

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief statement because this is December 1st and the media are most anxious to find out what is happening in our nomination of sites for offshore oil and gas developments.

The House will recall that in his public statement of October 16th past, concerning onshore developments related to offshore oil activities, the hon. the Premier stated that nominations for sites in addition to those designated by government and identified in the Premier's statement, would be received until December 1, 1980.

I am pleased to inform the House that I have received nominations for several additional sites for various oil related industrial activities. Evaluations of these sites against physical criteria defined for various activities, are now being carried out by my officials, and I hope to be able to inform the House of the detailed listing of these sites by the end of this week, or early next week.

The next stage of the process, consisting of environmental previews, will commence immediately after the sites have been identified.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wants to ask one, I will have to ask one, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: I want to direct a question to the hon. the Premier who is the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs. And it is a rather unusual question I want to put to the Premier so I hope you take it in the spirit in which it is asked.

Mr. Speaker, as members know, two of my constituents from Port aux Basques, Kenny Buttery and Hubert Francis, who went bird hunting on Thursday or Friday of last week, the engine broke down in their boat and they drifted about seventy miles out in the Gulf, were picked up by a Greek freighter, they were treated like kings aboard the Greek freighter but when they got to Quebec City where the Greek freighter was headed, they were treated like dogs, they could not get anybody to give them any assistance and but for the town policeman, who was not a Quebecer and drove them to the airport they would not have been in out of the cold or the wet, and they had to stay at the airport with nothing to eat and because it was two o'clock in the morning they could not get any assistance - and they were not begging, they were not looking for welfare there were no banks open and they had to wait until the next night to get some money from their parents from home to help them out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now I would like to ask the hon. Premier what can be done

MR. NEARY: in that kind of situation? Here we are talking about Canadian unity and the Constitution in this House: What can be done in that kind of situation when the Coast Guard refuses to even allow them to come in their office out of the cold and the harbour police will not recognize them? What can be done in that kind of a situation? Could the hon. gentleman tell this House?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is a highly unusual question. I have heard of such incidents before happening, Mr. Speaker, I can get the details of the information and the incident from the hon. the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) and make representations. I notice that the hon. member mentioned the National Harbour Police and the Coast Guard, so we would have to make representations, I guess, in those instances to Canadian Government authorities. I do not know if there are any Quebec authorities involved as well over which there was less than favourable treatment, but we surely can make representation to the respective federal agencies where these two people got less than favourable treatment and express our concern and go on record as opposing that kind of treatment and asking them why in fact they were treated this way. I do not see anything else we can do but we can surely do that, and if there are other incidents involving governments other than the Federal Government, of course we would do the same thing or likewise for those respective governments too.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Premier's answer. I would be glad to furnish him with the information and I will get the - as a matter of fact, both gentlemen have been in touch with me and asked me to use their names if I wanted to. They are prepared to go on television if necessary to show the whole world the way they were treated in the Province of Quebec. And we are noted down here for our hospitality and I guarantee you that would not happen in Newfoundland. Two citizens of Newfoundland up in Quebec stranded, treated like DP's! But I would like to impress upon the hon. the Premier that I would like for him to communicate our feelings, the feelings of this House and of the people of this Province, to the government of Quebec because I believe the Harbour Police - I am not quite sure now about this but I will find out - but I believe the police that they referred to were probably employees of the Province of Quebec although they could be National Harbours Board. And then there is the Coast Guard involved and various other agencies -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - but I will get the details and I will ask the hon. gentleman if he would indeed communicate our feelings to the various authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will do to the respective authorities.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. While I was recuperating last week I happened to hear a voice report on VOCM radio news and it was that

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2535

EL - 3

MR. THOMS:

of one Mr. Mcwhirther, who happened to be the High Exalted Priest of the Ku Klux Klan in Canada and he was saying that once they have established an office in Halifax, that Newfoundland was fertile ground and that they would be establishing an office here in St. John's. My question to the minister is

MR. L. THOMS:

whether or not his department is monitoring the possible actions of the Ku Klux Klan in St. John's -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask my question without noise from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: Whether or not they will be monitoring the activities of the Ku Klux Klan in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, yes, I have heard reference to some statement by Mr. McWhirther that he thought Newfoundland would be fertile ground and apparently they are establishing or saying they are going to establish an office in Nova Scotia now. I am not aware that there has been any attempt in Newfoundland to organize a Ku Klux Klan. And I certainly think McWhirther would be totally ignorant to the Newfoundland situation if he thought that there were any fertile ground here for the aims of his organization which, as I understand, are white supremacy or even perhaps limiting down the whites to the supremacy. But it is a totally racist organization based on racism and prejudice. So I really do not think that he would have any favourable reaction at all from Newfoundland. I cannot think of any segment of Newfoundland society which would be in any way sympathetic. And I think it would be a total waste of his time and effort if he were to come here. But if indeed he does attempt to establish here, certainly being aware of the nature of the organization we would watch it very carefully.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, when they are burning a cross in front of the minister's house he will not think it is quite as funny as this particular hateful organization is throughout North America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether or not any consideration is being given by his department to make representation to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) in Ottawa to have this particular organization- as I understand some other cities in Canada are doing- to have membership in the organization considered a criminal offence?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correct there has been some discussion on that. As I recall the consensus-it was more of a discussion, you know, than an actual position for an immediate decision but there was a discussion among ministers of Justice of that- and as I recall the consensus of opinion was that in case of an illicit activity on their part, there were relevant provisions of the Criminal Code and that to outlaw an entire organization, however despicable, I suppose, its aims might be, is a kind of action which, you know, in Canada is very, very



MR. OTTENHEIMER:

rarely justified. I could never say it could never be justified because, I do not know if one can be that absolute, but I think that there are ample provisions in the Criminal Code to guard the citizens against such an organization.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this particular organization is that despicable that it should be made a criminal offence to belong to the organization. The minister recalls of course it was made a criminal offence to belong to the FLQ in Quebec at the time of that particular crisis. But would the minister indicate whether or not his department - I do not know how many people in this Province are aware of what the KKK is really all about and how many people would join such an organization - but if an attempt is made to establish the Ku Klux Klan in Newfoundland, would his department, would this government undertake to give some public information about the organization to the people?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker certainly, you know if the matter did become a problem, if the organization did establish here and, you know, there appeared to be any reason to believe that they could organize on any realistic basis, certainly we would undertake to inform people of what the nature of the organization is. As I understand it, it is essentially a racist organization built on the premise of white supremacy and anti every other race, anti-black, anti-Semitic, anti-Asiatic; and also, I think, in religious terms, anti-Roman Catholic, and as I say I, myself, I know that there are people of all kinds of fringe views and fringe ideas, and sort of, you know, fringe crackpots, but I find it difficult, although anybody can be wrong, difficult

MR. OTTENHEIMER: to imagine that such an organization, based on anti every race but white, and in the religious sense, anti-Semitic, and anti-Roman Catholic as well, could have any audience or sympathy here. But certainly if the matter did become a real problem then we would certainly undertake to inform people throughout the Province of the nature -

MR. THOMS: It is a problem in Toronto, Mr. Minister.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I would not doubt that, in Toronto and probably - and perhaps, you know, in places like Montreal or Vancouver, I do not know. It could be. I would think that in Newfoundland there, you know, who would be receptive to them, you know, I find it hard to think of any group or even significant number of individuals who would be, but one never knows that, and if indeed there did appear to be a potential problem we would certainly undertake to be sure that the people knew precisely what their aims and objectives were. I suppose one of the difficulties with these organizations is that some people - I mean no doubt in a constitution or whatever they have, they probably have all kinds of laudatory phrases as well, you know, pseudo patriotism and belief in God and all of this, and these hate and anti-religious and

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

anti-race elements are hidden either in small print or may not be in print, they may just be in practice, and if the matter did become a problem certainly we would undertake to see that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador were fully aware of the nature of the organization.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Could he tell us what - report to the House on his trip to see the Queen or whoever he saw in England, and could he tell us what he accomplished during his trip to England?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As a matter of fact, in anticipation that the Leader of the Opposition and the House might like to know a little bit about the trip I would like to now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - give a full report to the hon. House as it relates to that very important matter.

As the Leader of the Opposition knows, and I guess most members of this House know, the purpose of my trip to England last week was twofold; one, it was to keep an engagement to the Canada-UK Chamber of Commerce for a speech that -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On a point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I understood the hon. the Premier to say that he was going to give a long-winded answer. I believe my hon. friend wanted a short answer. I believe it is against the rules of this House to give a long-winded answer to a short

MR. NEARY: question. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity to make a Ministerial Statement and he did not take advantage of it. But I would ask the Speaker to enforce the rules of being brief in questions and answers.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order. The rules are clear for everybody to observe and to respect. I cannot anticipate how long the answer is going to be because the hon. the Premier so far has only been about ten seconds. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked for a report and I will have to assume that the hon. the Premier will observe the rules, and if he does not then the Chair will certainly call it to his attention.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. My trip was twofold: One, was to keep a commitment to the Canada-UK Chamber of Commerce, at which time I took the opportunity to once again reiterate the Province of Newfoundland's and the Government of Newfoundland's position as related to the Constitution but also to talk about economic development of our Province, which I emphasized heavily in my speech to the Canada-UK Chamber of Commerce. However, there was another aspect to the trip which was just as important, Mr. Speaker, for the Province of Newfoundland and that was to sit down with business and financial people from England, Switzerland, and France particularly, to discuss the future of Newfoundland and Labrador and the economic opportunities that we have here. So it was a twofold trip; one to deal with primarily in a speech to the Canada UK Chamber of Commerce with constitution and economic opportunities in our Province and, secondly, to meet with a lot of people in England and throughout Europe, financial people, whom we might like to access in the next number of years as it relates to dollars and economic development. So I met with the Royal Bank of Canada London Limited, with Viscount Harding

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2538

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD:            managing director, and Mr. Robertson  
executive director and a Miss R.P. Reid, associate director of

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Royal Bank of Canada, London Limited, who are a very strong banking organization in England now, having increased the numbers from around 20 to 125 in the last year involved in about \$19 billion worth of projects around the world.

The Royal Bank of Canada, Canada's representatives, also flew over for the meeting, especially people of the Global Energy and Minerals group, Dr. Salton and a Mr. McKay, to talk about offshore oil and gas, hydro developments and the fishery in our Province, and the Royal Bank of Canada are very eager to get involved in a stronger way in our Province.

I also met with some people who are interested in offshore oil and gas, and particularly a Mr. Paul Bristol, who is chairman of K.C.A. International Limited and they are doing some of the major work now on the Frigg field and the Forties field in the North Sea and who want to get involved in Newfoundland's offshore oil and gas developments and will be over here in a couple of weeks time. I also talked to British Petroleum about their activities in Botwood, about their ongoing activities in Newfoundland, about the permits they now hold on their provincial oil and gas regulations with the managing director, Mr. Adam, the general manager, Mr. Basil Butler, Dr. John Martin, assistant general manager and Mr. James Ross, regional co-ordinator of the Western Hemisphere, and Mr. Jim Birch, area co-ordinator for Canada on British Petroleum.

Then from the business side, banking side, the Royal Bank of Canada, we went on to have very lengthy meetings with the Orion Bank Limited with the Rothschild and Sons Limited Bank, with J. Henry Schroeder, Wagg and Company Limited, Swiss Bank Corporation International Limited, Kleinwort, Benson Limited, Bowring Brothers

PREMIER PECKFORD: and Company Limited, S. G. Warburg  
and Company Limited -

MR. NEARY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Credit Swiss First Boston Limited.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: I believe Your Honour must have  
heard enough to realize that the rules of the House are  
being broken. I would like for Your Honour to enforce  
the rule as far as answering questions is concerned.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am just about  
completed. I am just going through the people that we met  
and I will be finished in another half minute or a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, obviously  
again, the rules are clear. I was observing the members  
to my right who seemed to be interested in the answer and  
I assume they wanted the answer, and if the hon. House is  
agreeable we will let the hon. the Premier complete his  
answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just to continue,  
I got to the Credit Swiss First Boston Limited, Credit  
Commerciale France. These people flew in from Switzerland  
and France to the meeting. (Merrill Lynch) International,  
Banking Corporation, Union Bank of Switzerland Securities  
Limited, Morgan, Grenfell and Company Limited, Ambrose  
Bank Limited, Goldman Saks International Corporation,  
Dominion Securities Limited, Hill Samuel and Company Limited,  
A. E. Ames and Company Limited, McLeod, Young and Weir  
International Limited - these bankers were interested not  
only in the economic opportunities available in the Province  
but for a firsthand explanation of the initiatives we have

PREMIER PECKFORD: taken recently as it relates to Albright and Wilson and Long Harbour and especially the Upper Churchill Falls legislation which was passed a couple of days ago, which we found great support for in England.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.



MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much I do appreciate the point of order made by my colleague. I was interested in seeing how the Speaker would handle that matter. Of course, we do not have to raise a point of order; it is up to the Speaker to keep control and that is why we did not pursue the matter.

A supplementary question to the Premier, and I am glad that he gave us all the information because one of the things that happened, Mr. Speaker, while he was away - the good news he announces, the bad news somebody else announces - and one of the pieces of bad news announced while he was away, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) essentially announced that he was going to wash his hands of Come By Chance. I wonder - in all of those great lists, Come By Chance was not mentioned, and I wonder in view of the great developments, with all those wonderful bankers, and the offshore and Hibernia, I wonder if the Premier could have found thirty or forty seconds to talk about some way in which we could preserve Come By Chance instead of washing our hands of it, preserve the investment in Come By Chance to take advantage of Hibernia when that develops or has the Premier accepted the fact that Hibernia oil will never come to Come By Chance and will never come to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) in his supplementary asked me about Come By Chance, because I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to personally congratulate the Minister of Finance for bringing off another

PREMIER PECKFORD: brilliant coup for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Who better to run Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, than our own Canadian oil company? Who would have a greater commitment to Canada and to Newfoundland than our own Canadian oil company? Who is it amongst us today would try to condemn the efforts of the Liberal Government of Canada to support and to uplift this national oil company so that Canada and Newfoundland become part of a great national energy policy? Who would? Surely it is not the Liberal opposition who would oppose a very policy that their own national Party has supported over the last year especially, and have attacked the PCs nationally on. So obviously, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Come By Chance there is no question, any person who has reviewed the documents, the court has reviewed the documents, the receiver has reviewed the documents, all the people involved in the Come By Chance situation have reviewed the documents and the best proposal on the table, bar none, was Petro-Canada. And the kind of deal that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was able to put together on Petro-Canada and Come By Chance, given the problems that it has in both crude oil supplies and in marketing, was a master, master stroke and we on this side support the Minister of Finance 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. <sup>N</sup>

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Do you still feel the effects of that wine you had on television the other night?

MR. LUSH: Lonesome Charlie.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, one of the rules of the House is that if a Minister decides not to answer we have to accept the answer. He made a brilliant diversionary speech but he did not answer the question, and that the fact of the matter, I presume, since he chose not to answer it is that he did not have any discussion about Come By Chance when he was talking to all those people in B.P. and the other places. And in his response, the coup, I presume the coup that he means -

MR. MARSHALL: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making a speech commenting on the answer that has been given. This is Question Period. If he is dissatisfied with the answer there are procedures open to him.

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had made a few brief words as a preamble to his question after listening to a long speech by the Premier who did not answer the question that was asked in the first place.

MR. FLIGHT: There is no point of order, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I must repeat again the rules are there clearly for everybody to understand and adhere to. I have tried to be flexible and fair and I will allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to pursue his supplementary question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary then to the Premier. Did he in fact have any discussions about the rehabilitation of the oil refinery at Come By Chance? Did he have any discussions whatsoever while he was in England about getting any kind of interim financing to reopen that oil refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of interest in Come By Chance as there was in the Lower Churchill development, as there was in offshore, and the big interest in Come By Chance obviously was in the linkage. We have, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, and most of our documents indicated that we want to through our oil and gas regulations, if they apply, an access to the crude oil on Hibernia must first be refined in Newfoundland if we have the capacity to refine it. So very much a part of our plans is linking Come By Chance with Hibernia. The question is that window of time between now and when Hibernia comes on stream and being able to put in place some kind of development plan so that Come By Chance is available for Hibernia four years or five years from now. So it is this window of time now that is critical and there is a high amount of interest given now the nature of Hibernia in Come By Chance and I have talked, yes, to people in Europe about the whole question of Come By Chance.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Of course, one cannot talk about it alone as it relates to any development deal, financial deal, unless one also talks to Petro-Canada, so Petro-Canada will be the lead agency as it relates to rehabilitation and re-opening of the refinery but we, for our part, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and myself and the Minister of Development (N. Windsor) will be involved and will pursue the matter with all diligence to ensure that the best possible development for Come By Chance comes off.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, I think that is a much more responsible answer than the first time I asked the question. I am glad that the Premier has now indicated he is going to take an interest in Come By Chance. Is the Premier aware that essentially the deal between Petro-Canada and the receiver-

MR. L. STIRLING:                    apparently they came to Newfoundland and said to the Province of Newfoundland, 'We will only proceed if you agree to certain things.' The certain things included the right of Petro-Canada, if they cannot have a viable operation, to scrap the oil refinery. Do I gather now that the Premier is indicating that he is prepared to re-open those discussions and not have the oil refinery scrapped and take back that unqualified agreement that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) gave in his absence?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):                The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:                Mr. Speaker, we will do all in our power to ensure that the kind of Liberal policies of the past as it relates to economic development are not pursued. That is, that there will be no more giveaways and where there have been Liberal giveaways the Tories will take back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:                      A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. S. NEARY:                    In other words, you are not going to do anything.

MR. SPEAKER:                      Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING:                    Mr. Speaker, we seem to have a kind of schizophrenia going on here today. One question is wild and hand-raising and characteristic, the next one seems to be reasonable and then when you pursue that, he then retreats to making some kind of political, obnoxious comments. The thing that -

MR. SPEAKER:                      The point of order?

MR. L. STIRLING:                    Yes, the point of order. On that question, Mr. Speaker, the question is, in fact, what the Premier has just gotten on with in no more giveaways is exactly what happened and I was trying to give him the opportunity to say that it happened in his absence. But

MR. L. STIRLING: that kind of giveaway is the one page letter that was done. It is an absolute giveaway to Petro-Canada. Do whatever you want, we wash our hands of it.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. President of the Council, to the point of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That point of order is an abuse of the rules of this House. A point of order is for the purpose of bringing up a disorder in one of the proceedings. What the hon. gentleman is using it for is the purpose of injecting his opinions for the purpose of debate and by so raising that point of order he is himself abysmally out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that several of them have gotten up on points of order.

Mr. Speaker, if I could refer you to page 133 of Beauchesne, paragraph 363, part(1), "A minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal" etc.; part(2), "An answer to a question cannot be insisted upon". And if Your Honour will turn to page 131, paragraph 358, part(2), it says, "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, in all three instances the Premier has gone against the grain by not being brief, he has not dealt with the matter raised in this particular instance, and he has provoked debate by talking about what went on in the previous administration of the



December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2543

NM - 1

MR. F. ROWE:

Liberal previous administration.

MR. THOMS:

Previous, previous.

MR. F. ROWE:

Previous, previous administration, so I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is entirely out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

With respect to the point of order, I did not really interpret that to be the point of order. It did not appear to me that that was the point that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was trying to make. In any event, you have quoted a section that is quite legitimate, quite legitimate, but in respect to the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe that was a point of order.

There is time for one further question.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, what about my point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

I beg your pardon?

MR. F. ROWE:

Is Your Honour saying that I was in fact raising a second point of order?

MR. NEARY:

No, you were on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was suggesting the hon. member was not relating to the point of order raised.

MR. F. ROWE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, need I repeat all this? Can I simply have a ruling on the point of order that I raised?

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, first of all, the ruling that I gave was related to the point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I did not hear the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde raise a point of order. He was debating or discussing the point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: - that the hon. the Premier has continuously and continually in this House, in answers to questions, disobeyed paragraph 358 of Beauchesne, part (2), "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

Now in the last instance I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was not brief, to start off with, and has never been brief. He was not dealing with the matter raised, which was a letter that my friend, the Leader of the Opposition raised, and he was provoking debate by referring to examples of some of the actions of the previous Liberal administration, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was entirely out of order on all three counts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. That is a statement of what the hon. member sees in Beauchesne and the fact of the matter is that questions are asked and answers are given in response to questions. The quality of the answer very often depends upon the quality of the questions. Unfortunately, because we are not the authors of the question, Mr. Speaker, we cannot be entirely responsible for the quality of the Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order -

MR. MARSHALL: And -

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry.

MR. MARSHALL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The government's main concern is to have a Question Period, not raise spurious, silly little points of orders like that.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the rules, as I said, are clearly outlined for all members on both sides. Because as the section quoted by the hon. member

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) deals with answers I suggest that the section also, or there is another section, I cannot just find the reference at this moment - that applies to questions as well. I bring that to the attention of all hon. members and at this particular point in time point out to hon. members that the time for Oral Questions has now expired.

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not mean to be challenging the Chair. The Speaker has informed hon. members that the time for the Oral Question Period is over, but did we get a ruling on this point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Yes, with respect to the point of order I gave the ruling that there was no point of order in this particular instance and that the rulings by the Chair, of course, during Question Period are not debatable or subject to appeal.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Juries And Compensation of Jurors In The Supreme Court Of The Province And Compensation For Certain Witnesses In The Courts Of The Province."

MR. SPEAKER: Answers to Questions for which notice has been given. Presenting Petitions.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman going to answer a question? Mr. Speaker, I have almost fifty questions on the Order Paper now since back in March and April of this year and I do not have the answers. Would the hon. House Leader indicate to the House when I am going to get the answers to these written questions?

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: This is not a point of order that the hon. member is rising here before the House now.

MR. NEARY: A point of information.

MR. MARSHALL: Points of information can be given during Question Period. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask me the question during the Question Period I will answer it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I do not think I have discuss it very much at length. I refer the hon. member to previous rulings that I have made on the same point of order. If you could check Hansard I think it will clearly state that that is not a point of order.

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Main - Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition similar to one that was presented last week dealing with patriation of the Canadian Constitution. And this petition, Your Honour, I present on behalf of approximately 600 people of the communities of Avondale and Colliers and the prayer of the petition reads as follows, "We the undersigned residents of Avondale and Colliers in the constituency of Harbour Main - Bell Island, do hereby protest most vigorously the unilateral patriation of our Constitution and do also support without reservation the recent stand taken by government and as a result of the foregoing we do today petition all members of the hon. House of Assembly to take a similar stand and support government in this effort."

Mr. Speaker, this petition reinforces the views of the constituents of Harbour Main who had their petition presented last week and, as I mentioned, it represented the views of 100 per cent of the people of that community.

MR. DOYLE: Now in presenting this petition I am very happy to say also that 100 per cent of the people who were contacted felt an obligation to sign this petition as well. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that a few of the points that were articulated last week deserve repeating in view of the very important and serious nature of the subject matter involved. It is again quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Avondale and Colliers are saying to the members of the House of Assembly in this petition that there are protesting the latest move taken by our central government in Ottawa to unilaterally patriate the Constitution of Canada and they are also, Mr. Speaker, asking that all members without exception support the resolution recently placed before the House of Assembly by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now in my view, Your Honour, this is a non-partisan issue and not one only for elected leaders of the federal government to decide upon but it is an issue that should be dealt with by all people at the grass-roots level because everyone without a doubt will be affected by any changes that are made in our Constitution. And I believe also that the people of these two communities are very concerned and they want to be given assurances and they want to be given guarantees that their rights and privileges will be protected forever. Nothing is more important, Your Honour, than the rules and regulations by which a people must live and raise their families. Constitutions are not documents that are changed every day. They are not like a labour agreement that can be renegotiated every two or three years and changes made to it as the need arises. It has to be considered a lasting document and a set of rules that the people of our country live by and that is why the people of Avondale and Colliers want us, as members of the House of Assembly,

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2544

AH-4

MR. DOYLE: to put forth a non-divided and a unified position to Ottawa to ensure that the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are forever protected.

So , Your Honour,

MR. DOYLE: placing this petition upon the Table of the House I would once again state, on behalf of the people of Colliers and Avondale, that this is just one more indication of how very concerned the people of these two communities are, one more indication of how concerned the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are regarding this particular matter. So I would now like to say, Your Honour, that I support this petition without reservation and I lay it upon the Table of the hon. House and I would like to have it referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: At the time of adjournment we were debating the amendment as proposed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk).

The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me start off by making a few remarks about how I perceived this issue over the Summer. I would like to do that while speaking to the amendment that the Leader of the Opposition so ably put forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have to start off by saying that when the constitutional issue first arose in the district that I represent, I do not believe the Fogo district was overly concerned, people of the Fogo district themselves. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the matter was and is important but I think the people of my district had a mild interest as they saw the First Ministers in this country try to bargain favourite status for themselves in a constitutional issue. Mr. Speaker, that was to be expected, but yet, while we are good Canadians and while we are good



MR. B. TULK: Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, I think we sometimes have to sit back and say, 'Well, what is the difference their being a Newfoundlander than a Canadian?' I, for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, cannot distinguish the difference between being a good Newfoundlander and a good Canadian; they are one in the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. B. TULK: The debate, Mr. Speaker, and the issue, as I said before, was far removed from the Fogo district. The more important issues in that district over the Summer, Mr. Speaker, were in the fishing industry. And I suppose the biggest single issue that hit my district this Summer was a fisheries strike or a fisheries lockout.

MR. WARREN: Terrible, terrible.

MR. B. TULK: Thousands of fishermen, or at least hundreds, Mr. Speaker, in my district spent this Summer wanting to fish but realizing that their future as an organized labour body was in doubt, they could not, either because they were locked out or they were on strike. So, Mr. Speaker, we spent the best part of the Summer in Fogo district frustrated by a lack of earnings in the height of the fishing season. Many of our fishermen, Mr. Speaker, were forced -

MR. MORGAN: Not on Fogo Island, you did not.

MR. B. TULK: Except for Fogo Island, Thank God for our co-op.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on. But not the Department of Fisheries.

MR. TULK: But certainly not the Department of Fisheries.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. MORGAN: We do not (inaudible)

MR. B. TULK: Without wanting social assistance, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of Fogo district this Summer,

MR. B. TULK: which makes up, as I said before, a large part of the Fogo district, found themselves without a livelihood. Mr. Speaker, one of the most humiliating things that those people had to undergo this Summer was when they had to go to the Department of Social Services and were told by the Social Services Minister (Mr. T. Hickey) in this Province that if you are a fisherman the answer is no.

MR. G. WARREN: Shame, shame.

MR. TULK: After opposition, Mr. Speaker, from a large part of this Province about that issue, those people were then reduced to having somebody from the Department of Social Services walk in and look in their kitchen cabinets or their kitchen cupboards. The privacy of Newfoundland this Summer, Mr. Speaker, was invaded, yet for eight weeks we saw no action by this government, no action at all except to go on television and ask those people to wait for seven days and then thirty days. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the final action that was taken by this government could have been taken at least two days into the strike.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Forest and Lands (Mr. C. Power) is well aware of this one, another problem in my district this Summer that took away from the constitutional issues were the problems in the sawmilling industry. Mr. Speaker, I live in an area where there is a dying forest, where the federal government, federal forest service says that at least 90 per cent of the forest is either dying or dead.

MR. TULK: We find a strange situation in that district where our people had export permits which could make jobs in an area where unemployment is probably as high as anywhere in Newfoundland, but because of dumping, Mr. Speaker, by mainland firms where they sold lumber for \$178 a thousand, they could not sell their lumber. Therefore, they had no operational capital, another fifty jobs gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House can understand that there would be no strong feeling towards the constitutional issue in the district of Fogo. Mr. Speaker, I do not think my people were in the mood, because before you can start thinking about the more important social things, you have to first of all have your physical needs met.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: This government, Mr. Speaker, has failed to do that in the district that I represent. But then, Mr. Speaker, comes October 20th at 7:30 P.M. We had the Premier with, I suggest, the biggest build-up in the last decade, come on television and tell us that our sacred rights in this Province were threatened. Mr. Speaker, I can clearly remember when that television programme came on I waited breathlessly. We had heard rumours in this party that the Premier was going to bring up the system of denominational education and the Labrador boundary as being threatened by the constitutional process that is now taking place, but we did not believe it. But sure enough, Mr. Speaker, there was the Premier at 7:30 P.M. on October 20th -

MR. WARREN: Large as life.

MR. TULK: - large as life -

MR. WARREN: Waving his hands.

MR. TULK: - waving his hands and explaining

MR. TULK: to us, telling us poor, ignorant Newfoundlanders that our whole way of life in this Province was in danger of being threatened. As my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) said, it was indeed the politics of fear. We were told that we were losing Labrador.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: I welcome the member for Stephenville.

We were told that we were losing Labrador, that we were losing our denominational system of education. Mr. Speaker, the strange thing was that in that speech, the Premier, I think, devoted one paragraph to mentioning our natural resources.

MR. WARREN: He was on for half an hour, was he not?

MR. TULK: One paragraph out of a whole half hour was devoted to natural resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, like every Newfoundlander in this Province, I am not willing to accept that anybody will take away rights that have been founded as a result of a long process in this Province. So when the House opened, we knew there was going to be a resolution put on the Order Paper concerning the Constitution but we fully expected that we would see a resolution put before this House addressing itself to those two sacred issues. The reasoning, Mr. Speaker, was simple. Those two issues were important enough to occupy a half hour of prime time television. The Premier dealt with them separately. Well, what did we get? We got a resolution, Mr. Speaker, where the two issues that the Premier mentioned, spent a half hour on television at, were not even mentioned. They were not even mentioned. So, Mr. Speaker, it is quite reasonable that the Opposition in this Province would become pretty suspicious of the government's motives and we were forced to ask if indeed the Premier was using those two sacred issues, issues which are dear to all Newfoundlanders,

MR. TULK: whether he was using them to gain their support and really cause an uproar in this Province where they would rally around him.

MR. STAGG: Rally 'round the flag.

MR. TULK: Rally around the flag. Were they then, Mr. Speaker, was the government and was the Premier using those two issues to pick another fight with the federal government?

Mr. Speaker, the only conclusion that we could come to was that this indeed seems to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition spent two or three days in our caucus deciding what our stand should be with those two sacred issues. And then we saw this, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's resolution. As the Leader of the Opposition said in introducing the resolution, we wish to make it quite clear that we support any sacred rights that are founded in our Terms of Union, but we wish also, Mr. Speaker, to separate the sacred from the political. The Leader on this side invited the Premier when he made his opening remarks in this debate, invited him to bring in separate resolutions on the other issues;

MR. B. TULK: bring in a resolution on offshore, bring in one on transmission of power across Quebec, bring in one on shared jurisdiction in the fisheries, and then we will see what we can support and what we cannot support.

Because, Mr. Speaker, on offshore ownership, on our offshore rights we agree, and we have agreed, I think, as has been said in this House many times, we agree on the ownership issue. We may not agree to the method of development, and we may not agree to a method of confrontation versus negotiation that this Province has taken with the federal government, but we agree we own it. But, Mr. Speaker, one other thing: the former Leader of the Opposition (D. Jamieson) in this House asked for a select committee to discuss and to debate and to explore and to investigate the affect the development that offshore would have on this Province. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are forced to ask the question what will it do to Newfoundland? For example, we have just heard the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), and we heard him before in this House, announce that in certain places the government has chosen certain places for growth centres in relation to offshore oil. They have selected certain areas where the land is frozen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question has to be asked and asked quite sincerely, will the growth of those centres and will the coming of offshore oil and gas to this Province lead to migration from the smaller centres? Will we see our young men and women flux into large growth centres in this Province and see the outport way of life, which the Premier - and I agree with him - seems to support so ardently, will we see those smaller centres die? In this context, Mr. Speaker, one has to ask quite seriously if we are promoting centralization, if indeed we have again got

MR. B. TULK: back to promoting centralization with this government - another issue on which I agree with them - a move which should never again be an issue in this Province.

One other question has to be asked, Mr. Speaker, and that is will the development of offshore oil and gas in this Province lead to greater inequalities than now exist as the cost of living rises to reflect wages paid to those employees with the oil and gas resource while leaving those on fixed incomes and the minimum wage still further behind?

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a political issue. There is little connection in that issue of denominational education and the Labrador boundary. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, we agree on some but not all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to a part of the government's resolution while speaking to this amendment that is very important in my district. It is the concept of shared fisheries jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I sat in this House last year as a young member of the Legislature and heard the Premier of this Province, and the then Minister of Fisheries, say that they wanted total control. Then last Spring, as I recall, in the middle of a resolution presented by the member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Andrews) I heard the Premier sit in his seat over there and say to the Minister of Fisheries while he was speaking to it, 'Well, we do not want total control, we want real consultation'. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the government does not know what it wants. They are fuzzy about what they mean by shared jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, one can further justify not extending the government's control over fisheries by an example of mismanagement that ever fisherman in this Province has experienced.

MR. J. MORGAN: The people of Fogo district are not saying that.

MR. B. TULK: I will take the minister to Fogo district any day at all and they will say, 'No, Sir.'

MR. G. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we can look at -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) federal government (inaudible) I can tell you right now.

MR. B. TULK: They would take, as somebody said the other day, one Romeo LeBlanc before they would take 1,000 of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that we now have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. B. TULK: My Liberal friends are fishermen as well as the minister's PC friends.

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. G. WARREN: You are upset. You are upset.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, one can further justify not extending the government's



MR. TULK:

control over fisheries and I am sure the minister will agree, he has to - by an example of mismanagement that is known to every fisherman in this Province and I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the Fisheries Loan Board where before last year everything seemed to be free. You could just ask and it was there. Then - bang! we enter the opposite extreme in this Province. There was nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Loan Board has become so rigid, I must say to the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) that I am pleased to see him introduce the latest regulation that has introduced to the House. It is a problem that I had to deal with this Summer and I hope had some influence in convincing the minister that he should introduce the regulation.

Mr. Speaker, we have another problem. We are told in a brochure that is published by the department that you have take ten per cent of the cost of building boats in this Province. Mr. Speaker, in the cases where there are federal subsidy and where the government bounty is paid, fishermen in this Province are now paying twenty per cent of the cost of a loan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if a boat costing \$300,000 is subsidised by the Federal Government and the bounty from the Provincial Government, that person will pay, not ten per cent of the \$150,000 but twenty per cent of the \$150,000 for a total of thirty per cent, it is \$30,000, that is correct.

I will give the minister an example. I will not use the name in the House, but I will give him an example. The rate of interest, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: is now eight per cent, and that is fair enough. The fishermen in this Province are not complaining about that, but I wonder is the Minister aware that fishermen who buy boats over \$50,000 are now required to pay sixteen per cent, or whatever the going rate happens to be, to the bank on a loan and then wait for the bureaucracy to refund whatever is over eight per cent -

MR. MORGAN: It takes two weeks.

MR. TULK: Two weeks. You are quicker than the Department of Finance.

MR. MORGAN: It should be back in two weeks -

MR. WARREN: Two weeks?

MR. TULK: So, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again -

MR. MORGAN: - that is automatic in our department.

MR. TULK: - why did they have to do it?

That in these political issues that we are talking about there are differences. But our amendment says take out denominational education and the Labrador boundary but let us debate these other issues on their own ground.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: That is not as my friend from Terra Nova (T. Lush) said, raise the head of sectarianism ever again in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on the local preference policy of this government and it is a policy versus the mobility of all Canadians from coast to coast. And like my friend from Grand Bank (L. Thoms), I would stand or fall on that issue because as I said originally, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I am a

MR. TULK: Newfoundlander or a Canadian.  
I care for Newfoundland as much as any man in this House -

MR. WARREN: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: - but I am also a Canadian too.  
And it seems to me that the government in this Province are giving our people a false protection and I cannot emphasize that word enough. Instead of trying to protect us from competition, what this government should be doing, and I wish the Minister of Education (L. Verge) was in the House, what this government should be doing is the Department of Education is giving our people the necessary skills and training, Then, Mr. Speaker, they will be able to compete with anyone.

At the present time I would like to suggest to the minister that there has been no real improvement in education as far as the department is concerned, there has been no real improvement in education in this Province in the last ten years.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: It is not an issue. Education is not an issue, it is not a vote getter, therefore governments have fluffed it off. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council of Canada tells us, and this report to the government, again is fluffed off, that Newfoundlanders, given the breaks, are more productive than most people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: So, I say to the minister, to the government, train our people and you will not have to protect them. They will get the jobs on their volition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want, before I finish, to take a couple of other issues that bother me as a Newfoundlander, that bother me as a Canadian. It seems to me that there is an attitude developing in this Province where the provincial government continually encourages mistrust of the federal government, particularly the federal Liberals. The federal Liberals, we are told day in and day are out to get us. No doubt about it, they are out to get us, they say. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in the Province believes, they would be crazy to believe, that any provincial government or Opposition will always agree with federal priorities or positions. But surely there is little need in this Province for the confrontation on every issue that this government has raised with the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Surely there must be some room for negotiation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for the government, for its own political end, to spread the attitude in this Province that the federal government, regardless of whether it is Liberal or PC, is out to get us. There is no need for it.

Mr. Speaker, I come from - my district is in the district of Gander-Twillingate. The other evening when the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) was talking about educational spending in this Province, and educational facilities, the spending of the federal government, which I suggest to this government has not been reached by the provincial government, the amount that he mentioned, and yet that is their sole responsibility, when speaking the member reminded me of the spending that I had recently seen that has been carried on in Gander-Twillingate since 1974 to 1979.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize before I get into those expenditures that Gander-Twillingate is only one of seven federal seats in this Province. And while our

MR. TULK: Federal MP is probably as good as most at getting money, I would say that it has been larger in certain areas. For example, I drove over a beautiful road the other evening on the way to Harbour Breton. Now the cost of that must have been enormous but I would suggest that it is one of three roads that goes down on the South Coast.

MR. FLIGHT: Provincial money?

MR. TULK: No, no, federal money.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, federal, oh.

MR. TULK: But in any case, Mr. Speaker, the total expenditure of the federal government in Gander-Twillingate, one of seven federal ridings, from 1974 to 1979 the total expenditure was \$260 million in one federal district. For example, let me take some, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion spend \$33,398,126, the Department of Manpower and Immigration spent \$16,638,000. I would like for the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook), the Minister of Municipal Affairs to listen. The Department of National Defence spent in Gander-Twillingate from 1974 to 1979 \$68 million -

MR. WARREN: In Gander?

MR. TULK: In Gander -

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. TULK: - and to add to that, Mr. Speaker, the same government through Transport Canada spent \$114 million, again of benefit to Gander.

I would like to suggest to the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) that indeed most of federal spending in Gander-Twillingate takes place in her district.

MR. FLIGHT: In her town.

MR. TULK: In her town.

So I would ask her, Mr. Speaker, if  
when -

MR. WARREN: Not in Benton.

MR. FLIGHT: Not in Benton.

MR. WARREN: No.

MR. TULK: Oh no, not in Benton.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. TULK: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Municipal Affairs the next time sits down in Cabinet and hears either the Premier or his colleagues talk that talk about that lousy federal government up in Ottawa, that she tell them, "Perhaps we should not always be confronting the federal government. Let us instead try to negotiate something for Newfoundland."

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Mines and Energy should do that.

MR. TULK: And the same thing, Mr. Speaker, speaking of federal government expenditure in Gander-Twillingate, in 1974 to 1979 the Bonavista North Loop Road was built. The construction cost was \$22 million, a federal expenditure. The Provincial Government - what did they do? Very little but try to take the credit. It is their role. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to this government that the people around the Bonavista North Loop Road know the difference.

That highway, Mr. Speaker, is the best in the Province, and I suppose it was built by the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for two reasons -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which road?

MR. TULK: The Bonavista North Loop Road. \$22 million, and it was built I suppose for two reasons, to give safe and easy access to the major centres, such as Gander, and again

MR. TULK: I would like for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) to listen. But I suppose the second and perhaps most important reason was for the development of areas covered by the district that I represent, Fogo, and the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition, the district of Bonavista North. Now, Mr. Speaker, our people have a safe and easy access to the major centers but I want to say that I believe through development control, the section of the department that the minister handles, after you get outside of Gander for four miles land use is so restricted that little development can take place. The result is any regional development that you want to take place in Fogo or Bonavista North is severely restricted. There is little development in the outlying areas. So what happens? Anything that we want to buy or just about anything that we want to buy, if we want to go shopping for a day we have to hike off to Gander and we give Gander fifty to sixty per cent, I am told, of its business.

MRS NEWHOOK: The hon. member (inaudible)

MR. TULK: I am sure the minister is well aware of that.

MR. FLIGHT: It is just designed that way.

MR. TULK: Designed or not, that is the way it happens, Mr. Speaker. Again we see a federal initiative to develop an area fouled by the provincial government's plans. I want to get into one other question, Mr. Speaker. The government of this Province seems to operate on the principle, and it is an important principle, that those who produce economic wealth should be in control of that wealth and get the first benefits from it. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree because that provides initiative to people. But the government carries through only when they are talking

MR. TULK: about offshore oil and gas for Newfoundland. Do they carry it through in the fishery? Let me speak to you about Fogo Island. The minister said, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said it is one of the best economic areas in Newfoundland. The people of Fogo Island are a self-made people and last year they exported \$22 million, the export value of their fish was \$22 million into the Canadian economy. This year, Mr. Speaker, they will reach \$35 million, yet this government looks at them and says, "You cannot get a decent ferry system or air strip because we do not have the money." There is not a water system or a sewer system in Fogo Island. Half the island, the little bit of road that has been paved on Fogo Island, I suggest that most of it has been paved as election bait and the rest remains unpaved. Hopefully when the next election rolls around we will get the rest paved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is that great principle that those who produce the wealth and those who use our natural resources to produce wealth are the first people looked after?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Where is that principle now, Mr. Speaker? Musgrave Harbour, another community in my district, produces annually about \$4 million to \$6 million worth of fish, export value again, and that community, Mr. Speaker, has been eleven years and there are still eighty homes not serviced by water and sewer. I think the Premier when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs had the privilege to cut off what the Liberals had started in that district. Now, Mr. Speaker, those people in that community who have water for want of a treatment plant they are still drinking mud.

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



December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2550

AH-3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

By leave. Is it agreed?

MR. TULK:

I will clue up in a few seconds,

Mr. Speaker. I just ask where is that great principle now that those people again who produce, who produce wealth for this Province out of natural resources, where is the principle? It applies on a provincial level if we are rowing with the federal government but it does not apply from the provincial government down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and talk about the urban and rural areas in this Province but I have no desire to divide this Province. But I will say this, that the attitude of a large part of urban Newfoundland towards rural Newfoundland was expressed very well by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who

MR. TULK: made a remark which he should withdraw about - you know, it was expressed very well by Richard Cashin when he said, 'Boy, it is good enough for them.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, in summary, I would like to say this, that our amendment that we have put forward in this House shows that we do not always and will not always agree with the federal government, whether they be Liberals or P.C.s, and that we will sometimes agree with the Province, but, Mr. Speaker, when politicians are reduced to using sacred rights and emotional feelings in this Province to get their political and economic ends, then we must disagree. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. STAGG: No.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) decided that he would tell us what he was talking about for the thirty minutes he had when he indicated that he was in support of the amendment because he never addressed himself to the amendment at any stage in his talk and I asked the Speaker about it privately and he indicated that a ruling had been made that debate could be wide-ranging. It was so wide-ranging that the hon. member did not deal with the resolution at all. So I think it may be his maiden speech. He has been here for two sessions now and I think this is the first or second time he has spoken so it is possible that that may be the reason. But I would implore the hon. member to address himself to the resolution in the future.

MR. STAGG: Before I get into the meat of my remarks, I must extend some congratulations to some hon. members opposite and some condolences to other hon. members. I see that one hon. member who used to sit close to the door has had his place taken by another hon. member who now has his back to the wall and as close as possible to the door. And congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition who has now been elevated to Cabinet ministers' salary, and the hon. House Leader for the Opposition (Mr. Hodder) who, I suppose, commenced with a raise in his stipend. And I think we have a new Whip on the opposite side, such are the plunders of the political process. And we have some demotions. To those of you who are demoted, well, my condolences.

Another interesting concept, another interesting fact is that opposite I think we have the world's record for former Leaders of the Opposition sitting in the House. I do not think we have received the resignation. At least it has been spoken about in the media but I have not heard it mentioned in the House today, that there are one, two, three former Leaders of the Opposition opposite and they are members of the House, and there is one Leader of the Opposition, so that is four. So I suppose eventually if you have enough leadership conventions you will all get a crack at it, boys.

I also understand that since I was here last - I have not been here since June; I would have been here earlier - but we have had the House of Assembly's version of the Leonard-Duran fiasco and there is a Roberto Duran sitting in the back benches of the Opposition, a Roberto Duran over there.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

MR. THOMS: The rule of relevancy, Mr. Speaker, certainly there is an extent to which the hon. member can go. I think comparing the situation that happened in the House a week or so ago has no bearing whatsoever on the matter being debated in the House right at the moment.

MR. STAGG: I agree, Mr. Speaker, I was out of order there but I was just cluing up my introductory remarks. I am just so glad to be back here in this place along with -

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

MR. STAGG: Well, I agree there is a point of order. I was not relevant to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary to rule on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, there is a legitimate point of order, and I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment on the floor.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at this amendment. If hon. members opposite would give me the benefit of listening, so that I could be heard in silence -

MR. THOMS: Look, we listened to you in Corner Brook before the DREE Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Yes, indeed I did, Mr. Speaker. I appeared before the DREE Committee in Corner Brook and we were talking about the Constitution at the time.

MR. THOMS: You were an embarrassment.

MR. STAGG: Yes, and I embarrassed a lot of Liberals who were in Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

December 1, 1980

Tape 2551

EC - 4

MR. STAGG: I embarrassed the Chairman and  
the Vice-Chairman who were there and I did it deliberately.  
I did it deliberately and I would do it again.

MR. THOMS: Hard stuff for Newfoundland.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, because there was a group of Liberal clones, they were clones of one another, they were all going before it and they were all being fed the line by the chairman, 'Would it be preferable if, in order to get DREE projects and DREE proposals before the federal government, that we bypass the Province?' That is what the chairman would say to the members and the members would say, 'Yes, I think that would be a great idea'. So I got there and I said, 'I am a PC, I am a Conservative, I am a member of the Newfoundland House of Assembly and I disagree with this sort of thing.' The chairman, whoever he was, he got into an argument with me and tried to beat me down and then when I tried to defend myself they raised points of orders saying I was not to be permitted to have anything to say. That is the Commons Committee that was in Corner Brook and I was the only independent voice on that particular day the rest of you were clones, clones, c-l-o-n-e-s. That is what you were.

AN HON. MEMBER: Clowns.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, clowns and clones.

MR. J. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not being relevant to the amendment under debate. And not only is he out of order in that respect, but I am not sure that the language that he is using, Mr. Speaker, is in order as well. So I would ask that the member refine his remarks to the motion.

MR. S. NEARY: He is a disgrace and embarrassment to the House.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is obviously responding to interjections from the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) into the debate which is making on the matter. If the hon. member would refrain from making his injections as he did, I am quite sure the hon. member will get on with his usual relevant and weighty speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is fair to say that there are some provocative remarks coming from both sides of the House, and I would ask the hon. member for Stephenville to confine his remarks to the amendment.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that I am within the bounds of relevancy. I was asked by one hon. member opposite who interjected successfully about my appearance before the DREE committee in Corner Brook. I addressed myself to constitutional matters there and this certainly would have to be relevant here. I indicated that they were clones. Well, maybe they are not clones, Mr. Speaker, but they have a remarkable similarity to clones.

MR. L. THOMS: You are challenging the Chair.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, one of the clauses in the preamble to this resolution of the Leader of the Opposition, his first foray into this sort of thing - I am sure it was drafted by him - and it says, 'And whereas the Government of Canada has stated their policy that such a result is neither intended nor desired by them,' then it goes on to say that, we should support the resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the Government of Canada, what about the Liberal Government and their statements of policy? Are their statements of policy, are they backed up in the long run? Do they always do what they say they are going to do?

MR. F. STAGG: I have a few brief comments to make on this and I am going to run you through the last twelve years relatively briefly. I think I have thirty minutes to go.

Now beginning with the Trudeau years, 1968 - June 1968 I was in Churchill Falls, by the way, in June 1968. Mr. Speaker, I was down in Churchill Falls with the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). He and I were college students at the time. We got there, by the way, Mr. Speaker, we got to Churchill Falls because of local preference. We got to Churchill Falls because of local preference. The hon. member's father was then a member of the House of Assembly and through his good offices we were able to get jobs down in Churchill Falls. And I must say, Walter Hodder, I thank you very much for it. That is one of the reasons we got down in Churchill Falls. When we were down there in 1967 and 1968 we found that there were a lot of university students down there but there were only a handful of Newfoundlanders. The rest of them were the friends of the Acres Canadian Bechtel and Dufresne Mannix and the rest of them from Ontario and Quebec and even Saskatchewan, an awful lot of them. That is where a disproportionate number of the Summer jobs in 1967 and 1968 on this grand imperial concept of Mr. Smallwood, that is where they went. Some of us were lucky, some of us had friends in higher places and we managed to get down there. Did I swallow my pride and go down to Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, did I swallow my pride and go down? Yes, indeed I did swallow my pride and I went down,



MR. F. STAGG: and made adequate money to go back and continue and finish university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STAGG: And I am sure that an awful lot of Newfoundlanders are saying to this government today, 'Thank God you are standing up for us so that we can get a job and they are not bringing the people in from the French -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STAGG: - bringing the Eastcan people in and these mobile groups of offshore oil workers, they would be ready at a moment's notice to get in there and take all the jobs.

MR. FLIGHT: Make them lose their self respect.

MR. STAGG: 'Make them lose their self-respect.' That is what the hon. member would like to have us with all the self-respect of the world but wallowing in poverty, that is what you want, yes, wallowing in poverty -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STAGG: - but I have my self-respect, nobody can say that I do not have my self-respect.

MR. S. NEARY: How many from your district are now out on the oil rigs?

MR. STAGG: I have several from my district out on the oil rigs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Several.

MR. STAGG: Several, yes.

MR. S. NEARY: There is one from Western Newfoundland and that is down in Rose Blanche.

MR. STAGG: Well, boy, your statistics are wrong because I was hunting with a fellow who goes back and forth -

MR. NEARY: There is only one Western Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

Well, I am going to get back to the Liberals now in 1968, I digressed for a minut there, Mr. Speaker, In 1968 I was reminded of where I wa and then I

MR. F. STAGG: was reminded of the relevance it is to the Constitution because of our local preference -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STAGG: - and how the Canadians practiced mobility -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - in 1968; they took all of the jobs that the university students in Newfoundland should have had. That is the Just Society.

MR. FLIGHT: That is a low blow.

MR. STAGG: Low blow! I will blow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: I would kick you anywhere if it meant that it would be better for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: I would not want to carry the metaphore too far, however.

The Just Society of 1968, that was a proposition that was foisted on the Canadian public by Prime Minister Trudeau shortly after he won the leadership convention of February 1968, the Just Society of 1968. Have we had the Just Society in the intervening twelve years? because they told us we would have the Just Society as they have said in this resolution, 'And whereas the Government of Canada has stated their policy that such a result is neither intended or desired by them,' Can you believe a word they say? I say, no, you cannot believe a word they say. What about DREE? In 1969 DREE - and I gave it to the DREE Committee in Corner Brook and if they ever send out the transcript so I can send it out to all of my constituents to show what a hero I was before that Committee in the midst of all these clones, I will indicate to you here now and I will indicate to my constituents and to anyone who would care to listen that as far as I am concerned Dree has been a

MR. F. STAGG: failure. They have thrown money at problems - not too much money, mind you - but they have thrown money at problems and have not addressed the real problem. One of the ministers of DREE threw a lot of money at his problem down in Burin - Burgeo and I think it worked successfully for him, he threw practically all of the money at it but I think he is resigning today.

What about the War Measures Act of 1970? Pierre Trudeau throughout his previous history he had been a civil libertarian, one of the red socialists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Yes, did it to protect civil liberty, he threw hundreds and hundreds of people in jail to protect civil liberty -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - and you know what happened, it gave the intellectual stimulus to the separatism movement in Quebec. They were drowned in 1970 and they were drowned again in the election of 1972 because of the fear that was prevalent in the Province at the time and of the manipulation of the press and the manipulation of the public. However, in 1976, in the sober light of retrospect and also seeing the kind of disreputable group that they had elected and all of the scandals of the Bourassa regime, they threw them out - and who did they put in? They put in the separatists, and separatism would have been dead in Quebec except for the War Measures Act and the method that the Prime Minister used to get back at some people who had not been friends of his and he had scores to settle. That is the Prime Minister who we are to believe will be consistent and will look after Newfoundland because they said, 'Such a result is neither intended nor desired by them so far as the boundary and the denominational school system is concerned', we are to believe them. Well, I say that hon. members opposite are being chattels of the federal Liberals. I suggest that

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2553

SD - 4

MR. F. STAGG: hon. members opposite are more  
loyal to the Liberal Party than they are to Newfoundland.  
Their first loyalty

MR. STAGG: is a political loyalty. Their first loyalty is to the Liberal Party and the acquisition and retention of power, The acquisition and retention of power. That is the Liberal credo. They have won the rat race, they have won the rat race on many occasions. On several occasions in the past twelve years they have won the rat race and as John Crosbie said in the House of Commons, quoting Lilly Tomlin, he said 'The problem with winning the rat race is after you have won you are still a rat.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Go away, boy. You are an embarrassment to the Province (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: I hope I am an embarrassment to you because these are the reasons I am saying it. I want to embarrass you. I want to evoke from some of you individuals other than a partisan response. I want you to have a look at this resolution.

Getting back to the Liberals in 1970-I am only as far as 1970 yet. They had an Energy Minister, Mr. Joe Green, who indicated in a policy announcement that Canada had oil enough for centuries. There was no problem with oil in Canada, we had it in abundance. That was in order to export a whole lot of it to the United States so that they could get the money back into the Canadian economy because of the way the Federal Budget had ballooned in the intervening two and a half years. How Bryce Mackasey in 1968 made it more profitable not to work, made it more profitable not to work when he raised the unemployment insurance premiums to heights never before dreamed. And who paid for the overruns? Who paid for the overruns?-

MR. STAGG: the taxpayer of Canada. And when that did not work, who paid then? They would print more money and feed inflation and drive up the prices. That is the Liberals, that is the Liberals who we are being asked to trust here. And the Energy Minister, Mr. Green, he did not last too long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: What about budget growth, budget growth? These are things that people do not want to talk too much about; budget growth is talking about money, statistics, People say, 'Well, I am not very good at it. I ask my accountant.' Well, the budget, the Federal Budget in 1968 was approximately eight billion dollars. That is a lot of money, eight billion. What is it now? I did not get the final figures but I think it must be close to seventy billion, is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are talking ten years ago.

MR. STAGG: Getting up around - between sixty and seventy billion. Between sixty and seventy billion, that is the money that the Government of Canada is spending, that is the money that they put back into the economy. Well, how do they get it out in the first place? They get it out by tax money, they get it out by deficit financing, by borrowing abroad and they get it out by feeding inflation, having a vested interest in inflation and by printing money. And probably by a variety of other ways, and they also want to get it back now by giving forty-three per cent of our offshore oil and gas to Petro-Canada, just a paper transaction.

MR. STAGG: You can have it. You can have it. Budget growth, budget growth. Has the Federal Government been in the least responsible in the past twelve years? The answer is no, it has not been responsible. There was one brief shining light of responsibility for nine months, for nine months or thereabouts or however long the Conservatives were in; it was a brief shining moment in Canadian political life in the last twelve years. It was snuffed out, it was snuffed out in February of this year, and we got a Budget there a few months ago, a couple of months ago that was a joke.

Now, what about 1974? - back in the Liberals, back to these people whom we are supposed to trust. What about 1974, when the Progressive Conservatives and the NDP combined in the House of Commons to defeat the Liberals, who only had a minority government because they had fought an election in 1972 on the basis that 'The land is strong.' Do you remember those stirring commercials, 'The land is strong,' in 1972? Well, they almost lost. They came within three seats of defeat.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) in 1972

MR. STAGG: In 1972, yes, boy, it was in 1972. 'The land was strong' in 1972 and the people responded by just about throwing the Liberals out of office, one hundred and nine to one hundred and six, and then the NDP and the PCs, in 1974, about April or so in 1974, they defeated them in the House of Commons, defeated them in the House of Commons on Mr. Turner's budget and we had an election and in that election, Mr. Stanfield, to his everlasting credit, indicated that the economy was in such a mess now, the economy was in such a mess because of six

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2554

EL - 4

MR. STAGG:                    years of Liberal mismanagement-  
as a matter of fact a lot more than that because Mr. Pearson  
had come before him, although Mr. Pearson,



MR. STAGG:  
Mr. Pearson.

I will not say too much about

MR. THOMS:

Only because you cannot.

MR. STAGG:

Because of Liberal mismanagement over the previous six years and their failure to respond to the energy crisis brought on by OPEC in 1973, it was thought that their budget was terrible, so they defeated it in the House of Commons. And Mr. Stanfield said, 'The only way to cure this - one of the methods of curing this is price and wage control.' He said, 'That is what we must have.' So what happened? The Pierre and Margaret show went across Canada on their train, whistle-stopping throughout Canada, decrying price and wage control as the sort of thing that you could never envision. And, of course, the N.D.P., who are closet Liberals in any event, they were right on - 'Down with Mr. Stanfield! Down with price and wage control! Up with the Liberals!' Yes, they got it in 1974, a majority Liberal Government in Canada. In October, 1975 what do we get? What do we get suddenly? Between 1974 and 1975 there has been a dramatic change in the Canadian economy. Mr. Trudeau suddenly finds that in those intervening fourteen months or so there has been a dramatic deterioration in the Canadian economy and it is now time for - and can you not see him in his little boy outfit, his little boy black suit on television with his rose in his lapel and his sepulchral tone, you would think he was in a mausoleum, as he told the people of Canada that we must have price and wage controls in 1975. This is the person who in 1974 cavorted - cavorted, I think, is a good word for it, Mr. Speaker - across this country decrying price and wage control, and the people of Canada, ever looking for an easy solution to a complex problem - and you cannot really say too much about the people because people will look for the easy solution to the complex

MR. STAGG: problem - they voted for him. And between 1975 and 1979 the government lurched along from crisis to crisis and found out that the RCMP were going and breaking into people's houses in Quebec, we find out -

MR. NEARY: They did it in St. John's also.

MR. STAGG: St. John's also? Well, if you know about it you tell us about it. We find out that the gloves are off, the RCMP can go out and break the law under this Liberal regime, and this paragon, this Northern magnet is the person who is supporting all of this and the perpetrator of all of this. And in 1979, having avoided an election for almost five years, he had an election and was defeated. And in came a group of people who decided they were going to do something about it. We had a budget in December of 1979 that will be looked upon as one of the most formidable economic plans that Canada has ever seen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Unfortunately, there were certain problems at the political end so they decided - the N.D.P. again, the closet Liberals, they came out of the closet again dressed up I do not know how, but it would be interesting to see how they were dressed that evening, because one gets certain impressions about them. Out they came and they defeated the government in the House of Commons. And then they ran an election on the basis of eighteen cents on a gallon of gas. Well, I drove in from Stephenville last night and I bought gas on the Trans-Canada Highway - thirty-seven cents a litre. Multiply that by 4.55 and you get approximately \$1.70 a gallon that it cost me for gasoline on the Trans-Canada last night. Do you know what gasoline was a gallon in February? It may have been

MR. STAGG: \$1.20, it may have been about \$1.30. Eighteen cents - it is going to be more like eighty cents. And it will go up to \$3.00 a gallon. And we have other examples. That is Liberal hypocrisy. It is something that hon. gentlemen are well acquainted with and obviously condone.

So what about this resolution that we have here? This is a resolution that shows a complete lack of understanding of the issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is an amendment.

MR. STAGG: This amendment to the resolution shows a complete lack of understanding of the issue. It shows, really, that hon. members opposite as I have indicated earlier are more loyal to the Liberal Party and the Liberal tradition

MR. F. STAGG: gaining power and keeping power at all costs, they are more loyal to that than they are to Newfoundland. What about the mobility rights? What about the offshore rights? Do they not want anything in there about that? What about -

MR. THOMS: No, we do not.

MR. STAGG: No, you do not want it, you do not want it? Well, the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) does not want it, he does not want it. He wants all the jobs to go to the rest of Canada. He wants the construction jobs to go to the Halifax Shipyard and other places. He does not want it to go to Argientia or to Spanish Room or other places throughout the Province, or Stephenville because we are in there for some of it, he does not want it to go there, he wants it to go elsewhere. That is what the member for Grand Bank who is standing up there slouching his way through a cigarette in the doorway, that is what they stand for. And hon. members opposite are to be pilloried at every possible opportunity by people here and people elsewhere and they are going to be pilloried by the electorate at the first possible opportunity. I think we will start in Bellevue. If the declaration of resignation is followed up in fact by an actual resignation, I think we will have to go down to Bellevue. I might even make a few appearances in Bellevue myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Just ask me, just ask me to go down to Bellevue and I will lay it on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: 1978, listen to this! In 1978 there were two rigs offshore at Newfoundland. How many Newfoundlanders were working on those rigs?

MR. DINN: No Canadians.

MR. STAGG: No Canadians! There was somebody over

MR. STAGG: there recently beating his breast - as a matter of fact I saw the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), this was his acceptance speech, he got up and beat his breast, "I am a Canadian. I am a Canadian". How many Canadians were offshore? Zero in 1978. And how many Canadians are offshore now? An awful lot.

MR. DINN: 900.

MR. STAGG: 900 Canadians offshore now. How did they get there? They got there, I would submit - hon. members opposite would say they got there because they swallowed their pride, they were willing to take second class citizen status, that is how they got there. Hon. members opposite would have us poor but -

MR. FLIGHT: He went to (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Yes, have us poor but we would have our pride.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) on the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Poor but we would have our pride. I am afraid that a certain leader of another political party whose ghost is over there today will eventually make it into this House of Assembly because of the paucity of ideas.

MR. FLIGHT: Keep worrying.

MR. STAGG: Well, everyone should be worried when you have a government that is governing and you have an Opposition that asks the kind of foolish questions that they asked in the Question Period here today. One, two, three questions. One, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that should not have been the lead question - important to the two fishermen who were lost and went to Quebec and were not treated well, but surely it should not have been the lead question. Is there no discipline over on the other side?

MR. STAGG: Is there no discipline? Is there no sense of priority? The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), obviously these are his constituents, he was bringing it to the floor, but really the Question Period of the hon. members opposite has always been very low quality but I think they have sought and found a new low in this. And I must say the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), although I congratulate him on having won the position, he is not off to a very good start. And this resolution that he has here, certainly if that is an example of the kind of leadership he is going to show to his colleagues and the kind of policies that he is going to propose to the people of this Province that was supposedly to catapult him into office, well, I think eventually if - that is presuming all of these fellows get re-elected - we will have four Leaders of the Opposition over there and a Leader of the Opposition. And you probably will have a caucus of five so you will all have your own office because I think your furniture and your secretary and all these things go with you when you are Leader of the Opposition. So the perks of office will go with you. And, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time. But I must say I am delighted that hon. members, I am to some extent delighted that they put it on the Order Paper because I am a partisan figure, you see. I believe that the P.C. Party is the right party and the Liberal Party should be politically wiped out. And I must say I thank hon. members for the political fodder that they have given me to assist me in that. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for St.

Mary- the Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY

He is our answer to Sugar Ray

Leonard here.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

I would gladly relive that match, Mr. Speaker, if I could be Duran and that guy could be littered out in the corridor somewhere. The only thing would have to change would be the colour. There is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province does not allow TV cameras in here to have to listen to what we just had to listen to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

I do not profess to be a great speaker by no means, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is just as well.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Well, I agree with the member, but I tell you if I could not put on a better show than that I would be darned if I would ever run for re-election again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I am glad I did not attend the same university that he did. No wonder they did away with what Mr. Smallwood brought in, free tuition, I can see why.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks on this amendment to the resolution that was put forward by this government. The thing that amazes me is that I cannot see how this government

MR. D. HANCOCK: cannot support the amendment when the Premier went on TV for twenty minutes and the two main things that he spoke about were -

MR. G. FLIGHT: The only two things.

MR. D. HANCOCK: - the only two things really that he spoke about the mentioned a couple of other things just in passing but the main two things that the Premier spoke about were the denominational system and the boundary. And a guess if you want to be hypothetical about anything you could find loop holes in whatever you want to imagine. But I do not for one feel, Mr. Speaker, that the denominational system will ever change and that the boundary will ever change. If I did I probably would not be over here, I would be over there. I do not think it is going to change, it will never change. For any government, especially a federal Liberal government to put in the vicinity of \$40 million into the denominational system in the churches in this Province and then to turn around and try to do away with it to me is a bit ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I had a phone call this morning and it disturbed me. As a matter of fact, after it was all over I just got together and I sent out a little package to this lady who phoned me from the Cape Shore. She could not send her child to school this morning because she did not have a pencil and she felt embarrassed. That woman with nine in the family, seven children and two parents, is living on \$513 a month and we are going to stand here in this House, elected members on both sides, Mr. Speaker, and argue about a little thing like the Constitution when we have people out there who cannot send their children to school.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.



MR. D. HANCOCK: I will tell you how much interest there is in my district, and I meet as many people in my district as any guy over there and I would challenge anyone to say that they meet more people in a run of a week than I do, and I cannot get one person to mention the Constitution whether they are in favour of it or against it, they just do not give a damn. They want jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK: My district is basically a fishing district, Mr. Speaker, and if it were not for the fisheries we probably would not be there at all, we probably would be starving to death. But our system has to be changed. We cannot expect fishermen to live and work for two or three months of the year, - my God, I could not work for two or three months of the year and then draw unemployment, I would just crack up with seven or eight months off the year.

AN HON. MEMBER: It would never happen.

MR. D. HANCOCK: It would never happen, the hon. member says it would never happen. Something has to be done. I represent a district which, I can tell you right now, from November until April or May has the highest unemployment rate in Canada. We have nothing. We have the fishing industry and that is it. And if we do not in the future, Mr. Speaker, bring in some secondary industries into districts like my own, then we are not going to survive whether we get the bloody oil or we do not get the oil in my opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: You cannot put the constitution in the oven for Sunday dinner at the thought of getting oil.

MR. HANCOCK: It is like a person said to me yesterday, she said, 'You cannot eat the Constitution, you cannot put it on your table, and you cannot feed your bloody family with it'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK: 'Why', she said, 'do elected members of the House of Assembly spend so much time on foolishness?' she said. We had the flag debate that went on for six or seven weeks and we were just as bad as you guys to stand up and argue with you. There are more important issues facing this Province today, Mr. Speaker, than the flag or the Constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I am not going to

MR. HANCOCK: stand here for thirty minutes, but I have a point to make, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to make that point. I was elected to make points here.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of this House of Assembly have to change. There is no way a person should come in here, be elected and get the money that we are getting now and be allowed to stand on his feet and listen to the bull that this man over there shot for thirty minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Rubbish, rubbish.

MR. HANCOCK: It should not be allowed. Ten minutes on this constitution is long enough for any person -

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is too long.

MR. HANCOCK: - any person, it is long enough, and other issues that are not as important as the constitution, ten minutes is long enough to speak on them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. HANCOCK: We could be bloody well out looking after the problems in our district if we had never spent as much wasteless time here as we spend. And I for one, Mr. Speaker, cannot understand why the Premier - I know it is a secondary thought - why he has not gone to the Committee that is set up and let his beefs be known to that Committee. First of all, before he went on TV for twenty minutes or twenty-five minutes, whatever it was, that would be a last resort if I was Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, or any other level-headed person would be, first of all, to get all the facts, present your beefs to the Committee and then if they do not accept it then you buy the time and let the people know what is going on. You do not put the cart before the horse at all times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: There are times when you have to be level-headed.

MR. NEARY: Right on, right on, right on!

MR. HANCOCK: And I think there is something we have to dwell on, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: I would gladly support shared jurisdiction of the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this Province or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) could guarantee me, Mr. Speaker, that we -

MR. HISCOCK: Get better management.

MR. HANCOCK: - not only better management, but if there was a storm damage or whale damage, whichever occurred, that the Provincial Government would take care of it, I would gladly support shared jurisdiction if I could get that in writing and every fisherman in my district would get it in writing. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: - but right now I cannot support it. No. It would be suicide, Mr. Speaker, for not only that government, for this government, if we were the government, to be licensing fishing boats and small boats around the Province. It would be suicide.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: The Tories would get it when you guys were in, the Liberals would get it - we have this system and we are not going to change this system because we are not all politically naive, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is having -

MR. HANCOCK: No, it is not happening now, no, no. No, it is not happening -

MR. NEARY: You can get a crab licence if you know So-and-So in the government.

MR. HISCOCK: Sure you can.

MR. MORGAN: In Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: No, right here. I am talking about a crab, a processing -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - a processing licence -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) naive.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - a processing licence -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

This House is beginning to get in disarray, I suggest, because of the shouting back and forth of hon. members. I am sure the hon. member from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) would like to be heard by everybody in this House and it is making it very difficult. So, I call that to the attention of all hon. members and ask the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes to continue with his comments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I know there are times when we all get carried away from both sides of the House.

There is another thing in this that I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, this mobility clause, There has to be a way other than the way the PC Government is doing it. We have a local Manpower here which can be told what to do, in other words. You can go down to the local Manpower as the minister and say, "Look, we want jobs for Newfoundlanders". You do not have to go publicly and say, "Look, nobody is going to get hired only Newfoundlanders".

MR. HANCOCK: My God, if that happened to Ontario tomorrow, this Province would have the highest unemployment rate in any province across the Nation. It has now but it would be doubled, I can assure you, if one province -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: - if one province, if one province, Mr. Speaker, said, "Newfoundlanders, go home, we do not want you, we need jobs for our local guys here". This is just stupid. It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Having spoken for five or ten minutes on this, I think it is long enough, Mr. Speaker, and there are more important issues that we have to get down to, but I think if we have more co-operation on both sides of the House, then I think this Province, Mr. Speaker, will be a hell of a lot better place in which to live.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the hon. member for Port au Port? Those in favour of the amendment signify by saying 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MR. STIRLING: Divide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Division?

Those against?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the 'nays' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed to waive the ten minutes on both sides?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

Is the House ready for the question then again? Those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Flight, Mr. Lush, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Thoms, Mr. William Rowe, Mr. Frederick Rowe, Mr. White, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Warren, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Neary, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Hancock.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the amendment, please rise.

The hon. the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture and Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mr. Dawe), the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Andrews, Mr. Butt, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Carter, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Aylward, Dr. McNicholas, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Baird.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Those in favour of the amendment, fifteen. Those against the amendment, twenty-seven. I declare the amendment lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We are back on the main resolution now.

The hon. member for the

Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Maybe someone from the other side would like to speak, in which case I will yield.

Assuming



MR. E. ROBERTS: rights are protected, I would like to say a few words on the main motion but if -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, I mean the last speaker was from this side of the House. We are on the main motion, yes.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I intend to move an amendment before I conclude which I think will give the hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity to show whether, in fact -

MR. F. STAGG: I thought the member for the Straits (inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, but, Mr. Speaker, let me say two things right now to my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and I am very glad to see him back and I know he will understand what I say when I say I wish devoutly he could have been with us last week. I understand why he was not and I feel very deeply about that. But let me say this to him; first of all I only half an hour and I did not interrupt him and I would ask him to do me a reciprocal courtesy. Secondly, my friend for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) was talking about a very bad speech made from the member for Stephenville. I am going to try to make a better speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: I may or may not be able to make it, but as my friend for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) says, 'That is an immense effort.' I shall try to rise above it. But I have a few things I want to say before I move the amendment about this mobility preference business that we hear so much about from hon. gentlemen opposite. And we do hear a great deal about it; I suspect because they have so little else of which they can boast, so little else in which they can take

MR. E. ROBERTS: pride. And I want to make one or two remarks because never in my recollection I have heard so much camp and nonsense and jargon and mumbo-jumbo and material which is intellectually dishonest and certainly in my view is not the kind of conduct of which any government or any members of the House of Assembly in this Province or anywhere else ought to be guilty.

I have three points I want to make with respect to these mobility rights. And hon. gentlemen opposite may or may not agree with them but I will suggest to them that they make a great deal more sense than much of the nonsense which we have heard about this. I first of all, want to say that as I understand the Constitution of this country, we, as a Province, have a legal power to make regulations, to make laws, this House does, the legislative sovereignty is vested in this Legislature. If we enact statutes that is one way the jurisdiction is exercised. We also delegate certain powers -too many powers in my view- but certain powers to the executive government, to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the Cabinet. And we as a Legislature do have powers to make laws which would require local preference and I use that term in a sense in which it has generally been used these past few days in this House and that is having to do with the employment of Newfoundlanders on the offshore drilling rigs.

Our power to do so, our legislative power in this House of Assembly acting together with His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor to enact legislation, our legislative power is not in any way conditioned upon who does or who does not own the resources off our coasts. Hon, gentlemen opposite may not grasp that, I am not sure the hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) has understood that, but I would counsel him and advise him

MR. E. ROBERTS: to mull it over because that is so. That does not detract from the belief which I have in the ownership by this Province of those resources. I do not have any question in my own mind, I think we own them. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel that we own them too, so do hon. gentlemen on this side. Unfortunately, for these purposes the Government of Canada does not and they have not accepted our claim. So that is where we are with respect to offshore. That is why we have come to the point we have reached.

But with respect to the jurisdiction, the legal authority to enact local preference regulations, this is inherent in our jurisdiction under the British North America Act as it now stands and it will not be changed in this respect by the Constitutional changes except insofar as I shall discuss later on. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is writing it down - it may or may not be a typical brilliant point of his in debate. I shall come back in a minute to the requirements that would be enacted by

MR. ROBERTS: the constitutional proposals being put forward by the Government of Canada at Ottawa. The first one I want to make is that as of today, our power to enact these regulations - and I believe they are validly enacted - our power to enact these regulations is not inherent - I am sorry, is inherent in our jurisdiction as a Province, our legislative jurisdiction, does not depend - those rights do not depend, that power does not depend upon whether or not we own the offshore, and I think that is important. And when I hear some of the guff that is got off by hon. gentlemen opposite who say that unless our ownership is confirmed - and I am not so sure that they really believe that they own it because they are seeking the House's approval for a confirmation of it and asking the Government of Canada to do something to confirm what we already own, and we already own it. So what they are really asking is for the Government of Canada to abandon the claim which they, the Government of Canada are putting forward. But our power to make these regulations, our power to make regulations about the offshore is dependent not upon our ownership but upon our legislative jurisdiction under the British North America Act, and, I guess, particularly Section 92 of that enactment. That has already been recognized by our own law. The Labour Relations Board of this Province, which I believe is the only court of record that has ruled upon this question, has come to that conclusion. I may add, in so doing they went against companies who were doing what they properly had the right to do, companies seeking to say the Canada Labour Relations Board, the Parliament of Canada's agency for labour relations matters, that the CLRB had the authority to make laws with respect to the offshore. That stands. I am not sure whether that decision has been appealed or not. If it has been appealed from the Newfoundland Labour Relations

MR. ROBERTS: Board to the courts, I am quite confident when I say the courts have not disposed of that appeal as yet. But I simply want to say that the only body in this Province to adjudicate upon the matter, as far as I am aware, our own Newfoundland Labour Relations Board, has come to that conclusion and did so despite the submissions by several companies engaged offshore who said that the CLRB ought to have the jurisdiction.

I think those who claim that our right to enact regulations is dependent upon ownership are being intellectually dishonest and I will leave it at that.

Now, secondly, let me turn directly to the constitutional proposals which are before the joint committee at Ottawa and which we are talking about in this resolution.

As I understand them, they would strike down any law anywhere in Canada that restricts the ability or the freedom of any one of us as a Canadian to live or work anywhere in this country. Now, I do not have the wording of them in front of me and I am not sure that the wording is particularly good. In fact, there is a great deal, in the wording of the resolution that is before the Parliament of Canada, a great deal in my view needs to be improved upon. I would think the Committee - which has three Newfoundlanders on it, by the way, three Newfoundlanders out of the twenty-five members, that is a pretty good representation, Senator Petten and Mr. Tobin, the very brilliant and dynamic young member from Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe and Mr. McGrath, a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of respect, even if the government opposite at times have been heard to question his Newfoundlandness, I guess, if there is such a word. But I have a great deal of respect for Mr. McGrath

MR. ROBERTS: even though I have never in my life voted for the gentleman and I never intend to. But I have a great deal of respect, and he has been elected to Parliament and for good reason, he shines in the debates in Parliament.

The Committee is going to make a lot of changes, I have no doubt, and some of them ought to be made. And I think one of the sections they ought to look at is the wording of the mobility provisions. I do not want to get into the wording, but I do want to talk about what we will obtain if that wording is adopted and I want to say why I think some words ought to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is simply this, either we in Canada are Canadians with the freedom to live and to work where we wish, or we are not Canadians. Because if we do not have the freedom to live and to work where we wish, in my view we have lost one of the greatest freedoms that any peoples can have and I do not see any point in being Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The government are fond of saying, 'This protects 900 jobs'. Well now I say to the Minister Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) if he wants to take care of the 30,000 - how many unemployed have we today? .

AN HON. MEMBER:

30,000.

MR. ROBERTS:

30,000.

AN HON. MEMBER:

More than that.

MR. ROBERTS:

More than that, I have no doubt, and if the Minister of Labour and Manpower was among them we would be all better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I would say that if the Minister of Labour and Manpower really wants to do it, let him enact legislation, which he has the constitutional right to do and which is as sound in principle as this offshore regulation of which he boasts so nauseatingly time and time again, let him enact legislation to say that nobody shall work in Newfoundland unless he was born here and brought up here because that is the logical extension of what the minister is talking about, that nobody should live in this Province unless his mother happened to be here and the moment when the term of her pregnancy came to its natural conclusion. And there is as much logic in what I have said - and there is no logic at all in what I have said - there is as much logic in it though as there is in his defence of the government's policy in this matter. Why should we single out offshore? If we really believe in Newfoundland for Newfoundlanders, then to hell with the rest of Canada, which is what this government are saying, and let the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) ban all of the teachers except those who happen to be born in Newfoundland.

MR. G. WARREN:

Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS:

And let the Minister of Lands and Forest

MR. ROBERTS: (Mr. C. Power) ban all employees from the President of Bowaters and whoever the chief man is at Price-Abitibi on down to the lowliest seed carrier. And let the Minister of Health (Mr. House) ban every doctor and every nurse except those who were born in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the logic of it.

MR. THOMS: That is the logical conclusion.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, that is nonsense, is it not? That is a prescription for suicide as a people; that is a prescription for drawing in the walls around us; that is a prescription for getting it a hole and pulling it in after us; yet that is what this government are talking about, that is what they are doing. Oh, they may say, 'The 900 jobs for the offshore, you are against them'. Oh, I can hear the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) prating and prattling now, I can just hear him. And the saddest thing is I suspect he believes it, that is what causes me to despair, that he really believes this narrow, chauvinistic, anti-Canadian, inward-looking, anti-Newfoundland policy. By God, he cannot even get right on that stuff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: It cannot even be justified on the grounds that it is in the best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador because if that policy were to be adopted by all our fellow Canandians we would double our population overnight, would we not? Is there a member of this House who has not got somebody in his family employed somewhere on the mainland? I doubt if there is. I doubt if there is a member here who does not have a first cousin or an uncle or an aunt or a brother or a sister, a nephew or a niece working somewhere on the mainland in Canada.

MR. ANDREWS: My sister has got to leave Montreal.



MR. E. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman said that his sister has got to leave Montreal and that should be struck down too and it will be, and that is the reason it should be struck down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree completely with the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews) that if his sister has to leave Montreal because of an enactment of the Quebec Legislature -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the work permits.

MR. ROBERTS: - and the work permits should be struck down too, you are blankety well right they should be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they should be, and we should be the first to stand for that. The hon. gentleman's party is standing against it. The hon. gentleman is standing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is standing for a policy to endorse the work permits, because that is what we have now. He is standing for a policy that if our sister provinces adopted it could see thousands of our people sent home as he was sent home, and hopefully with better results than he produced by coming here.

Mr. Speaker, the policy is anti-Canadian, it is also anti-Newfoundland and I find it intellectually dishonest and I find it politically dishonest and I find it offensive in the extreme. It is short-sighted, it is divisive of this country, and why are we Canadians if we cannot live and work where we wish? Why are we Canadians? Suppose we were to say to my friend from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), who had the brains to move to Canada and become one of us, I believe, but who did not have the good fortune to be born one of us, are we going to say to him, 'You shall not practice your profession because

December 1, 1980

Tape No. 2562

SD - 4

MR. E. ROBERTS:            you were not born here'? There is  
as much logic in one as the other. And the member for  
Exploits (Dr. Twomey), an estimable gentleman, would be  
favour a policy that says, 'No doctor shall draw breath  
professionally in this Province unless he was born here'.

MR. ROBERTS: Why single out the offshore? I will tell you why. Because it is emotional, the same reason these so-called sacred rights were singled out and we will deal with those in this amendment. And we will see if the government can put their action where their mouths have been, we will see who is playing politics, we will see who is being hypocritical. But I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they should give deep and grave thought to this. If it has been done in other provinces, as it has, that is not reason for us to do it. If one man goes out and murders his fellow that is not justification for us to go out and murder somebody. And if we in Newfoundland with thousands of Newfoundlanders and thousands of Labradorians working happily and gainfully across this country should erect the wall across the Cabot Straits, then we had better make it high enough to keep all the Newfoundlanders who are going to come back when they are made to leave because of the walls erected around their province. It is the most astonishing policy that a group of men whom I believe believe they are acting in the best interests of this Province, I believe they believe that, and they have some brains and they have some honour, but a group of men who are either unsure of themselves, who do not feel that we as Newfoundlanders can go wherever we wish in Canada and hold our own, and we can although I think members opposite really have their doubts about that. They have an inferiority complex. It shows all the time. They boast, and that is the surest sign of a bully. The surest sign of a man who is unsure, as Your Honour will recognize, is the man who has to boast. The drunk who swaggers up to the bar and says he can lick any man there has to prove that to himself. The man who has some confidence, the man who knows whereof he speaks, does not have to boast. And that is of course why the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) is so vehement in his defense of this policy. That is precisely why. And the Premier as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as a Newfoundlander it causes me grave concern because I am a Newfoundlander and I am a Canadian and I value my right to live and to work where I wish in this country and I want to see that right preserved.

MR. THOMS: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And that is why I think the provisions of the Government of Canada are asking for may need to be improved, but need to be implemented. They ought not ever to have to be put into law because you would think we as a people in Canada would be sensible enough. But the truth is we are not. And these provisions are not aimed against Newfoundland: They are aimed against all of the provinces that have these regulations including Quebec with this infamous work permit system.

Let me turn to another point in connection with this because this is something too that that government either ignores, if they know about it, or are too stupid to know about it, one or the other. And that is this, there is nothing in the requirements that would be mandated by the new Constitutional Act when it becomes law, and I believe it will become law, there is nothing in that, Sir, that would in any way inhibit or restrict the government of this Province from doing what I believe they ought to do, that is enforce positive sanctions upon companies wishing to do business here. Take, for example, the requirement of 51 per cent Newfoundland ownership. That is working. It is a good policy. It is working and working well. And the result is that many Newfoundland companies are getting in on the offshore or the onshore portions of the offshore play and are getting the benefit of it. No question at all. I have seen enough in my professional work to know precisely how that works. And that is good. I believe there are some requirements in the regulations with respect to licensing and

MR. ROBERTS: so forth requiring education of our people and that is the way it ought to be, and that is the way to ensure that Newfoundlanders get the jobs. The hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, I believe endorse the principle of free enterprise. I think they say that is one of their philosophical tenets. Well, I say to them that if they believe in that they ought to leave it to the forces of free enterprise, to the invisible hand of which Adam Smith spoke in his book, The Wealth Of Nations, the invisible hand, the forces of the marketplace will ensure that if we have trained Newfoundlanders available they will be hired. And this narrow, inward looking -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon? Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) wish to say something? If so let him say it.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman should get his feet off the furniture.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it is difficult, Sir, when one is trying to make a serious speech to be interrupted by the likes of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I would rather have both feet on the chair than be like the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who has both feet firmly planted in mid air and shows it time and time again.

MR. L. THOMS: Close to his mouth.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mount Scio, I am sorry. The refugee who now represents Mount Scio, the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on. I do not know how much longer I have. I hope I will get a five minute notice because I do have an amendment that I wish to put before the House.

I just want to say again that I think these mobility regulations are wrong in every sense of the word. They may be right in their intent. I do not fault the government's desire, in fact, I applaud the government's desire to try to create jobs for Newfoundlanders. I just fault their means. And I do not believe, Sir, the ends justify the means. That is a most dangerous philosophical doctrine. Even the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will agree with that. We may not agree on which much else, but I think we will agree on that, that the ends do not justify the means. That is sound in philisophy and sound in princiole.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) good policy.

MR. E. ROBERTS: That shows how much the hon. gentleman knows about anything. He knows not about football but he is an expert on foot in mouth ball because he plays that often.

Mr. Speaker, the ends do not justify the means and as laudible as the ends may be that the government are trying to reach, I think it is a very dangerous doctrine they have adopted and one that could cause the people of this Province intense harm. Yes, Sir. And that is why I speak against it and that is why I shall do what I can to oppose it. There are other ways to achieve our goals of having Newfoundlanders employed. Let us require anybody working a permit on our acreage-and I do not have the regulations in front of me but I think there are provisions, as I recall it, to this effect in these regulations now - let us require them to train Newfoundlanders and that will ensure that Newfoundlanders are hired. Because when the trained Newfoundlanders are available they are as good as any in the world, as good as any!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: And when the trained people are available, they will be hired. That has been the record all through the years in project after project after project. But this narrow, provincial-in the most contemptible sense of that word - chauvinistic, inward looking, self-defeated - it is astonishing that a group of men who have taken it upon themselves to try to govern this Province would fall into that kind of trap. But if they still stand by that principle, then I say to them that in fairness and in equity they ought to extend it to everything. We should say to all the doctors and nurses and teachers and grocery store clerks and accountants and bank managers and insurance salesmen

MR. E. ROBERTS: and lawyers and politicians and everybody else that unless you are born in Newfoundland you had better not come here because we will only let you visit. You cannot live here and you cannot work here unless you were born here.

MR. STAGG: Would you have to go to school here?

MR. E. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman says went to school here. Mr. Speaker, I do not put that on it because that would exclude him. Now I say to him again, would he please be quiet and let me finish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the policy is wrong and it is not in the best interests of this Province; in fact, it is in the worst interests. And I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that while I can appreciate their desire to try to make a few political points, I caution them to do so other than at the expense of the people who they are, I believe, honestly trying to serve. And I think this policy is not designed to serve the people of this Province. It may be intended to, but it does not.

Mr. Speaker, just before I finish with that aspect of it, may I move an amendment, Sir? I have copies here if one of the Pages could take them to Your Honour and to the Clerk at the table and to the House Leader on the government side, my learned friend for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

I wish to move the following amendment, and I shall be seconded by my friend, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), who has not spoken in the main motion.



MR. ROBERTS: The amendment, Sir, is that the Resolution before the House be amended by deleting all of the words after "Whereas" and replacing them with the following, so it will read in its entirety:

WHEREAS the Parliament of Canada is now considering a Resolution concerning the Constitution of Canada;

AND WHEREAS concerns have been expressed that under the terms of the Resolution presented to Parliament it would be possible to alter, without the consent of this House, the terms of the constitutional provisions respecting the boundaries of this Province and the Denominational Education System as it presently exists;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada have stated their policy that such a result is neither intended or desired by them;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT this House requires and requests that the Parliament of Canada take such steps as are necessary to amend the said Resolution to ensure that the Constitution of Canada contains provisions adequate to ensure that the territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Denominational System of Education cannot be altered without the authorization of a Resolution of this House.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Speaker of this House be directed to convey this Resolution to the Co-Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons now considering the said Resolution, and to the Speakers of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada.

Your Honour, I move that and I shall now await to see if it is in order. I do not know if my learned friend cares to object. It is the same

MR. ROBERTS: as the one before except - and an important exception - the words about patriation being approved have been dropped, Sir.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The amendment has just been handed to me, and as the hon. the proposer has indicated, it is the operative parts - and we do not take the "Whereasés" really - the Resolution parts of the amendment, I believe, are exactly the same verbatim except that the middle Resolution is deleted, is that correct?

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

MR. ROBERTS: That is correct, Sir, and I will speak to the point of order if in fact there is one.

MR. MARSHALL: If I could just make (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes, of course.

MR. MARSHALL: As I said, just having had the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, obviously, if a matter is substantially the same as a matter already having been decided by the House in this particular session, it is not competent for the House to consider that Resolution again, that question again. Now, I know there is authority here in Beauchesne for this and I can supply you with authority on that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the only question that I pose is that just by deleting one of the Resolutions that 'subject to such amendment being made, this House supports and endorses the proposal to patriate the Constitution of Canada,' whether that in effect, just that mere deletion from it makes this new Resolution different in substance from the previous one, I think is one that Your Honour would have to consider.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: To the point, Mr. Speaker. It is not up to me to say whether Your Honour wishes to consider or not. Your Honour will consider whatever Your Honour considers Your Honour should consider. But I would say to my learned friend that for once he is correct in his citation of the parliamentary law, but to that I hasten to add that what he says is completely irrelevant because, Sir, this amendment is substantially different from the one which my friend, the Leader of the Opposition put before the House. That resolution which has been defeated would have achieved two things, Sir, if it had been accepted: One, it would have made this requirement of the Parliament of Canada that certain changes be made; and secondly, it would have approved the - I do not have the wording; I do, I am sorry - it would support and endorse the proposal that would patriate the Constitution.

This matter now in the amendment, Sir, is substantially different. It makes no reference to patriation, it makes reference only to the question of protecting the so-called sacred rights, to use the term that was put upon them. I would submit to Your Honour that this matter ought to be allowed to come before the House so the House can decide whether it - it has ruled upon two issues, approving patriation and the alteration to entrench certain rights. In my submission, Your Honour, the House ought now to be allowed to decide whether it wishes to speak only on this question of protecting the so-called sacred rights of this House. I am surprised that my learned friend objected because,

MR. ROBERTS: of course, Your Honour, this Resolution embodies as purely as can be, if I understood correctly, the points the Premier made in his somewhat hysterical address on the television, that this Resolution embodies them clearly and concisely and I would hope all hon. gentlemen would support it. But, you know, Your Honour has to rule it in order before we can debate it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Well, it is certainly not a matter that I would like to give a ruling on right away. I would like to have some time to consider it. I do not know how much time I will require.

MR. NEARY: Move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: No?

MR. ROBERTS: His Honour perhaps could adjourn the House and consult the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I will take a recess.  
Order, please!

With respect to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), first of all I think I should point out that it is clear the question we have to address here is really whether or not the amendment proposed is substantially the same as one that we have already dealt with.

To quote from Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition, page 150, paragraph 416 which reads: "An old rule of Parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgement of the House." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion of a motion of the same nature and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session."

I quote also from Sir Erskine May, page 389, the bottom of that page, which reads in part: "An amendment is also out of order if it is inconsistent with an amendment already agreed to or if it is substantially the same as an amendment to the same motion which has already been negated".

In my opinion this amendment is substantially the same as the one just disposed of and is not in order because an amendment must not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has already

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): given a decision in the same session.  
We are on the original resolution. The  
hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself  
in the few moments that remain until adjournment on the main  
question that is before the House on the resolution. And  
in so doing I want to address myself to the remarks made by  
the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts)  
while he was last addressing the House. The position taken  
by the hon. member I cannot ascribe to, neither can I really  
understand. What the hon. member is doing, and indeed what  
the members of the Opposition are doing is that they are taking  
sacred rights, as we have said before, and confining them to  
one or two things which indeed are sacred to this Province,  
the denominational education system and also the boundary  
rights. But there are other things that are equally as sacred.  
There is the right of the young person in this Province to earn  
a livelihood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The right of the young Newfoundlander to  
be given an opportunity to work on the offshore. There is  
the right of the people of Newfoundland to be able to give some  
direction to the main industry which they have, that is the  
fishery in this Province. There is the right to see that  
people who have fished for years are not going to be restricted  
by regulations that come in from Ottawa as is presently proposed  
by the licensing system.

There are also the basic rights, Mr.  
Speaker, equally sacred, and if the hon. members there opposite  
wish to isolate that they are only education and the boundary,  
they are certainly sacred to us, but if that is only as far  
as their horizons go I cast my horizons westward to the Province  
of Quebec, to the line that is going through, the power line  
that is now going through Quebec, that is carrying our power

MR. MARSHALL: but whose power is owned by the people of Quebec, not by the people of Newfoundland. This is a sacred right and that is one that must be redressed and in this main resolution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: — in this main resolution, Mr. Speaker, we seek to redress this wrong because it was a wrong which was visited upon the people of this Province when the Upper Churchill was built. At the particular time we had the same rights as we do today and this

MR. W. MARSHALL: right is to transmit power through any province in Canada to, in other words exchange - in that case it is a commodity, a matter of commerce, inter-provincial trade. When the people in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, want to sell their goods from their manufacturing concerns in Ontario, they do not have to sell them to Quebec and Quebec then sell them to New Brunswick and then to Nova Scotia and then it finds itself down to Newfoundland; they whistle them right through and so they should. But the road runs, Mr. Speaker, in both directions. Equally sacred to us, Mr. Speaker, equally sacred to this Government is the right for the recognition of the ownership of our offshore. We own the offshore, it has been said from time to time by members opposite, but their solution to the problem, and it is only a problem that has been caused by the present government in Ottawa, you will note, their solution is to bring it to court. The Provinces of Manitoba and the province —

MR. HANCOCK: Lamaline needs a snow plow.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Look, the hon. member talks about the people of Lamaline and his snow plows. I heard the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes today get up and he made a very good and eloquent speech taking about the needs of the people in his district and the high unemployment. If the hon. gentlemen would raise their horizons a little bit they would see through these measures; they are bread and butter issues which would go a long ways to enabling these ills to be rectified. But, Mr. Speaker, what I find to be, in the few moments available here, as I say the confirmation of the offshore we have gone through that. There is no reason why this Province should have to fight in court for its rights when these same rights were recognized to other provinces at other periods of time.



SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - And the question comes down, Mr. Speaker, to equality, the same rights as other Canadians. I have heard members on the opposite side refer to people taking this particular position, particularly the position on local preference that we have as being anti-Canadian. And I am rather surprised and disappointed that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), whose observations in the House are usually very well taken, would join in this particular condemnation. By doing this, Mr. Speaker, they are saying to be pro-Newfoundland and to be for Newfoundland is to be anti-Canadian. You can be for Newfoundland and at the same time you can be for Canada and I reiterate again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - that particular attitude, Mr. Speaker, is enunciated by the Uncle Toms - and I do not mean any pun on the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) when I say it - by the Uncle Toms up in Ottawa on the Liberal side of the House. And they talk about embarrassing the people of Newfoundland by the local preference policy, when the Minister of National Revenue goes to British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, and says, 'Look at all the money Newfoundlanders had since Confederation, how disgraceful it is that they should ask,' what he is saying is that there is now a price, Mr. Speaker, on Canadian citizenship and there is a price for Newfoundland citizenship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: And after all, Mr. Speaker, is that not what the hon. gentlemen there opposite are really saying? There is a price to have equal rights.

MR. W. MARSHALL: We should not have equal rights, why? Because of all the monies we have had from beneficent Ottawa since Confederation. And I am quite sure, and this is where they are being anti-Canadian when they say it, that this does not reflect the views of our fellow Canadians in Ontario or in Alberta or in the other provinces of Canada. I call upon them particularly to stop embarrassing the people of Newfoundland and instead stand up for the rights of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is in the area of these mobility rights to which the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) referred that I wish to address myself particularly in addressing myself to his remarks. I find the position taken by the hon. members opposite on this to be probably the most untenable aspect of their position against this resolution. And the reason for it is that it has been proven - now the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle said, 'yes, it is working for the requirement of fifty-one per cent of Newfoundland content in companies because it gives the companies the right to get in on areas and it gives them commerce that they otherwise would not have'.

MR. MARSHALL: He also said he does not find fault in the matter of requiring the people to put in - oil companies to put in funds for the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Educational training.

MR. MARSHALL: - educational training of young Newfoundlanders. Well, you know, what is the difference? Does he put a higher priority on capital than on human resources?

PREMIER PECKFORD: A good point.

MR. MARSHALL: Because it is the human resources that this government is much more concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And those human resources, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, those human resources represent in the main to me the young people of this Province, the younger people who are attempting to get jobs, which they would be barred from otherwise, and I will dwell a little bit more on that for a few minutes tomorrow when debate resumes, but at the present time, it being six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed to call it six o'clock? Agreed.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three o'clock.