the position, in terms of the electorate in the country changed, they would be quite at liberty to renege on their solemn obligations. Now, this is quite opposite to what both the federal P.C. Party and certainly the P.C. Party on this side ascribe to.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1071

NM - 1

DR. COLLINS: If we make an arrangement we will stick to it.

MR. STAGG: We will honour it.

DR. COLLINS: We will honour it. We will not tear it up. We will not say one thing one week and then for a partisan benefit say something the other week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I might just -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! Order, please!

I cannot hear my ears.

DR. COLLINS: I think I might just have a minute or two to answer a few other points brought up by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), not really directed towards the offshore but he brought them up and I feel at liberty to make them.

He stated that this government is concerned only with fish and oil. Now that, of course, is a -

MR. BENNETT: Not fish and oil, hydro and oil.

DR. COLLINS: That, of course, I presume, means that he has not been paying attention, or he is a little bit hard of hearing. We are certainly concerned about fish and oil. But we have been bringing up in this House many, many times, the forestry, our mineral resources on land. We have been bringing up tourism. We have been bringing up social services. My hon. colleague has brought up many times the concerns of health. My hon. colleague has been talking in regard to education. I mean you would have to be distinctly hard of hearing if you thought that this government only was concerned about fish and oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: And I might say we will give the hon. member a summary of our concerns in all fields in the very near future when we bring down our five year plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member also implied -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister's time has expired.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Island.

MR. ROBERTS: - but fortunately the jollity carries on.

I hope the minister will get a weekend's rest and come back on Monday.

I simply want to make only one remark at this stage. You know, a number of years ago we had in this House Mr. John Crosbie who has since gone on to greater things that destroyed a Tory Government in Ottawa. We had the present member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who then represented a district which rejected him in the election when he went back and we had the present Premier. And we on this side referred to Mr. Crosbie as being the university debater. And we referred to the gentleman from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) as being the -

MR. LUSH: High school.

MR. ROBERTS: - the high school debater. And we referred to the Premier as being the school boy debater. And each of those was an accurate characterization, Your Honour, and still stand. Well we now I will say, having suffered through the minister, we have now heard the baby debater in this House. I have never -

MR. LUSH: Pre-schooler, Pre-schooler.

MR. ROBERTS: I have never in my years heard a performance - I will say that it was not deliberate because I do not believe it, I do not think the minister has that kind of malice in him - but I have never heard

MR. ROBERTS: a performance with as little intellectual integrity, as little solidness, as little coherence, as little common sense, and as little relevance as the minister's performances here this morning.

Now, I suspect it is about to be called one o'clock. We will have to rise for Committee and report some progress on this side, none on the other side. Fortunately we still have a couple of hours left, and I would simply say to my learned and hon. friend, the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), that on Monday would they please bring in somebody who can speak for them. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has a right to sit here, but let him sit and learn, Sir, and let us have somebody on the other side who can speak because you know we can lead a horse to water, even half a horse, but we cannot make him drink. And really, you know, there is a serious issue here, we would like to see it debated. We are debating it. We are prepared to debate it. So I say to my learned and hon. friend, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), that would he please -

MR. STIRLING: This morning we heard one end of the horse.

MR. ROBERTS: - please in the interest of the House, and I do not expect him to be concerned with ours, but in the interest of the House and the Province would he ensure that on Monday there is somebody here who can speak sensibly for the administration, not the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1071

NM - 4

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, report some progress on Head III, the Executive Council, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted,
Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

The hon. the President of the Council.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1072

DW - 1

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I did have a schedule of the meetings - I have one here of the meetings, wait now I have it - the Estimate committee meeting on Monday morning between 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., the Resource Committee meeting will meet at the Colonial Building and the Estimates under consideration will be Tourism, and at the same hour 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room-

MR. BARRETT: That is wrong.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Am I reading the wrong one?

MR. BARRETT: It is supposed to be Monday - 7:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I was either handed or picked up the wrong sheet. I stand to be corrected. There you go. From 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Colonial it is the Department of Finance considered by the committee on services.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not correct.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, will somebody enlighten me then so we can. I do not want to get everybody going now. All right we will try again. April 25, that is today and I thought that was the same one I had a moment ago, I am sure it was I must have read it incorrectly. The Resource Committee from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Monday in the Colonial Building -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, that is wrong.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, this is what it says here Monday, April 28th. -

MR. STIRLING: That does not mean that it is correct.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, I am delighted to hear that because now I can blame somebody else other than myself. So perhaps I could ask the Chairman of the Resource Committee when is your next meeting.

MR. H. BARRETT: Monday, 7:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. - Tourism.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1072

DW - 2

MR. W. MARSHALL: Okay, Monday, 7:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., Tourism. What about Social Services, when is the next meeting there?

AN HON. MEMBER: Social services, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room.

MR. W. MARSHALL: 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room and what Estimates?

MR. STAGG: Government Services is 7:30 to 10:30.

MR. BAIRD: Government Services is 10:00 to 1:00 in the Colonial Building.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Government Services is Monday night, is it not?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Monday evening, yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed to stop the clock?

MR. STAGG: Colonial Building.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Colonial Building. Well, the 7:30 one on Monday night we can clarify on Monday but there is only one on Monday morning as I understand it, The Social Services from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., is it?

MR. R. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. R. BAIRD: The list that I have says Resource Committee at 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Colonial Building that is Tuesday the - I am sorry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. BAIRD: Tuesday, the 28th. Government Services 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Colonial Building, Social Services 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Perhaps it could be clarified later on.

The hon. President of the Council.

April 25, 1980

Tape No. 1072

DW - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, then with that I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 p.m. and this House do now adjourn.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before we put the adjournment motion back on Head III, on the Committee of Supply?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Thanks.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 p.m.