

VOL. 2

NO. 76

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Sinms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, over the past several months, there have been statements made, both within this House and outside, that the Government of Newfoundland has not requested the federal government to assist in various highway projects. The impression being created is that the federal government has funds available for such projects and is only waiting for Newfoundland to make a request.

The purpose of this statement, which, by the way, is not very long, is to clearly show that government has consistently and repeatedly requested federal funding for a large number of high priority highway projects over the past several years and, while some projects have been jointly financed, a great many have not yet been accepted by the federal government.

In the highways sector, there are two main federal departments involved, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Ministry of Transport. At present, the funding available under existing agreements with both of these departments has been virtually used up and there will be very little funding available for highway projects next year unless new agreements are signed almost immediately.

MR. C. BRETT: There are four main agreements which would need to be signed to cover the majority of highway projects which have been submitted. These are: (a) A new Trans-Canada Highway Agreement with the Ministry of Transport; (b) A new Highways Subsidiary Agreement with DREE which would include funds for a Trans-Labrador Highway as well as various other highway projects throughout the Province; (c) A Coastal Labrador Subsidiary Agreement with DREE which would include the Straits Road, or the Southern Labrador Road; and (d) An Industrial Development Subsidiary Agreement with DREE which would include a number of industrial access roads.

Attached to this statement is a listing of some of the main representations made to the federal government over the past years. It is important for hon. members to note that this list is not exhaustive but is only illustrative of the many representations we have made. It is also important to note that in addition to the formal representations there have been numerous meetings with the federal government, both at the ministerial level and at the officials level, to discuss various highway projects throughout the entire Province.

In summary, therefore, hon. members should note that: (1) Government has consistently and repeatedly made representations to the federal government for a large number of priority highway projects over the last several years; (2) Some of these representations have resulted in federal-provincial agreements with either the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or the Ministry of Transport; (3) The projects covered by these agreements have now been virtually completed and, unless new agreements are signed almost immediately, there will be hardly any cost sharing agreements in effect for next year which will result in a drastic reduction in highway construction; (4) Discus-

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2800

DW - 3

MR. C. BRETT: sions are currently underway at both the ministerial and senior officials level in an attempt to reach new agreements for a continuation of work on improving the Trans-Canada Highway and to initiate work on various other vital highway projects throughout the Province. In many cases, these discussions have been ongoing for several years with little or no success; and (5) Government will continue to work strenuously toward achieving agreement for a new Trans-Canada Highway Agreement and for a new subsidiary agreements with DREE for high priority highway projects.

The

C. BRETT: final decision on these matters rests with the Federal Government, not with the Province. All we can do is present well-planned and logical projects for funding. We can only hope that the representatives of Newfoundland in the Federal Government will strive to ensure that this Province is treated equitably and that new agreements will be forthcoming in the very near future.

We have not attached the correspondence, just the listing and the dates of correspondence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few brief words, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that there is a terrible amount of emphasis placed on federal funding for highway construction generally in the Province. Only yesterday I asked the minister questions related to items which are totally and entirely provincial responsibilities, and hopefully, even if DREE never does come down with any more funding, I hope that the minister can see fit to carry on with the road construction by hook or by crook.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where there is smoke there is fire, and if there are rumblings about the lateness of the minister getting his priorities established with Ottawa, if there are rumblings surely there is a clap of thunder there somewhere and I am wondering why these rumblings. In the last ten or fifteen or so years, I understand DREE dollars in excess of a half a billion dollars, primarily related to transportation, not necessarily entirely but in the order of a half a billion dollars has been spent by DREE in the Province and as we go along probably the minister might very well be able to compare provincial spending as it relates to DREE spending. Now if the minister finds it so difficult in getting co-operation from Ottawa and

MR. BENNETT: DREE, I am wondering if there is any way, Mr. Speaker, that the minister in his wisdom can communicate with other Provinces across Canada and see if indeed they are having the same treatment from Ottawa and if they are having the same treatment, then, in my opinion, we have a legitimate gripe that we can go to Ottawa and suggest that we are being discriminated against, which at this time I doubt very much if we are being discriminated against and I question, I really do question, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, like the minister is suggesting that they have been continually going to Ottawa looking for the co-operation and support and having their priorities established, and I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what the priorities are and indeed how long since these priorities have been placed on the table in Ottawa and to the minister concerned up there.

In my opinion, there has been very little money spent by the Province in relation to what has been spent by DREE funding, so as we go along, probably, Mr. Speaker, we will have more discussion. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) concerning a programme, the 1975 gear replacement programme where gear was confiscated in this Province and put in storage. Cases have still not been solved and in my

MR. HISCOCK: district, in Forteau, for example, all this fishing gear is in the basement, stored in the basement of the RCMP detachment. Could the minister inform this House what is going to be happening with those cases? Several million dollars are involved and it is all throughout the Province. What is going to be happening? Are we going to be dropping those cases? Are we going to be prosecuting or what action is the Minister of Justice taking?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, with relation to this there was a prosecution and indeed a conviction against a company a few months ago—two or three, I cannot be exactly sure—in one of the district courts, there was a conviction there and the other prosecutions will be going ahead within the next few months.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) inform this House why it has taken almost six years to solve this problem? And as I said, it is being stored in other areas but in my district, as I said, in the residence of the detachment. It is now flooded, the nets are becoming mouldy and becoming almost a health hazard to the detachment there. Can the minister inform us as to how much is involved, how much gear? How many cases are pending? If further ones are pending, how many there are and the number of prosecutions involved and how much money is also involved in this?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there are several prosecutions which will be taking place in the next few months. There may be additional ones depending on matters which, you know, may or may not come to light between now

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and then but there are several which will be prosecuted within the next few months. With respect to the total amount of money involved, I would have to check that figure and give it to the hon. gentleman after I have refreshed my memory on the total figure.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I would appreciate if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) would do this and report back to the House on this matter. There are several businessmen also who bought the fishing gear and ended up giving it or selling it to the fishermen, and when it was confiscated what ended up happening is that these businessmen are now out of pocket and a lot of them are out of pocket a fair amount of money. Can the minister inform this House as to what steps are being taken to make sure that these businessmen are reimbursed or what will be happening in this matter to get this money paid to the businessmen?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, you know, obviously in some of the instances where gear and other material was taken by the police, this was pursuant to a police investigation and, you know, in some instances there will be prosecutions so it will obviously depend upon that, you know, whether -

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, there are prosecutions yet to come?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There are still some prosecutions to come, yes. There was one prosecution a few months ago and a conviction but there are some yet to come so naturally it will depend upon the disposition of that.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). By now he

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2802

AH-3

MR. STIRLING: should know that the information
which I gave him in the House yesterday was correct because
I understand the union has now been in touch with the
member for the district

MR. STIRLING:

as well as being in touch with me, and maybe between the two of us we can maybe now get the minister to take some action. There is absolute confusion which has only been added to by the minister's statement which was carried on Here and Now last night, which indicates that the layoff will only last a couple of days. The local management people in Wabush still confirm as recently as fifteen minutes ago to the union leadership that the layoff is still effective December 15th and between us - I have spoken with the member for the district, the member on the other side, and I think he has now spoken to the minister. So will the minister now make an effort to try to clear up this situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, however second-hand the information the Leader of the Opposition is going by, or whatever the lack of information local management at Wabush Mines might have, the people of Labrador City and Wabush working at Wabush Mines know as of the C.B.C. news at 12:30, I think it is, in Wabush, know exactly the latest information effective from the head office of the operators of Wabush Mines minutes before the 12:30 news, which I conveyed directly to C.B.C. to inform the people of Labrador West, and they know exactly and fully just what the situation is.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of attitude that this government has, not only the member but the whole government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: What an absolute insult to the members of this House!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: In other words, a question is asked -

MR. ROBERTS: Does anybody know what the question was you asked yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary question?

MR. STIRLING: I thought you called order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I did call order because I could not hear what you were saying.

MR. STIRLING: Oh, that is why I sat down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary?

MR. STIRLING: Yes, I think it is an insult to this House that a question is asked on a very serious matter affecting a very large part of this Province - now I know they realize they do not consider it part of the Province, but they do not have to show it every day - and in addition a question was asked and he has said, 'I have advised C.B.C. and they have advised the people. I do not intend to advise this House and I do not intend to advise the union leadership that has been thrown into confusion because of the problem.'

I repeat the question. Would the minister again, for the benefit of this House, let us know the secret information that he has from the head office of Wabush that the local management do not know about

MR. L. STIRLING:

in Wabush and the union leadership did not know about as of fifteen minutes ago? Now would he please do us the favour of telling us what that information is?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was elected at a recent leadership convention and his first two public statements were, (a) that the Premier was a maniac; and (b) that to erect a Newfoundland flag on Newfoundland territory in Labrador would be a declaration of war.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: That is right.

MR. BARRY: And the type of comment being made now - not in the question, nothing wrong with the question, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think I should point out that both the questions and answers seem to be leading more to debate rather than serving the purpose of Question Period which is to ask questions and to provide answers.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the provocation got to me; I apologize. The question, legitimate question, the ancillary remarks, Mr. Speaker, the same type of remarks that the Leader of the Opposition first made after being elected and they are not really up to the standards that this House has seen from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret information. I just got through telling members and, you know, the Leader of the Opposition may throw a tantrum for not being the first to get it, but the people of Labrador West, for whom I thought he wanted to get the information, they have had it since 12:30.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the latest information hot off the presses is that the contractor has been working on repairing the transmission lines since the day after the damage occurred. As soon as the damage occurred the company got a contractor, with the assistance of Hydro Quebec, working on the transmission line; they have been working since last Saturday. Their best estimate is that the line will be completed, Mr. Speaker, repairs to the line will be completed around the 19th of December, given that the weather continues as well as it is right now. If bad weather intervenes there could be further delays.

Mr. Speaker, this will mean that the pellet plant at Pointe Noir should re-commence operations around the 19th of December and that means that once this plant has started up which should be in the area of a day after that, that the shut down which will have taken effect as of this coming Monday at Wabush should no longer be in effect and that Wabush Mines, Scully Mine will be back in operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the best information that I can give, that the company can give in responding to what

MR. L. BARRY: has been an Act of God, a sleet storm which damaged the transmission line, which is being repaired as quickly as possible and a situation where government is remaining in constant touch with company officials, and the company officials have agreed to keep me informed immediately if there are any new developments.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: The minister, obviously, is more interested in playing silly games than in being concerned about those people who live in the area. Now I presume from that latest bit of garbled information, that his information from yesterday, which was of two days, has now gone to four or five days.

MR. L. BARRY: Read Hansard if your memory is not -

MR. L. STIRLING: And will he now take some action to persuade the company to give some definite information to the employees who are affected? Travel problems in and out of that area at the Christmas season - those things are bad enough - will he now take some action to simply say to the company, 'Continue to stockpile and keep those people employed during this period, whatever this period happens to be, because the minister cannot make up his mind whether it is two days or five days and nothing has changed that I can see. Will he now take the action he should have taken which is ask the company to continue on full operation and stockpile?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the union leadership, I have to assume, was satisfied with the response I gave yesterday by telex. There was no request for clarification. The Leader of the Opposition, I understand -

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

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order?

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

MR. L. STIRLING: The minister knows, because he has just been told by the member for the district on his own side that the union membership were not satisfied with that information he gave yesterday, he knows that.

MR. L. BARRY: What sort of nonsense!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am responding to the point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has, from time to time, gotten up in this House on points of order of this nature which are, in essence, not points of order but points of attempting to interrupt the normal flow as the rules of the House provide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is going to continue, all you are going to have is going to be disorder in the House. And I respectfully submit to Your Honour that the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself is completely out of order when he is acting in this manner and he should be really advised that if he is going to continue that the rules of the House will be bent against him.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I rule there is no point of order but a difference of opinion.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, when his analogy of the raising of the Newfoundland flag on Newfoundland territory being a declaration of war when that did not work the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) had to turn around and see what other sorts of mischievous nuisance statements he might come up with.

Mr. Speaker, I have given a full statement over the airwaves in Labrador West at 12:30 today. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time Wabush Mines has 800,000 tons of concentrate stockpiled

MR. L. BARRY:

at Pointe Noir, that Wabush Mines will have, by the end of this week, another 100,000 tons stockpiled at the Scully mine. They are approaching close to a million tons of concentrate in stockpile. The highest amount of concentrate they have ever previously held in inventory is in the area of 500,000 tons. Apart from the problems with respect to freezing, Mr. Speaker, of the concentrate, there is a limit to how much concentrate a company can hold in inventory, there is a limit to how much concentrate, Mr. Speaker, can be tied up in inventory. Economically that operation, Mr. Speaker, must do what it has to do in order to remain economically viable. And we saw what international conditions can do to our great iron ore operations last Summer where there was no choice, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are defending the company?

MR. L. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Mines and Energy for this Province I will defend the mining companies of this Province, just as I will defend the employees in the mines of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: And if members opposite want to take the irresponsible tack of attacking these good corporate citizens who are employing thousands of Newfoundlanders, go right to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: Go right to it and we will see -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: - where the people of this Province put their confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. minister, I am not sure if he has completed his answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I just had a point to add that economically there is a limit to how much concentrate

MR. L. BARRY: can be held in stockpile. We believe, Mr. Speaker, from the evidence that the company has given us, from the facts and figures submitted that the company is bending over backwards to minimize the impact on the employees. They have agreed, Mr. Speaker, at our request, to do everything possible to minimize the length of the shutdown and they will do everything humanly possible and, Mr. Speaker, that is all we can ask of anybody.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and it relates to the Newfoundland Medicare Commission Report that came out yesterday. The first question I would ask the minister is is he very concerned about the significant increase in the administration costs of the Newfoundland Medicare Commission? It has now gone over 4 per cent of the total programme expenditures, almost 4.5 per cent; it is the first time it has gone over 4 per cent in a number of years. Is this just another example, Mr. Speaker, of a bureaucracy getting out of control and does the minister intend to do anything about it?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, want to point out to the hon. members of the House that it was a choice of the government, I guess all

MR. HOUSE: past governments of Newfoundland that we would go with a commission to administer the Medicare programme. And I would suggest that if anybody took time to study it and look at it that this is one of the most efficiently operated programmes that I know of, and I am sure there are other provinces in Canada that would be quite happy to have something so efficient. It is around 4.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker, it is \$1.4 million. You know, it is increasing for the simple reason that there are a number of fee for service people expanding around the Province. There are sixty people employed in the administration of the programme; they are all employed here in the Province. We are quite happy with what is happening and we are quite happy with the cross-check, the checking that is done on billing. The Auditor General reviews this and gives his report and he is quite happy with it also.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the Auditor General has nothing to do with running the Newfoundland Medicare Commission. All he does is audit to make sure that what they do spend is spent properly and so on.

My supplementary to the minister is would the minister give an undertaking to this House today that there would be no further increase granted in fee for service, in other words, salaries to doctors this year, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that to the end of April, 1979 there was an 8 per cent increase granted, another 15 per cent increase since that. We see in the totals given in the M.C.P. report that 90 per cent of

MR. WHITE: the doctors in Newfoundland involved with Medicare are getting over \$60,000 and over one-quarter or about one-quarter are getting over \$100,000. Could the minister give us an undertaking that with the economic situation in this Province being what it is, there will be no further increases granted to doctors in this Province for quite some time?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, no, I am not going to give any such undertaking. I think hon. members are looking at this and we are seeing the average income stated for G.P.s and the various specialists. True, there was an 8 per cent increase and last year there was a 15 per cent increase - 10 per cent, I think, straight and 5 per cent that was to adjust certain specialties.

AN HON. MEMBER: That does not show up in these.

MR. HOUSE: No, that is not showing up here at all. And that was to try to catch up with the average, I guess, in the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have to bear in mind is we have 413 doctors in fee for service in the Province and the operative thing we should be looking at is not necessarily the average incomes but the amount that they get paid for each particular service. And

MR. HOUSE: the fact is there are some doctors in this Province who are working seventy and eighty hours per week and so -

MR. ROBERTS: And there are some who are not.

MR. HOUSE: - and there are some who are not, obviously, that is true and, of course, that is reflected in the figures there. So I am not going to give any such undertaking. As a matter of fact the government has given an undertaking and there will be negotiations with doctors again. I am not saying what that will result in and whether there will be any increase, I am not going to talk about that here in this House. We are not going to negotiate in public, but we will be sitting down with doctors again as we do every year.

MR. WHITE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if what I heard is correct and I will just ask the minister to re-state the last part of what he just said, But in less than two years a twenty-three per cent increase has been granted to a group of people in this Province who are making between \$60,000 and \$120,000 a year and the minister is telling us now that the government is getting ready to give them another increase. Is that what the minister is saying?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I never said the government is getting ready. I said the government will be sitting down with doctors and discussing their tariffs, I think is the word they use, and schedules for the next year. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to debate with the minister and so I will not, but you will understand my saying if the government sits down to negotiate, they are obviously going to put money on the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. ROBERTS: However, I want to come back to this question of the MCP budget. The minister conspicuously failed to answer the question which my friend from Lewisporte (F.White) asked so I will try it again. The cost of administering Medicare as a percentage of the total amount so it has little to do with the number of fee for services being performed. But the percentage of the total payout of Medicare has gone, as I understand it, from a little over three and a half per cent to nearly four and a half per cent in the last five years. And, of course, the minister would concur that there are - that is three and a half of a much smaller amount that it is now four and a half of. I wonder if the minister could give us any explanation at all - he is responsible, he is the only person whom we, in this House, can question, he would concur - Why has this gone up as a percentage?

MR. NEARY: Abortions have gone up.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain why it has gone up. I guess it is like everything else, the cost of salaries and so on. If you notice the computer service there costs about three hundred. That has gone down in the last year by about fifty thousand dollars. The salaries went up, according to the remainder of the public service, by about a hundred thousand. That was in keeping with the same percentage of other people in this public service. The rent went up this year, and that is a rental agreement with the St. John's

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2809

EL - 3

MR. HOUSE: Housing Corporation. So those are the major increases. One other thing not reflected, of course, is that since 1977 or '79 the salaried doctors are not reflected in this particular increase.

MR. ROBERTS: Why should they be?

MR. HOUSE: They were before that.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, come on, 'Wallcae.'

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to table a list - I do not wish for names, that has nothing to do with it - a list showing the number of positions in Medicare, the M.C.P. Commission - it was always a very tightly run operation but it seems to be getting out of hand - the number of positions in the Medicare Commission, the number of position per, say, one thousand services performed - let us get a measure that way- he will find the words in Hansard, he does not need to write them down- and the number of positions that are paid more than, say, \$15,000 a year? Because I suspect and I suggest to the minister that what is happening is the insidious classification process and I suspect that MCP is being classified up even more rapidly than anywhere else in the public service and if that is so I would like to know why it is so. Would the minister table that information, Sir?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take the questions and get the answers for the hon. gentleman. I am pretty certain, of course, that there are not that many doctors employed, that is in the administration of this particular programme.

AN HON MEMBER: One.

MR. HOUSE: One, that is right, yes. Dr. Russell is in the booklet here.

MR. ROBERTS: The Medical Director. There has always been one right from the start

MR. NEARY: And do not forget to answer my question on the Order Paper today.

MR. ROBERTS: He has always been carried in the solitary vote.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly give

all the answers and all the information. And I say again that this is perhaps one of the most efficient run operations that any government has in Canada. When you are getting bills in from all over this Province, perhaps fifty or sixty a day from each physician across the Province and there is a lot of checking to be done - and I just point out to the hon. members how efficient the operation is. Some time ago we saw a programme on CBC where a particular person went to three doctors in one day to prove a certain point and before that particular programme came on the airwaves that person was checked finding out what was happening for her to be to two or three doctors in one day. A very efficient operation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The same one put in place twelve years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. Could the minister advise why fuel oil and gasoline would cost more in a community such as Makkovik where the consumer buys from a government operated store than it would cost buying it from a retailer in Nain?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I will certainly advise but I will have to take notice of the question and I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile.

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2809

AH-3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mrs. Newhook), Sir, and it has to do with the dismantling of the Water Services Branch of the minister's department. Would the minister care to tell the House how this

MR. NEARY: work is being handled now, water services, well drilling and so forth, and what will happen to the senior positions in the minister's department as a result of their becoming redundant because of the dismantling of the Water Services Division of that department?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, we have two divisions for water services in our department, one is industrial and the other for unincorporated areas.

Our department has been reorganized. There will be a number of redundant positions and there will be a number of other positions which will have to be filled. It is hoped that the people occupying the positions that will become redundant will be placed in the other positions which will become open.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago a police investigation into certain aspects of the water services division of the minister's department was undertaken and various other divisions of the minister's department. Would the minister care to tell the House if these police investigations have been completed or, if not, when they will be completed and if any charges or suspensions or dismissals will result from this police investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to take notice of that particular question and get the information so that I can give you a full account of it.

MR. NEARY: Tomorrow?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Tomorrow.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Resolution that has been passed in this House under the name of the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) - this is the Select Committee on Resource Management - I move that the following do constitute this Committee: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. Speaker, I can give this as notice of motion, but because the matter has been debated, perhaps we could pass that motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave. So it is moved and seconded. You have heard the motion. Those in favour, 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary?

The motion is carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Orders of this House, I move that the following

MR. MARSHALL: constitute the Privileges and Elections Committee of this House: The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the hon. the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

Again, Mr. Speaker, because this is a Standing Committee, I would ask that the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would assume there is definitely leave of an agreement?

MR. NEARY: Your party was so successful last night, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think the hon. gentleman could have picked a better time to set up a committee on Elections and Privileges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I understand there is agreement then? You have heard the motion. Those in favour 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary?

The motion is carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Wednesday, Private Member's Day; last Wednesday when the House adjourned we were debating the amendment to Motion No. 1, the amendment moved by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and I believe the hon. the member for Eagle River had adjourned the debate.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, as I was finishing saying last Wednesday on this motion that basically asks where before Confederation its offshore minerals thing and did not

MR. HISCOCK: relinquish it under the Terms of Union, basically the motion says, we are saying that this Province controls the offshore. A resolution like this was passed each year or every two years by this House. Whether it was regarded as the Liberals or the Conservatives, a joint motion was always sent to Ottawa saying that we owned the offshore. The Conservative Party has said time and time again that - of course, we as the Liberals and particularly the Opposition provincially do not support this position. We support this bill, Mr. Speaker, as we have in the past and we will continue in the future, and we will

MR. HISCOCK: continue to work to make sure that Newfoundland not only gets control of its offshore, but maximum benefits. I would like to go a further step in this; instead of us now talking about the control of the offshore and the ownership and that, I think we should be preparing more for the impact of what is happening with the offshore when it comes, whether we are going to be bringing the oil in tankers to Come BY Chance or whether we are going to have it in storage. I remember the Premier saying in this House, if I am correct, that not one bit of the oil is going to be going to other markets, that it was going to be brought to this Island, was going to be processed and that he was not going to permit these large multi-national companies to go and load at the wellheads and then take it to markets without ever coming on land. There were talks of a pipeline, there were talks of other ways of bringing it onshore. Now the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) as well as the Premier have basically softened their position and said, 'Well, it depends on the quantity. We cannot bring one million barrels a day onshore, which is quite true. But what I think it is really pointing out, and the member from Lewisporte (Mr. White) pointed out in his speech, that we are rather concerned on this side because of the confrontation issue between Ottawa and also particularly probably with some of the companies. Now what is going to happen is that either they are going to turn around and load at the wellhead, take it on to markets of the Eastern Seaboard, and that Nova Scotia or some other area of Canada will get maximum benefit from Hibernia or from other wells that develop. So I am concerned with that and I hope that this does not happen.

The second thing that I think we

MR. HISCOCK: should have to be concerned about is the cost of living. The cost of living now, Mr. Speaker, is going up ever so fast because of the potential of Hibernia. We see highrises going up in St. John's, new hotels going to be built, and low income rental houses as well as apartment houses, Mr. Speaker, that are going to be built. All this is going to have a great impact on the person on Social Assistance or a person on a fixed income. I would like to know what policy does this government have, Mr. Speaker, with regard to lessening the impact. Are we going to do as they do in Saskatoon, buy up land banks and let us, say, buy the land around St. John's in a radius probably of fifty miles and the Province control the land instead of opening it up to speculators and driving the cost of land far beyond the average person? Newfoundland itself and particularly St. John's prides itself that we have about an eighty per cent rate of people owning their own homes in this Province. We see now a proposal going out to build 750 rental units. Our concern on this side, Mr. Speaker, is that we continue to have the lifestyle of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians owning their own homes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: If we do not get into the process of buying land and taking it out of the hands of the real estate speculator, what is going to happen is that the price of land is going to go far beyond the reach of the average home owner. Young couples who are trying to start a life for themselves, they are newly married, find themselves that they cannot even build a house now because of the high interest rates and mortgage rates. And now compounded on that they cannot even basically afford the piece of land. And I would say that this government

MR. HISCOCK: itself with all the Crown land in and around St. John's and other areas of Conception Bay or Salmonier and whatever, that basically all this land should be made available to the residents of the Avalon and particularly around St. John's, that we bring down the cost of land and thereby keeping our own lifestyle and culture.

Another question that I am concerned about with the offshore and that is do we have - and I have said this in speeches before - do we have proper pollution control? Are we as a Province wanting to take full responsibility for the offshore to get ownership? Are we going to accept full responsibility for development? And if we are, are we also going to turn around then and expect Environment Canada and the Coastguard to pay the bill or foot the bill for cleaning up any oil spills? So I would say, Mr. Speaker, when you have Hibernia or Ben Nevis or any of the other wells 200 miles out in the Atlantic

MR. E. HISCOCK: and there is a storm and there is a blowout and we have the clean-up equipment here in the harbour of St. John's or in the harbours around the Province, I am asking the question, Mr. Speaker, do we have enough, number one; number two, should it not be located out on the Banks themselves. I suggested that for each well, for each drilling platform out there, we should have another type of boat with equipment on hand for a one to one basis. If, Mr. Speaker, it is going to cost billions of dollars then what is wrong with having equipment and a boat out there that would cost about \$5 million or \$6 million and have the equipment there and not have to wait because of stormy weather or other problems in getting this equipment out there?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there is no question that Hibernia is proving itself commercial. It has been put up to 1986, the companies are saying, before they bring it on stream but in the meantime we are finding land, houses, cost of living and X number of other factors involved jumping out of control. Are we going to lessen that impact and, if we are, how are we going to do it?

Mr. Speaker, I think these are questions we should be asking ourselves now. We should get out of the realm of debate of the ownership. This government should accept the words of the Opposition, and we have said it time and time again, we support control of the ownership of the resource. Now this House, and I am not saying that the government give up the political battle with Ottawa or whatever, I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is instead of government getting up, and it will happen after I sit down, instead of the government getting up and criticizing us and saying, no, you do not really support it and X number of other things and trying to score political points, I think it would be much better if all this House of Assembly and the representative for the people

MR. E. HISCOCK: put their energy into solving the problem that is going to come after the oil starts coming on, after that and also before the impact comes of the cost of land and other factors going up.

And, Mr. Speaker, I really do feel that we are making a political issue of it and it may go in for election and we may have another election fought on. I feel that we will have a provincial election fought on this issue and that is going to be fought on Ottawa versus Newfoundland control of the resources and control of our destiny. And I think it is going to be a very shallow issue to be fought on because the government here as well as the Opposition basically supports that view. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this House should divert its energy into should we buy up land banks, as I said, like Saskatoon has? The city of Saskatoon controls all the land, they decide how much is going to be built, they decide whether it is going to be residential and then a church in a radius, say, of ten blocks and then also a school in that area.

MR. STIRLING: This Province used to in the Northeast Land Assembly.

MR. HISCOCK: And this Province used to do it in the Northeast Land Assembly. Are we going to be getting into those experimental projects? Are we going to be getting co-operation with Ottawa from the point of view of low income housing? Are we going to continue to keep ahead of, let us say, people on low income? These are the ones I think we have to be concerned about here in St. John's, the older people who have larger homes and are living by themselves. Are we going to drive the cost of living so high by the speculation that they will have to give up these homes and go into apartments? We hear very much about the quality of live and culture that this government is maintaining

MR. E. HISCOCK: but in the meantime I do not see and I have not seen any programmes. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) implements a study. A study is very good, but what are the concrete proposals of that study? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question with regard to the offshore, we own it, we own it as a province, we have always owned it and we will continue to own it. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, what we have to do now is come to an agreement with Ottawa over this and get it settled and then the other thing is, as I say, we have to continue to look for new experimental ways of lessening this impact of oil and gas on this Province. And if we do not do it and the government in particular in power now, if they do not do it then all the drilling and all the money that is going to be coming in, we are not going to have the type of Province that we are living in now. We already see the changes that are coming.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise this government instead of getting up and criticizing the Opposition and the Liberal Party in this Province it would be much better

MR. E. HISCOCK: to put the energy into the areas of finding how we can lessen the impact of oil and gas on this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):
Stephenville.

The hon. the member for

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is very much a recurring theme in this House of Assembly, debates being held in which we, as elected members in this House, put our views forward as to what our positions are with regard to our offshore resource. It is something that has been familiar to us over the years and it was really something we were looking at in the academic back from 1949 to the present. It was an academic thing, it was something for the lawyers, the constitutional lawyers or the people on the fifth floor, the Justice Department, to consider as an academic exercise.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is no longer in the field of academics. This is in the practical field at the present time. And just how practical is the problem that we are facing today? Now there was introduced in the House of Commons yesterday a bill which is to give legislative approval and teeth to a proposal in the federal budget which was announced some time in October. I do not have the full details of the bill but I hope that hon. members who follow me will. But the principle that is being established there is that the federal government is laying claim to 43 per cent of our offshore resource. Forty-three per cent, it is a confiscation an outright confiscation. It is an outright power grab, a resources grab that is announced with the fanfare of the Budget and is an out-and-out declaration by the federal government

MR. F. STAGG: that they and their Crown agency, Petro-Canada, will have a strangle hold on our offshore resource forever more. That is their declaration and where do we stand on that? Obviously, we stand where we always have stood. We stand where we always have stood, four square for Newfoundland. Now where do hon. members opposite stand?

MR. L. THOMS: Four square for Newfoundland.

MR. F. STAGG: Where do hon. members opposite stand? And you can always tell, Mr. Speaker, when you are starting to make a point because the caterwauling and the interjections and the attempts to frustrate the speaker, the person who is speaking, they always start as soon as you begin to make some progress. Where do hon. members opposite stand? Where do hon. members opposite whose districts are represented by Liberal members in the House of Commons, where do they stand on this issue? Where do they stand as far as the confiscation of Newfoundland's resources of our offshore? It is called 'frontier oil lands', that is how it was referred to in the Budget. Well, frontier oil lands is frontier exploration and so on; well, that includes the Northern areas, the Northwest Territories, Prudeau Bay and whatever other ones are up there. But, Newfoundland is regarded as a frontier by the Ottawa Government. Now what is significant in calling it a frontier? Well, a frontier is probably peopled by people who are less civilized than people who live in the civilized central part of the country. The history of frontier areas is that they have been exploited. Well, is the federal government being consistent? Yes, they are very, indeed, being consistent, very much, indeed, being consistent. They are attempting

MR. F. STAGG: by the device of first announcing it in the Budget to attempt to give some political credibility to their claim to our offshore resource that we brought into Canada in 1949. We brought it into Canada, Canada did not own it, did not have anything to do with it previously. It was foreign land to them. Now they are claiming 43 per cent of it for Ottawa. Now, I would like to know how hon. members opposite can wrestle with their consciences, because they were all out last year campaigning for their respective Liberal candidates in the federal election, but hon. members opposite are going to reap, they are going to reap what they have sown. They have sown some Liberals up in Ottawa and we are going to reap the political benefits of it because the people of Newfoundland are probably going to toss at least - how many of you are there now? Seventeen of you - they are going to toss at least fourteen of you out in the next election.

MR. STAGG: There will be a few pockets left which we will get probably in 1988. The hon. members opposite have to come to grips with the problem of where do they stand, where do they stand on issues as Newfoundland versus Ottawa, because that is what it comes down to, Newfoundland versus Ottawa. Where do they stand with regard to their federal colleagues? Where do they stand when we are faced with this type of debacle that Mr. Rompkey and the Leader of the Opposition wrecked upon this Province some weeks ago, which was designed for the base political purposes of the incident? Where do they stand?

They cannot get by. It is not sufficient to get up and say, 'We own it. We own it and we always owned it,' because your friends, your colleagues, the people that you put into office are out there trying to grab outright forty-three per cent of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: That is where we stand in this Province today and hon. members opposite cannot hide their heads in the sand, or wherever they hide them, and avoid that issue. That issue is very much part of this resolution. This resolution is a part of the consistent philosophy and consistent approach that has been prevalent on this side of the House. The hon. members opposite cannot have one policy for this House of Assembly, one policy that really skirts the main issue: Where do they stand with their political bedfellows in Ottawa and the five people that they campaigned and put into office in the last election?

I would like to see hon. members opposite speak on that issue, direct themselves to that issue. Where do they stand with regard to their political colleagues in Ottawa? What do they think, what do they think of the five Liberals in Ottawa who are trying to grab outright forty-three per cent of our resource and who say that Newfoundland owns zero per cent of it because of certain legal technicalities

MR. STAGG: which they indicate would show that the Federal Government has jurisdiction and control? That is the issue that hon. members opposite have to face. And you are not going to be able to skirt it, it is going to be thrown up to you time and time again. It is going to be thrown up in the House and it is going to be thrown up on hustings because the hustings may not be too far away on an issue of this type.

Now, that is the issue that is before the House of Commons at the present time. It is before the House of Commons in Ottawa. The Liberal majority of the House of Commons in Ottawa have a bill coming before the House of Commons that is going - brought in yesterday that is designed for the confiscation of forty-three per cent of our offshore. That is the bill that is before the House of Commons in Ottawa. And hon. members opposite are going to be satisfied with saying, 'We own it! We own it,' while your buddies say they own it, your friends say they own it. Let us see if you break with them. Let us see where you really stand on these things because we need your help, we need your help. We all know where we stand. We know where we stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: We need your help on this issue. This is an issue that crosses party lines. This is an issue similar to the issue on which the member for Twillingate (W. Rowe) crossed party lines some time ago, a great patriotic move on his part, a great patriotic move on his part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Where do hon. members opposite stand? They hope, hon. members opposite hope that the people of Newfoundland will not get this matter put properly before the next election. I can tell you right now that it will be before the people on the West Coast. It will be before every legislator, every voter on the West Coast. It will be before every voter on the West Coast because I will make sure it is.

MR. STAGG: Now, what have we got here?
We have a motion introduced by the member for Placentia
(W. Patterson). Let us deal with the member for Placentia.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!
MR. STAGG: What kind of man is the member
for Placentia? The member for Placentia is a great patriot.
He is a great patriot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He is a man who has on many
occasions - prior to his election in 1975 he sallied forth
in the vain pursuit of election down in Placentia, fighting
against the Liberal juggernaut of the day. How many times
did he run? He ran about as many times as Al Evans ran,
another great patriot who at one time sat in this House.

In 1971, I remember it well
because I was running for the first time in 1971, the member
for Placentia he now is, then he was a candidate

MR. STAGG: in the district of Placentia East, he kept Mr. Smallwood under wraps. Mr. Smallwood could not take his travelling road show on the road because the member for Placentia came within 400 votes of defeating him in Placentia East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: That is the kind of man who put this resolution before the House. He is the man who has in his files all sorts of very interesting material. He occasionally gives it to me and says, here, you are going to speak on a certain thing, see what you can make out of this, and on occasion I must say he has been a great help to me. He is a great help and an inspiration to all members on this side and I am very proud that he has put this motion before the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the motion. Well, the motion is, "Mr. Patterson, Placentia to move:

WHEREAS, before Confederation, this Province owned its offshore minerals and did not relinquish the same under the terms of union;

AND WHEREAS the revenues, employment and industrial benefits which will result from offshore development will flow to the Province only if ownership and control are confirmed;

AND WHEREAS if the Province does not control the rate and type of development, many negative impacts will occur in our Province;

AND WHEREAS -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - if certain proposed offshore development plans are permitted to go ahead, few employment or industrial developments will accrue to the Province;

MR. STAGG:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House support the Province's efforts to preserve this Province's historic, moral and legal claim to own and control its offshore mineral resources.'

Well, that is a noble resolution. It is the kind of resolution that we have debated before in the academic. But we are right down to the hard facts of it now. This is not an academic problem anymore, gentlemen. This is very much a political problem for hon. members opposite because they hope that they can say one thing here and yet go out and consort with and attempt to further the political lives of the five Liberals in Ottawa who are going to vote for this bill, who are going to vote for that bill that is an attempt to confiscate forty-three per cent of our offshore resource. Those are the kind of people you sent up to Ottawa. You sent five Liberals up there and their objective is to further the aims and objectives of the federal government, which is to grab as much of our resource as possible, to have rapid development of it so that the federal government can have additional revenue so that its profligate spending habits can be brought under control by the use of a Newfoundland resource.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not stand for that here in this House. We on this side of the House, all thirty-four of us at this stage - there are going to be more because I think Bellevue may be the start of it, Bellevue maybe the start.

MR. THOMS:

Why do you not call a by-election?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

Well, I cannot call a by-election.

I cannot call a by-election, but I hope that when the by-election is called that hon. members - hon. members will go down there

MR. STAGG: and say, I agree with the federal government, I agree with these fellows that we put up in Ottawa that we want the forty-three per cent. Are you going to do that? I have not heard a voice raised. As I said before, you are a bunch of clones. You are clones. You are Liberals. The Liberals are all the same. A Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should know.

MR. FLIGHT:

And a fool is a fool is a fool.

MR. STAGG:

I am not going to raise a point

of order on that, Mr. Speaker, because hon. members opposite are living proof of that which they accuse others of being.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of an economy do we want in this Province? What we want in this Province is a resource based economy. We want a resource based economy not a resource dependent economy and I am going to quote here briefly from a speech which I made in Stephenville on the weekend. It was an excellent speech. I must say that I used some material from other sources but I basically put it all together myself and I must say it was quite a tome. We on this side, we recognize the great deal of difference between a resource based economy and a resource dependent economy. Hon. members opposite may not recognize it, but I will tell you that if we -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

- if you listen you may be

educated. In the former, the resource based economy, wise resource management can be used to create a broad range of economic activities and a broad range of new technological skills. In the latter, the resource dependent economy, which is really what the Liberals would have us existing under, the resources were extracted

MR. STAGG:

and exported without significant linkages to and spinoffs in other parts of the economy. We on this side of the House seek a resource based economy, not a resource dependent economy and we will use our resource ownership to achieve that goal.

Now, hon. members opposite would do well to direct themselves to the issue of whether or not they support their political colleagues in Ottawa. Ottawa members said, yes, they are in agreement with this Resolution. They are to deal with this Resolution. They are in agreement that Newfoundland owns its resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Well, do you agree with -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Do you agree with the five Liberals in Ottawa? Do you agree with Mr. Trudeau and Mr. LaLonde and Mr. Chretien? Do you agree with all them? Tell me, do you agree with them?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, I do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak up!

MR. STAGG: I hear muteness over there.

MR. FLIGHT: Wholeheartedly.

MR. STAGG: You agree with them wholeheartedly.

The hon. member agrees with Mr. LaLonde and Mr. Chretien and Mr. Rompkey. He agrees with all them. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) agrees that they should have 43 per cent of our offshore resources on the one hand and then he agrees with our motion. Well, the hon. member knows not what he says. And I must say this, that the hon. member is not one of the four safe seats that the Liberals have in this Province, and statements of that type reveal why he does not have a safe seat.

MR. STAGG: Now, I am going to quote from another noted Newfoundlander, one of contemporary powers. Many of us here attended Memorial University in the 1950s and 1960s. A contemporary of ours at that time, Mr. Doug House, recently gave a very interesting paper before a - what was it called?

AN HON. MEMBER: Environmental conference.

MR. STAGG: An environmental conference held here in St. John's recently. I am quoting from page three of that, talking about government policies and administration. Mr. House says, "I have argued elsewhere and will reiterate here that Newfoundlanders, including government officials, must reconcile themselves to a greater degree of government involvement in the economy if oil and gas are to be controlled in the provincial interest. Government approaches towards decentralized development, controlling lands speculation, financing oil impacted municipalities and protecting the fishery will be crucial determinants in how oil will affect the outports. Under federal jurisdiction," - and this is what he said, and I was delighted to see it; a young Newfoundlander in his thirties - you start calling people young Newfoundlanders when you get into your thirties yourself, it would be older if you were in your twenties - but a young Newfoundlander who is highly educated and, I think, a great patriot, said, 'Under federal jurisdiction I would be worried by 1) the remoteness of the decision makers in Ottawa from the needs of rural Newfoundland and 2) the likelihood that Ottawa would implement rapid development in the national interest,' - in the national interest, that is the sort of thing that is bandied about. It is in the B.N.A. Act today, and it was in the national interest to put in price and wage control in 1975 and so on. 'In the national interest' is a catch phrase. The likelihood that Ottawa would implement rapid development in the national

MR. STAGG: interest with little regard to outport Newfoundland.' Now, that is what Mr. House said. And I must say that I was delighted to see that sort of thing that he mentioned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: The man whom the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) supports so well, Mr. Chretien, let me tell you what Mr. Chretien said in Ottawa around the latter part of October. This is a quote from the Ottawa Citizen. "The Justice Minister, Jean Chretien, said Wednesday the federal government might be more willing to help Newfoundland in its energy battles with Quebec if it would soften its opposition to federal constitutional proposals. "I am amazed to see Premier Peckford always giving us all sorts of problems but when he needs the federal government he always calls on us to help him get his electricity across Quebec", the minister said during a heated exchange in the Commons. "If he wants us to help I think he should stop that kind of statement", Chretien added referring to Peckford's criticism Tuesday night of federal constitutional proposals. The power battle also highlights the need

MR. F. STAGG: for a strong central government he told James McGrath, the Progressive Conservative MP for St. John's East." And what does the Saskatoon paper say? Ottawa offers compromise to Premier Peckford;, and it goes on to say much the same thing. But the headline in the Ottawa Citizen said, 'Newfoundland must be good to get help'. In other words, we here in Newfoundland must toe the federal Liberal Party line if we are to get help from Ottawa. And quite often you will hear hon. members opposite say how much has Ottawa put into our Newfoundland economy. And the DREE committee in Corner Brook in September said the very same thing. As soon as they start to mention the fact -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. STAGG: - that Ottawa sends some money into Newfoundland, you are supposed to get down on your knees and prostrate yourself before them and that sort of thing and hon. members have been on their knees so long that they have holes in their pants.

MR. L. THOMS: Tell us how you embarrassed your own Party at the DREE Committee meeting.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, embarrassed my own Party! I did myself proud at Corner Brook and I am only hoping that the federal member there who was Vice-Chairman, who was acting as Chairman, that he sent a transcript around so I could have it sent to my constituents, because hon. members opposite were there each replying to the line fed to him by the Chairman.

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is making some very telling points, but all I can hear, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) with constant interruptions. Now the hon. member is entitled to

MR. MARSHALL: be heard by us without any interruptions and I would ask the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) be restrained if not named.

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

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

MR. HODDER: The hon. member is drawing that type of response from the House. As You Honour knows, when a member asks to be heard in silence he is heard in silence. But the hon. member, with all the garbage that he has been going on with in the House, is just drawing comments from this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: If you want to follow that, what the hon. member is saying is if you do not agree with what he is saying in this House you can turn it into a beer garden if you want to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think there is a legitimate point of order here -

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I think I have -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think there is a legitimate point of order here and I would ask all hon. members on both sides of the House to adhere to the rules of the House. The hon. member for Stephenville has about thirty seconds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, in my thirty seconds I just want to say that the previous Liberal speaker said there is going to be an election called in this Province sometime and control of our destiny is going to be one of the issues and he called that a 'shallow issue'. Well, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that control of our destiny is not going to be a 'shallow issue' and I say in summation we must have ownership and control of our offshore resources. We on this side must be vigilant in seeking that because

MR. STAGG: obviously hon. members opposite have no intention of doing so, and in the totality, Mr. Speaker, we must prevail. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova has the floor.

MR. T. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how to respond to that unmitigated, unadulterated, unscrupulous, unlearned, narrow, parochial mumble-jumble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. STIRLING: Now you are going to get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

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

The hon. member for Terra Nova has the floor.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times that members on this hon. side of the House are going to have to stand in their place and say where they stand on this particular issue, where they stand with respect to offshore ownership.

MR. T. LUSH: I have stood in this House now, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions to indicate where I stand. I have heard every hon. member here rise in his place to say where they stood individually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. I do not know what I am supposed to do, whether I am supposed to go down Water Street carrying a plaque indicating where I stand or whether I am going to have to go to the Stadium or just what I am going to have to do, Mr. Speaker, to indicate once and for all where we stand on this particular issue. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. STAGG: Tell him to oppose the federal government. Do you oppose the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I will say in time; I have twenty-five minutes or so and I will say it in precise language. I will say it in unemotional terms, Mr. Speaker; I will say it, Mr. Speaker, without accusing anybody on either side of the House of being unpatriotic. I will say it, Mr. Speaker, without attaching degrees of patriotism to hon. members in this particular House. Because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members in this House are patriotic. I do not believe that there are people in this House who are not patriotic. What a lot of nonsense! So, Mr. Speaker, I will not deal at that level, I will not deal with that kind of nonsense.

But, Mr. Speaker, be it known to all members of this House and let the people of Newfoundland know that we believe that this Province owns its offshore resources. We believe in that, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this Province owns its offshore resources. How many times do we have to say it?

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Province owns its offshore resources. And, Mr. Speaker, how many times do we have to say it? I wonder are the press quoting us on it? I do not know. Are the press quoting us?

MR. STIRLING: Yes, they are.

MR. T. LUSH: Are the press saying that we on this side believe that we own our offshore resources? Does anybody believe -

AN HON.MEMBER:

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I think I have said that enough times so that all hon. members on the other side get that point, that they get it loud and clear that we on this side of the House believe that we own the offshore resources.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will not get political on it, to go back into history as to what happened in past days and all this sort of thing because I want to get talking about the future. I do not want to get talking about what happened in the past. I want to talk about tomorrow.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: I want to get away from, Mr. Speaker, from this low-down political level of making -

MR. F. STAGG: They believe that you believe (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to get down to talking about plans for tomorrow. This resolution, this is a waste of time to be discussing this particular motion. This is something that we should have discussed three or four years ago. What I would like to be talking about now is what plans the government have with respect to production. This is what I would like to talk about, what infrastructure they have to put in place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: This is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, making a political football out of this offshore ownership. A lot of nonsense! A waste of time! How much more time are we going to waste in this hon. House talking about ownership, listening to hon. members going right throughout the Province, Mr. Speaker, prating and prattling and sabre rattling. Let us get down and have some action! Let us talk about the production stages and let us talk about the developmental stages. Let us get down to business, Mr. Speaker, let us get down to business in the development stages and tell the people of this Province what is going to on. Let us tell the people about the plans that we have for the development of this offshore oil and gas. Let us get down to providing manpower training programmes for our young people so that they can get jobs in this development stage and in the production stage.

MR. G. WARREN:

Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, to hear all of the talk, to hear hon. members talk you would not know but once we got oil that all of the problems of this Province are going to be solved, that once we get offshore oil and gas that there will be no more unemployment problem in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, let us tell the truth, let us tell the people the truth about this. What jobs, how many jobs are going to be made available to our people? What jobs will be created as a result of the development of offshore oil and gas? How many jobs, Mr. Speaker, how many jobs? It looks like, Mr. Speaker, from the best information that is available, that in a major oil development that the most we could expect is 7,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker. That is counting spinoff. 7,000 jobs and to hear hon. members talking you would not know that they were talking about 700,000 jobs, to hear them talking about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the kind of resolution that we should be debating today is not the ownership; the Provincial Government should have that taken care of. They should have had that taken care of by now.

MR. FLIGHT:

They have a mandate for it and do not know how to do it.

MR. LUSH:

And they should be, as I have said before, presenting resolutions and discussion in this House about the development plans, their plans for development and letting the people of Newfoundland know what they are doing so that we will reap the maximum benefits from that onshore and offshore. That is the kind of activity that we should be engaged in now, that is

MR. LUSH: kind of debate, that is the kind of worthwhile and practical and intelligent debate we should be now dealing with.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is all a red herring, that is what it is. It is a red herring, it is a smoke screen. It is just diversionary tactics by this government, Mr. Speaker, it is just diversionary tactics, Mr. Speaker, to take public attention away from the lack of performance by this government. That is what it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Failing to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the outrageous, disgraceful high unemployment levels in this Province. And to hear the minister come in, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (J.Dinn), to hear him come in and talk about 9,500 jobs, 9,500 jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what all of this is. Just a red herring, just a red herring. As I have said before, to hear the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower come in and to all of a sudden do a turn about face on two major issues in this respect. Hon. members will recall last year that the hon. minister in this House denied here that the Premier promised 40,500 jobs. He denied it, he denied it. Yesterday, of course, because we created 9,500 - not created because there was an increase in the labour force because there was an increase over the period in question. Because there was an increase of 9,500, he all of a sudden says now the Premier promised it and we have gone 9,500 towards meeting that target of 40,500 jobs. On the same day the Minister of Labour and Manpower repudiated Statistics Canada, repudiated Statistics Canada. All of a sudden he is believing in them, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: - he is believing in them now.

Well, the Minister cannot have it both ways, he cannot have it both ways. Here we have turn about face on two issues, two issues - one, he repudiated Statistics Canada, said that the Premier did not

MR. LUSH: promise 40,500 jobs. Yesterday, he turned about face, believes in Statistics Canada now, believes in that and says that the Premier did promise 40,500 jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, why will not the minister get up and tell the hon. members that that was a colossal bluff, this creation of 40,500 new jobs. Let me tell you what the Premier did-because any member here, any member in this Hon. House can go out and make this kind of promise to his constituents during election and be pretty accurate and thus come up with a commitment on the promise - what the Premier did, you see, was to take an average of the jobs that were created over the past five years. That can be done very accurately,

MR. LUSH: the natural growth in the economy, and you will find out that over the past six or seven years that we have had, that the growth of employment, the numbers of people in employment increases by about anywhere between six and eight thousand. So, of course, you project that into the future and you put a few figures on it for probably a little more growth in the economy, you put a little more on that and you can average it out to nine thousand, you multiply that by five and you get forty-five thousand jobs and you cannot go wrong, you cannot go wrong. But it is not forty thousand or forty-five thousand new jobs, Mr. Speaker, it is just the natural growth in the economy. If the Premier dropped dead, if anybody dropped dead that still would happen. It would just flow just like a river.

MR. FLIGHT: It might happen quicker. It might come quicker then.

MR. LUSH: It is just the natural growth in the economy. And for somebody to stand up here and to say because there are 9,500 more people in the labour force in November or October of this year than there were in October of last year and to say that the government created 9,500 new jobs, Mr. Speaker, is nothing but a colossal bluff, a colossal bluff. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we should be talking about, that is what we should be talking about. I would hope that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will get up in his place today and say how reliable these statistics are now in view of the outright condemnation that he leveled at these statistics last year. Last year, of course, last year the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower would not dare look at the labour force statistics particularly with respect to the rate of unemployment, he would not look at that at all. He would not look at that at all last

MR. LUSH: year because we were up around fourteen and fifteen per cent for the whole year. And what he was using last year as the measurement, what he was using last year as the measurement of growth in the economy, of course, was the employment ratio, that is what he was using last year, the employment ratio. But this year he has forgotten about that now and come in with this great, startling news from Statistics Canada that between the period, I believe it was, of October of last year-or January of last year, I am sorry, and October of this year, a nine month period, that we have 9,500 jobs and holding that up as getting closer to the target promised by the Premier of 40,500 jobs. Well, I can tell the people of Newfoundland now that they will get the 40,500 jobs but it was not in the context in which the Premier promised it. The people of this Province believe that the Premier was going to, that was promising them 40,500 new jobs, 40,500 jobs in addition to the natural growth that takes place in the economy. That is what the people of this Province believe.

MR. FLIGHT: That is what they were promised.

MR. LUSH: Well, I hope, Mr. Speaker, I have been successful in exposing that for what it was worth. Mr. Speaker, I believe that these are the kinds of issues that we should be talking about today and not this resolution relating to ownership, not this, but we should be talking about the other plans down the road, as the Premier is so prone to say, down the road. What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, in the developmental stages? What is going to happen in the production stages? Are we training our people, our young Newfoundlanders so that they can get the jobs on these offshore oil rigs and on the jobs that are going to accrue on the onshore? Do we

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2820

AH-3

MR. LUSH: have the manpower training programmes
in for this , Mr. Speaker, other than setting up these foolish
protectionist policies, local preference? Our people do not
want a protectionist policy. Our people want to be provided
with training, to be provided with training so that they
can go out there and get those jobs. That is what our people
want, Mr. Speaker. That is what our people want,

MR. T. LUSH: to set up an extensive training programmes that our young people are crying for so that they can get jobs for which they qualify. That is what we want, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FLIGHT: To get them in Alberta. They are going out there by the droves and going to work in Alberta and competing with Albertans and getting the jobs.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about? The amount of time that we have spent on this non-issue, on this non-issue, instead of talking about, as I have said before, employment strategies, instead of talking about plans in the forestry to develop the maximum potential of the forestry, now, Mr. Speaker, that is a topic in itself to talk about what the government is not doing in forestry, what they are not doing in agriculture to get closer to their avowed aim of self-sufficiency, to their proclaimed aim but one in which they are doing nothing, Mr. Speaker, one in which they are doing nothing. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said all of us here stand four square behind the fact that Newfoundland, that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador owns its offshore resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are having difficulty, we are having great difficulty in trying to ascertain where the Premier stands on the issue. We are having great difficulty trying to ascertain where the Premier stands. And as I have suggested before, just last Spring here in this hon. House he stood and read a speech in which he listed off, I believe, three or four points by which we could resolve this offshore ownership. He talked about the Maritime agreement, we could go that way. He

MR. T. LUSH: talked about a negotiated settlement with Ottawa, he talked about that. And then he talked about some vague thing of extension of boundary. But the one that the Premier at that particular time clearly supported was the negotiated settlement, but now it is reversed again, or he is now of course, because the constitutional debate is on the go, I suppose he figures that this a good way to make some more political mileage out of this particular issue, now we will go and try and get this into the constitution. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody on this side who wants anything else but ownership of the offshore oil resource. That is what we want, Mr. Speaker, that is what we want for Newfoundland. There is nobody on this side wants less than the maximum benefits from the offshore oil, the maximum benefits, the full benefits, that is what we want for the Province. So, let us stop making a political football out of it. Let us get down and do what has got to be done so that we can get on with the planning of the development and production. That is what we should be on to, Mr. Speaker. Too, too long, too, too long we have been hung up on this offshore ownership and listening to the government making political brownie points on this particular issue, too, too long. And let us get that out of the way, Mr. Speaker. Let us get it out of the way, let us stop putting forward these nonsense motions and get down to talking about something that will have immediate and real impact for the people of Newfoundland, that will have immediate results for the people who are going to face a hard Winter, for the people out there who are unemployed, for the people who do not know how they are going to live this Winter, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: For people, Mr. Speaker, that do not know how they are going to heat their homes this winter, for people who do not know how they are going to keep food on the table.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt) I would like to mention to the hon. member his time is up.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, for these -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH: For these, Mr. Speaker, and other reasons not mentioned I will be supporting this resolution as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak in this debate. I think everybody on this side knows what my position is with respect to ownership of off-shore. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just had to get up to correct

MR. DINN: some of the foolish statements made by the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). One of the foolish statements was that it is the normal thing, we get eight or nine thousand jobs anyway in Newfoundland. Eight or nine thousand jobs is the normal thing for us to get in Newfoundland, so that is what we get anyway, we created no new jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at a couple of years prior to 1979 and 1980. Let us just have a look and see whether that fact that the hon. member put forth bears any weight at all. In 1974 over 1973 we went down 3,000 jobs. In 1975 over 1974 we went up 5,000 and, Mr. Speaker, for each year thereafter it was 5,000 or 4,000 or 5,000. Now, what happened in 1979? Well, Mr. Speaker, for January and February and March of 1979 the unemployment rate in Newfoundland bordered around 20 per cent. In January it was 18.6, I believe; in February it was 20.1; and in March it started to creep. Something happened in March. Everybody in Newfoundland knows what happened last year on March 17th., a great date in the history of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and from that point on a steady, steady downward trend in the unemployment figures came about, Mr. Speaker. The Premier came out and he said, "Forty thousand new jobs, forty thousand five hundred new jobs". Well, Mr. Speaker, he was wrong. The Premier was wrong. There were not forty thousand new jobs. There were 9,500 in this year alone, Mr. Speaker, 9,000 last year, Mr. Speaker. In 1979 - now, Mr. Speaker, we just got on track, just on track, just got into full stride starting in March, and in the remainder of that year we picked up enough such that the average increase in 1979 over 1978 was 9,000 new jobs. He beat his figures in the first year, Mr. Speaker, by some 1,000 jobs, and this year, Mr. Speaker, how are we doing? Well, Mr. Speaker, I outlined it for the hon. members opposite. They do not want to hear it. They do not want

MR. DINN: to believe it. I talk about Statistics Canada and you cannot just look at Statistics Canada for one day or one month and believe them as a gospel but you can take the averages. That is the way you have to do it, and, Mr. Speaker, the averages - if you look at Statistics Canada and look at January last year over January the previous year it was 5,000 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at March it was 13,000; in June, 14,000. Well, I did not get up and make a great to-do about the 14,000 jobs in June. But, Mr. Speaker, if you take that 5,000 and the 14,000 and you average it out over the ten months that I gave the hon. member the figures for, and then Statistics Canada came out the day after I made the statement here in the House, Mr. Speaker, with another 11,000 jobs. Well, you cannot take that. I did not get up here in the House and run off at the mouth about the 11,000 new jobs because, Mr. Speaker, that is a capsule view. That is the fifteenth day of the month when they take that one shot look at the economy and they say what the employment and the unemployment rates are. Well, Mr. Speaker, I took that and I averaged it. We are still going. Our employment growth in Newfoundland is still better than any other province in Canada. We had 11,000. I said in this House that if we maintained the 9,500 average or above that we would be the greatest Province in Canada this year with respect to employment growth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Or, Oh!

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) does not like it. He does not want to believe it but the statistics are there and, Mr. Speaker, the statistics are there because something was done. What happened in this Province over the past year, where the jobs came from, I outlined that. I did not get specific. I did not say about the hundreds of jobs that were created onshore with respect

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2822

GH-2

MR. DINN: to the oil and gas offshore.
I just stated the statistics that I had in my hands,
Mr. Speaker, the Stephenville conversion to newsprint, the
linerboard mill that was a disaster area, a disaster area,
Mr. Speaker, that great mill now, that great economic device
that will revive the West Coast of this Province.

MR. J. DINN: The newsprint mill, that was one area where jobs were created; the Upper Salmon and the Hinds Lake hydro developments where hundreds of jobs were created there, Mr. Speaker; onshore, as I said, with respect to offshore oil and gas, onshore jobs in the hundreds; offshore - 900 jobs, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member does not want to hear it, 400 jobs in the spruce budworm reclamation of that timber, Mr. Speaker, 400 jobs there. Something like 1,400 in the past year and a half or two years created by the Rural Development Authority. Mr. Speaker, I could go on but hon. members opposite have heard it four or five times, they do not want to believe it, they keep getting up and trying to weasel their way around the facts but the facts will out, Mr. Speaker, and they stand up in this House today on this resolution and they say how Newfoundland owns its resources. Well that and fifty cents will get them a ride on a Metrobus. What are they doing with Mr. Rompkey? Why does he not believe it? Why do they have a resolution or a bill before the House in Ottawa now taking away - robbing - 43 per cent of that offshore resource, that same resource that hon. members opposite say we own?

Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace, it is a political disgrace that people on the opposite side can flip-flop. We had a member, Mr. Speaker, from Baie Verte - White Bay who just could not take the flip-flops anymore, he had to come to where Newfoundlanders stand up for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, he had to cross the House, an unprecedented move. The man did not want to do it but he just could not live with that kind of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, that kind of political hypocrisy in this Province. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment figures, as I state for November, and I will give it to

MR. J. DINN: the hon. member again, we created new jobs because they did not exist last year, 11,000 jobs this November over last November. And the hon. member got up in this House yesterday in Question Period - a silly, foolish question - and said, 'Are these new jobs?' Well Mr. Speaker, if they did not exist last year and they do exist this year, they are relatively new, Mr. Speaker; I mean, you know, one would have to think that they are relatively new. If we did not have them last November and we have them this November, they are relatively new. Yes, the answer to the hon. member's question then and is now that there are 11,000 new jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they are less than a year old.

MR. DINN: And they are less than a year old, Mr. Speaker. And next year, Mr. Speaker, I will predict for next year - and the Premier has been conservative, I will be conservative also - that next year it will be the same thing - 9,500 more jobs if not 10,000 or 11,000 jobs. It will be the same thing next year, Mr. Speaker, and I predict that the unemployment figures for next year will be such that they will be bordering on 10 per cent not 14 per cent or not 20 per cent as it was two years ago, Mr. Speaker. It will be bordering somewhere around 10 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not like the statistics. He said, 'I do not like Statistics Canada'. Well, the fact of the matter is it is a capsule view. I never ever said that I did not like Statistics Canada but I said that one shot in one month does not give the picture for the year, it does not give the overall state of the employment in the Province and that is what I said to the hon. member. And he got up and he twisted words and twisted the facts as I reported here in this House. And I also said in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not going to create 9,500 government jobs, because that is what the hon. member asked me. He ask me, 'Is the government

MR. J. DINN: going to create 9,500 or 40,500 new government jobs?' And I said, no, there will be no more jobs in the government, there will be a little bit of an increase in government jobs. The jobs will be created based on our resources. Well that is the whole philosophy of this Party, Mr. Speaker, develop the resources and the jobs will come in those resources.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member got up and he spoke for thirty minutes talking about foolish facts, he had no background, he said that 9,500 jobs is the norms. I just told him, I just gave him the statistics for the last five years, they average somewhere around 4,000 or 5,000 jobs and now there are 9,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker, and they cannot get away from that fact. And I will stand up here day in and day out and I will just ram her home until they realize that something is happening in Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, that something is great. And Mr. Speaker, that something is going to happen for the next four or five years or as long as this administration is in power.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in support of the amendment. Members who have spoken

MR. NEARY:

previously, Mr. Speaker, the last several speakers seemed to have gotten away from the resolution and the amendment to the resolution. The amendment really is what we are debating and an amendment to a private member's resolution brought in by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), which would not have been a bad resolution except for the fact that the hon. gentleman injected the Progressive Conservative party or the Conservative party in the resolution. And as hon. members know this happened once before in this hon. House and I think the Speaker ruled at the time that it had to be removed.

AN HON. MEMBER: There was an amendment by the Government House Leader.

MR. NEARY: There was an amendment by the Government House Leader. That is right. The hon. gentleman just refreshed my memory. They wanted to vote for a resolution and because it was worded in such a way that it brought in partisan politics, well then the Government House Leader moved an amendment and it was adopted by the House. So there is a precedent for it and what we have done here is we have asked to have the Conservative administration removed from the last, "Therefore be it resolved." And I think that is a fair request, Mr. Speaker. So all kinds of items now, all kinds of things have crept into this debate. And when I started out, you know, with the intention to have a few words on this resolution, I wanted to talk about the way the government had handled the offshore question but I am so confused now, my mind is so muddled after listening to the lower strata on the government side - and we just heard one now who just took his seat. Obviously his mind is muddled today. He is beside himself. He does not know what he is saying or doing. He seems to be uptight all the time.

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2824

AH-2

AN HON. MEMBER:

A personal attack.

Mr. NEARY:

No, it is not a personal attack.

The hon. gentleman is the smear artist in this House.

MR. WARREN:

Right on.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. member who just took his seat is rather uptight, Mr. Speaker, and my advice to him is to relax. Relax, because otherwise he is going to do himself some kind of physical harm.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He must have had a hard night, boy.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I do not know if he had a hard night or not, but I would suggest that he relax a little more and learn how to debate and get the level of debate up to where it should be in this hon. House and not leave the impression that the hon. gentleman is completely ignorant of the facts in this particular matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was paying attention to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and I must say that in all the mumbo-jumbo by the hon. gentleman and all the entertaining remarks made by the hon. gentleman there is something in there that I would like to dwell on briefly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh. Oh!

MR. NEARY:

There was something in there.

As a matter of fact the hon. gentleman may be on to something more than he thinks he was on to and actually I was going to mention it in my few remarks. I was going to mention it in my few remarks but the hon. gentleman spoke before I did so he upstaged me a little bit. And that has to do with the bill that was introduced in the House of Commons yesterday. I do not know what the implications are. When I heard about the bill, I immediately placed a phone call to Ottawa to ask to have the bill sent down to

MR. NEARY: me immediately because I want to study the bill. I do not know what the ramifications of it are, the implications, I would think, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that as a result of that legislation, if it is adopted by the Parliament of Canada, as a result of that the Province, the provincial government here in this Province will be forced, whether they like it or not, they will be forced to test that legislation in the Supreme Court of Canada. I am not a lawyer, I am not a doctor or an academic,

MR. NEARY: I am just an ordinary, common member of this House, but I have my suspicions. The Government of Canada introduced a bill that would give the provinces 75 per cent of revenues from offshore and onshore resources, offshore and onshore, and twenty-five per cent to the Government of Canada. Now that was the, if hon. members will recall, that is the agreement that currently exists between the Government of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick -

MR. MORGAN: Except (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: In the same bill they are going to add on a royalty system of 40 per cent of all the profits -

MR. NEARY: Well -

MR. MORGAN: According to the Federal Government as well.

MR. NEARY: Well, the bill goes a little further than a straight seventy-five/twenty-five. I do not know what all the implications of it are, but it merely sets down in law an agreement made with the three Maritime Provinces. As hon. members of the House know our Premier will not have anything to do with the Maritime Provinces. It is a seventy-five/twenty-five deal. And it also I believe provides where oil and gas companies are not Canadian owned, then the Government of Canada through Petrocan can buy whatever shares are necessary, whatever equity is necessary in the company to make it a Canadian company. And obviously the bill is meant also to help Canadianize the oil and gas industry. And I am all for that, Mr. Speaker, I am all for it. But having heard about this legislation and about this bill if I were the Premier of this Province, if I were the Premier, on my way back from New York where he is now down trying to mend some fences-the hon. gentleman has made so many enemies in the international business community and in the financial business community, he has made so many

MR. NEARY: enemies that now he is down trying to patch up his differences with some of the financial people in New York. I do not know if it is too late for him to make any friends, Mr. Speaker. I believe the time has come in this Province to set up a royal commission, establish a royal commission to try to determine if this Province, if the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) have a friend left in the business world. There should be a royal commission to try to find that out, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman in the last eighteen months has made one enemy after the other. And the other day I just jotted down a partial list of those who have been the victim of the Premier's wrath. The Prime Minister of Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this relevant?

MR. NEARY: It has to do with this bill, Sir. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Government of Canada, all the ministers in the Government of Canada, the Province of Quebec, the Economic Council of Canada, Mobil Oil and all the other oil companies drilling off our shore, exploring off Newfoundland and Labrador, the bondholders who put up the money for the development of the Upper Churchill, the financiers of that great union, the Fisherman's Union, has been the victim of the Premier's wrath, John Shaheen, Jim McGrath, a member of Parliament, and Bill Rompkey, Minister of National Revenue. All have felt the brunt of the Premier's attack.

AN HON. MEMBER: Joe Clark.

MR. NEARY: And Mr. Clark was also included in that select group there a year or so ago. That is only a partial list, Mr. Speaker. And now the hon. gentleman is down in New York trying to mend his fences. God only knows how much damage he has done to this Province. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland needs friends as well as enemies. I cannot point to one friend that we have in the international business

December 10, 1980

Tape No. 2825

IB-3

MR. NEARY: community or in the international
financial community or in the Government of Canada. Here
we are asking - we have the Premier

MR. NEARY: and his advisors asking the Government of Canada to give us control over the offshore development. And out of the other corner of their mouth they are saying, 'Go jump in the lake. We do not want to have anything to do with you.' It seems to me to be a peculiar way to conduct negotiations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Peter Lougheed.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is one friend that the Premier of this Province has. There is one friend and that is Mr. Lougheed. Mr. Lougheed has managed to suck him in. Mr. Lougheed has managed to use him. Mr. Lougheed will own this Province if he keeps going the way he is going, forcing this Province to borrow from the Heritage Fund.

MR. THOMS: Two separatists together, boy, two separatists together.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Lougheed and our Premier are in bed together and Mr. Lougheed is the gentleman who is seducing our Premier and using him to go out and advocate world prices of Alberta oil, sock it to the consumers here in this Province and then in return we can borrow from his Heritage Fund and pay whatever the going interest is to Alberta.

But what I started out to say before I got carried away there, Mr. Speaker, was this - and if I was the Premier of this Province before I would set foot in Newfoundland, before I would return from New York I would take a detour, I would buy a ticket to Ottawa and I would sit down with the Prime Minister of this country and I would say, "Mr. Prime Minister, what does this legislation mean? What does it mean? Does it mean now that Ottawa is going to take control of the offshore resources because that is what it means to me? Ottawa now - and I mentioned this the other day in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I have no doubt I hastened the Premier's trip to New York. What happened

MR. NEARY: between Mobil and the Premier of this Province the early part of the week? What happened? What I think did happen was that Mobil threatened to take the Province to court over the offshore ownership. The Premier got his back up, got his dander up as he usually does, went berserk, went off his head and said, "You take us to court and we will cancel your permit". And Mobil's answer to that is, "Well, go ahead and cancel the permit, we have a federal permit and we will operate under that". And, Mr. Speaker, do not think that they cannot do it. Both permits, Mr. Speaker, are equal. One is just as good as the other. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows that. The federal permit at the moment is just as good as the provincial permit.

MR. BARRY: No.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon! It is just as good because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY: You would like to think so.

MR. NEARY: - we do not know -

MR. THOMS: You made them just as good.

AN HON. MEMBER: You supported the federal decision.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, look, let me ask the hon. gentleman a question. If Mobil decides tomorrow to say, "To hell with your permits, Mr. Province, we are operating under a federal permit and we will make our proposals for producing oil on the Grand Banks to the Government of Canada. They will stick a destroyer out there that will cost \$4,000 or \$5,000 a day to keep her there and they will take control of the oil field. What is this Province going to do? Send out the Newfoundland Constabulary? What are they going to do? Send out the Catherine?"

MR. HANCOCK: You got to get permission from the feds to send her out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what will they do?

MR. NEARY: Send out the Newfoundland Constabulary, the water bombers, the Norma and Gladys to try to take back the oil field? Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter and the hon. gentleman may have been on to something more than he imagined when he mentioned it. Because I have a feeling that the Province now as a result of this legislation will have no choice, I would say their hands will be forced, they have no choice once this

MR. NEARY:

legislation goes through the Parliament of Canada but to challenge the legislation in the Supreme Court of Canada, something that they should have done four or five years ago. They should have followed through with the preparation of their case but now they have got themselves boxed in. They have got themselves boxed in. They cannot play chess as good as they thought they could. They cannot play checkers as good as they thought they could and now they have to move or be blown. And that is what I think is happening at the moment, the power play is on. The oil companies are making their move, they are getting desperate, they are getting desperate to get the ownership question settled because they cannot set their production plans in operation. They do not know who they are dealing with. They are not worried about provincial regulations, they are not worried about our little low-lifed Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), they are not worried about the Premier and the regulations in this Province. Only one thing -

MR. BENNETT:

I say.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am talking about the oil companies. There is only one thing they are worried about and concerned about and that is who owns the offshore? Who owns it? Once they determine that, Mr. Speaker, then they know where they are going and I would say now that Newfoundland, poor old little Newfoundland now is getting caught in the squeeze, the power play is on, and I am sorry to have to say that, I am sorry to have to say it. It is this government's fault. So as I started to say, if I were the Premier now I would leave New York, I would say, 'Alright, I will cancel whatever meetings I have,' and I would go up to Ottawa and I would say, 'Mr. Prime Minister,

MR. NEARY: when you were in Newfoundland prior to the last federal election you made a statement, you made a speech at Memorial University and I now refer to it as the University Formula. We were all there and we all heard it - you made a statement that Newfoundland would get 100 per cent of the revenue of offshore resources until such time as we became a have Province, in other words until such time as we would be no longer entitled to equalization grants. You made that statement. Now, with this legislation going through the House of Commons in Ottawa, does that mean now that you are going to renege on that deal? Because that was a pretty good deal, that was one of the best deals we are going to get. And the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister was willing to give us control of the resource so that we could control the pace of the development offshore, that was a part of the deal. But now does that go down the tube, down the drain? That is what I would like to know. Does this legislation supercede the University Formula outlined prior to the last federal election? That is the big question I would like to get answered right now, Mr. Speaker. And I would like for some of the heavies on the government side - never mind the lower strata, never mind the lower form of life over there who want to talk about foolish nonsense - let the heavies get up now let the President of the Council, the Government House Leader - I mean, we may not like him but he is well informed on these matters - let him get up now and tell us where we stand and where we are going and what the next move is going to be because I have a feeling, I have a feeling that this move that was made in Ottawa yesterday is a substantial move that is going to land us in the Supreme Court of Canada.

December 10,1980

Tape No. 2827

AH-3

MR. STAGG:

It is an arrogant move.

MR.NEARY:

It is not an arrogant move,it is
a move - Mr. Speaker, you can call it arrogant, you can
call it what you like,but it is a matter that comes under-

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR.NEARY:

Let us not get petty partisan
politics in it at this particular point in time. It is
to serious a matter. Newfoundland stands to loose too
much. We stand to gain quite a bit. Let us carry on our
negotiations without calling news conferences, without
calling press conferences and pumping out news releases,
let us forget all that. We are now reaching the crossroads
in these negotiations and in this matter, we are reaching
the crossroads. It is a very

MR. S. NEARY: serious matter indeed and we have to get it cleared up quickly. And I want to know from the heavies on the government side, where do we go from here?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile has the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know, I am winding up my few remarks but I want to forget the politics of this. It is a good resolution, we would like to see it amended, we are going to support it, but I would like for the heavies on the government side to get up and tell us the implications of this and not get nasty about it, not play politics with it and -

MR. HANCOCK: Well, they cannot do that now 'Steve'. You are asking too much.

MR. S. NEARY: - tell us what the next move is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am talking to the heavies. I am not talking to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I am talking to the heavyweights on the government side -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - people who are knowledgeable in these matters and know what they are talking about. We have to depend on the government and the people of this Province have to depend on the government for information on this matter, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the Liberal Party of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and this is a good opportunity while we are debating this resolution to get an update because

MR. NEARY: I think this was a very substantial -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I think, will agree that this was a very substantial move that was made in Ottawa yesterday and I would like to know what the counter move is going to be by the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I intend to talk on this resolution and on another matter, so I do not really respond to the hon. member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) invitation but suffice it to say this, as to what the next move, the next move tomorrow and the next day after is going to be consistent with the move that was made by the Peckford administration from its conception and as it will be in the future. The fact of the matter is that this particular act, Mr. Speaker, will apply to federal lands. And it is our position, Mr. Speaker, which has been held and will be held for the whole length of our tenure of office until we succeed that the offshore of this Province are not federal lands but they are provincial land. And we are going to press on, Mr. Speaker, much to the disappointment of the hon. members opposite. Hon. members opposite will be then extremely disappointed. We are not going to be satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with their formula that we get as much of the offshore until such time as we become a have Province from being have-not. We are not going to be satisfied, Mr. Speaker, in other words, to go only up to the stage when in effect we pay for our own services or social services or welfare payments and what have you and then have Canada take all of our birthright away from us, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to be satisfied, Mr. Speaker with anything else but full and complete ownership, Mr. Speaker, of our offshore resource, and when we get full and complete ownership and we become a have province, then we

MR. W. MARSHALL: will gladly, the same way as our sister provinces in Canada contributed to those who are in the unfortunate position to have less than ourselves. So that is the position, Mr. Speaker. I would note too to the House that it is very interesting to note that this particular bill that is now before the House of Parliament in Ottawa after scoring our own offshore regulations, after scoring our own bills that we have brought in and our positions as being inadequate, follows very much, very closely to our own formula but, of course, it tries to adapt it and appropriate it to the benefit of the federal government rather than the provincial government where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk in connection with this resolution in the few moments that are available. I want to spend my time talking, if I could, about the affect of the ownership of the offshore as it relates to the Come By Chance oil refinery because, Mr. Speaker, there have been certain statements made since this legislature reconvened that I think have been very unfortunate and the information that has been given or the incorrect information, I think, could be detrimental to the effects of this government to re-establish-or to establish, really, not re-establish because the refinery was never on a solid footing-but to establish the refinery on a solid footing itself.

A little bit of immediate history, Mr. Speaker, in the short time that is available; when the Peckford administration assumed office it was determined to do what it possibly could to establish that refinery as a viable operation. There were three considerations which it addressed itself to. Number one, that

MR. MARSHALL:

the refinery had to be adequate and safe for the environment, not have a bad effect on the environment; number two, that when it reopened that the jobs were to be secure for the people down there who were working there, that it was not to be a concern that was to open, say, for two months or six months and find itself closed down again; and, number three, Mr. Speaker, we addressed ourselves to the second mortgage monies that were owed. We were faced at the time, Mr. Speaker, with an offer that had been -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

If I could, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council has the floor.

MR. MARSHALL:

We were faced at the time, Mr. Speaker, with an offer that had been negotiated with the First Arabian Corporation. It was not completely satisfactory to us so we renegotiated it. Unfortunately, as history shows, that First Arabian offer fell through and then, Mr. Speaker, we - when I say 'we' I mean the government of this Province - and the Kleinwort-Benson and ECGD, who were the holders of the first mortgage - and it must be remembered they are the ones who own the refinery - sought to get another purchaser. There were advertisements placed all over the world. There were no takers and, Mr. Speaker, at that period of time I do not think it is any secret that the refinery was on the verge - that Kleinwort-Benson, the British interest, having exhausted every means available to them, were thinking in terms of attempting to scrap the refinery and sell it for scrap, but that is a matter of public knowledge. The government would not allow this at any cost, and the government stepped in and had negotiations with them, told them, Mr. Speaker, that we would not stand for this, and proceeded to get involved in the attraction of some other

MR. MARSHALL: concern to take over the refinery. We were successful, Mr. Speaker, in engaging the interest of Petro-Canada to come in, and we all know the story of what has happened and, unfortunately, the involvement of Petro-Canada and its offer and what have you has been distorted and, I think, distorted rather badly. The agreement was that they would purchase the refinery for a certain sum. Ten million dollars is to be paid before the end of this year and a further seven million dollars. Petro-Canada came in, did a feasibility study, spent well in excess of a million dollars, determined it was operationally feasible and on November 25th. of this year indicated it was going to waive its condition to get out from its obligation that it had incurred. So, in other words, it was a very positive step that Petro-Canada said that it was going to continue to be involved.

Now, I find it rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, and I think that this has to be emphasized because, as I say, it is going to have a detrimental effect on the prospects of jobs down there in the establishment of the refinery, it is going to have a detrimental effect on the efforts of this government to re-establish the refinery at Come By Chance unless certain things are understood. First of all, the offer that was made, there was much made - the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) made a statement, a blanket statement, without any substantiation whatsoever that the refinery could be scrapped and realize a hundred million dollars, without any foundation whatsoever.

If it were scrapped it would not realize this amount of money. Even if it were scrapped and realized a hundred million dollars, all of this money would go to the first mortgagees anyway. It would not go to the government of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, then the question comes in and what I find passing strange really is the way that the Opposition and certain people outside, certain scribes outside associated with the Opposition, have mooted and compared the difference between the new offer made by Mr. Shaheen and the offer made by Petro-Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shaheen allegedly has offered \$75 million, so they say, "Well, why is not the \$75 million accepted?" And, you know, "There must be some ulterior motive". Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who are selling this

MR. MARSHALL:

refinery are the British interests who hold the first mortgage. And surely to heaven if they could get \$75 million over \$17 million - I mean, they are not crazy. They have cast us under from time to time in our history, but they are not so crazy that the British interests are going to leave, you know, some \$60 million on the table. There has to be some reason for it. The reason for it is it was obviously not a realistic offer. It was not a realistic offer in the judgement of the people who own the refinery, it was not a realistic offer in the judgement of the government, and it was not a realistic offer to anybody who have any knowledge at all of the history of this refinery. I find it rather regrettable that Mr. Shaheen, the Shaheen interests are being championed and, you know, they should be given the refinery, all that is going to do we will say, it is going to have a detrimental effect on the efforts to reestablish this refinery itself. I can say right now -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that relevant?

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes it is very relevant, Mr.

Speaker, to this.

MR. STIRLING:

Would the minister permit a

question?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, I will permit a question

afterwards. But I want to, you know, point out the fact that the offer was made by Shaheen and it was turned down and it was turned down for a reason, for a very good reason. I would also like to point out the fact that the Shaheen interests had this refinery before and while they had it under their control it was turned into the largest bankruptcy in the Western World. So certainly there is reason for anyone having caution to turn it back to the same interests.

The fact of the matter is, Mr.

Speaker, there was nobody around, including Mr. Shaheen,

MR. MARSHALL: available to take this refinery. And the best chance of reestablishing of this refinery was and still remains in Petro-Canada. Petro-Canada has made a commitment for it -

MR. STIRLING: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. Leader of the Opposition bangs on the table. You know, he agrees but at the same time he is up in Question Period asking questions as to why it was not given to Shaheen. The tenor of his question, whether he means it or not, seemed to indicate that he was supporting the Shaheen interests over Petro-Canada.

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

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

MR. STIRLING: The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is quite at liberty to abuse this bill, to talk on the Come By Chance refinery because they have obviously had a change of heart, but he should not be putting words in my mouth and he is deliberately doing that. He has done that many times before and he is just not going to get away with it and it is just a distortion.

MR. SPEAKER: There is obviously no point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to get into the hon. member's mouth or any other part of his anatomy. Mr. Speaker, that is my assessment of the - let me say that is my definite assessment of the Opposition and their position on the Shaheen matter. I have heard it said from time to time, for instance, that the offer made by Mr. Shaheen would pay off all of the creditors. Now let me make it quite clear regardless of what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may say from time to time, if Mr. Shaheen had come in with a realistic offer to pay for the refinery in full, to pay off what was owed to the first mortgagees, to pay off the second mortgage and to pay off all of the creditors. And

MR. MARSHALL: secondly - that is first - and secondly have given an assurance of the nature that this refinery would have continued to operate on a sound basis for a long period of time -

MR. NEARY: He did.

MR. MARSHALL: He did in the hon. member's estimation but not in the estimation -

MR. NEARY: He did (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: No, he did not.

MR. NEARY: Yes he did.

MR. MARSHALL: No, he did not. I mean the hon. members -

MR. NEARY: What did he not do?

MR. MARSHALL: He did not put a realistic offer on the table. The offer that was put on the table by Mr. Shaheen has been looked at from time to time by independent people who are going to lose a tremendous amount of money in this venture.

MR. NEARY: Well tell us about it.

MR. MARSHALL: They have looked at his offer and they have

MR. W. MARSHALL: found that his offer is unrealistic and I think that that is the matter that -

MR. S. NEARY: That is not what Thorn, Riddell said.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That is what Thorn, Riddell said.

MR. S. NEARY: That is not what they said.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That is what Thorn, Riddell said and that is the position today. And when we get up, not only in his House but elsewhere, and we give a contrary impression, I think it is having a detrimental effect, as I say, on the legitimate desires of this government and Petro-Canada to see that refinery re-established with long-lasting jobs for the people in the area.

And the second part of it is he did not also not only did he not come in with a realistic financial offer, but neither did he come in with a realistic proposal indicating that there was a reasonable possibility of that refinery continuing to operate for a long, protracted period of time.

MR. S. NEARY: That is untrue.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, that is not untrue. That is the assessment of the people who had an in-depth knowledge of the workings of this refinery and the history.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I know the hon. member will not because the hon. member is supportive of the Shaheen offer. He thinks it is better than the other.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, okay, I am but what was unrealistic about it?

MR. W. MARSHALL: What was unrealistic about it. There was no offer. There was no real offer with respect to the payment. And when you talk about the secured creditors - listen to me talk about this - we say he is going to pay off the secured creditors. I think that it has to be judged - his offer too - in relation to an action which was taken by the trustee in bankruptcy in New York. Now the hon. member is aware of this and I think you have to judge - now I will say right from the first that that judgement is under appeal - but the fact of the matter is there was a judgement against Shaheen Natural Resources and certain people associated with Mr. Shaheen -

MR. S. NEARY: \$60 million.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes, for 75 millions of dollars. I quote from one of the papers in circulation -

MR. S. NEARY: Is that what is blocking the proposal?

MR. W. MARSHALL: No, that is the other thing. What I am saying is that you have to look at these things and you have to judge these developments when you are looking at the strength and the reliability of the proposal itself. Now in the New York Times or in the Wall Street Journal, I am not sure, around this particular time there was an article by Mr. Arnold Lubash, which said, 'A four year old dispute over a bankrupt oil refinery in Canada has resulted in a court verdict requiring Shaheen Natural Resources its owner, and some offiliates to pay more than \$75 million to the refinery company. The case focuses on a major Newfoundland oil refinery, Come By Chance, which was declared bankrupt in 1976. The bankruptcy

MR. W. MARSHALL: trustee filed a suit to recover large unsecured loans that the refinery company had made to its parent organization, Shaheen Natural Resources owned by John M. Shaheen, a New York industrialist. Milton S. Gould of Shea and Gould, the law firm retained to defend the Shaheen interest in the civil case, said yesterday that the court verdict requiring immediate payment of the loans was being appealed. Judge Richard Owen who presided over the trial refused last month to set aside the verdict which a jury rendered in July in the federal district court in Manhattan. I have a copy of this which I will table, Mr. Speaker, for hon. members to see.

MR. S. NEARY: I sent for the transcripts of the trial.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, I mean that is fine. The hon. member - it goes on to say that 'Clarkson and Company, the Canadian accounting company that was appointed as a bankruptcy trustee, sought to recover the money immediately to satisfy the refinery creditors. But Shaheen Natural Resources Limited contended that the loans were not due until 1985 under the terms of a promissory note. At the trial of the trustee suit' - now, Mr. Speaker, get this -

MR. S. NEARY: It was a jury trial.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - a jury. Much as the hon. member might be suspicious of lawyers and judges and what have you from time to time, but this is a jury of the hon. members's peers, you know, my peers as they say. Anyway, the jury found that the promissory note was a device to defraud the creditors of prompt repayment of the loans. The jury said that the loans should be repayed at once and that the bankrupt refinery should be compensated for not having had the use of the money for the last four years'.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw this to attention because - you know, I bring this and I say it has been appealed, but surely to heavens matters of this import and this nature - and here I table this judgement - should be taken into account and have to be taken into account when assessing Mr. Shaheen's offer that he made.

MR. S. NEARY: By whom will it have to be -

MR. W. MARSHALL: They will have to be taken into account by the people who own the refinery in the first instance.

MR. S. NEARY: Kleinwort-Benson.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Kleinwort-Benson. They have to be taken into account by this government, which is interested in protecting the resources of this Province, in protecting

MR. MARSHALL: the second mortgage, in attempting to protect the secured creditors. The hon. gentlemen opposite have gotten up in this House in this session and I have heard them say that the Shaheen offer is better for the secured creditors. Well, here we have a court case, a judgement that has been filed in the courts -

MR. NEARY: The real truth is starting to come out.

MR. MARSHALL: - no, we have - now, the hon. gentleman knew all this, he said, but when he was getting up, you know, he does not give the two sides of the story.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, the truth. I am well aware of it. I knew it before the hon. gentleman did.

MR. MARSHALL: But the fact of the matter is you have at least got to take into account the fact that there has been a judgement in the court in New York indicating that the Shaheen companies, and Mr. Shaheen, there have been judgements against them because they have said that they have appropriated money in their companies which is owned by these secured creditors which now the hon. gentlemen say would be protected by Mr. Shaheen somehow or other if he got the refinery back. Now, as I say, as far as the government is concerned, Mr. Speaker, as far as the British interests are concerned, as far as the trustee in bankruptcy is concerned, as far as the people of Newfoundland are concerned, regardless of what the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) may think our judgement is coloured by Mr. Shaheen, I say this that if anybody, including Mr. Shaheen, could come in with those prerequisites -

MR. NEARY: Is there any wrongdoing here?

MR. MARSHALL: - which he has not been able - I am not saying there is any wrongdoing. I am saying there is a civil suit there.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but does the Province think, does the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) think there is any wrongdoing?

MR. MARSHALL: The Minister of Justice can answer whatever question he wants.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what the hon. member is implying. The hon. member is implying -

MR. MARSHALL: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that a competent jury in the State of New York came in and indicated that -

MR. NEARY: Well, that is smear. Now, I mean, the hon. gentleman has to put up or shut up.

MR. MARSHALL: - the Shaheen Natural Resources have \$75 million which otherwise should have belonged to the company. Now, the thing is under appeal, the case is under appeal -

MR. NEARY: Right, but does the Province think there is any wrongdoing?

MR. MARSHALL: - but the fact of the matter is, surely to heavens, before considering an offer made and the sincerity and the depth of an offer that has been made by somebody, one would have to take into account actions such as that and results such as that. It is rather unfortunate that all we seem to get is a statement that, you know - the promised land is held out, that Shaheen's coming back into the refinery will somehow make it blossom again -

MR. NEARY: What I am curious about, what are the implications of what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. MARSHALL: - while not reporting salient and very relevant facts such as that judgement, such as the fact that, you know, the bankruptcy, and it is very, very

MR. MARSHALL: unfortunate. Because I say now, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) particularly should be complimented. But for the advent of Petro-Canada into the Come By Chance -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Petro-Canada.

MR. MARSHALL: - but for the advent of Petro-Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - and the hon. gentleman - but for, Mr. Speaker, yes -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order.

MR. MARSHALL: - that federal corporation, Petro-Canada, having come in at the instance of the Minister of Finance and of this government that today this refinery would have been scrapped or very likely would have been scrapped over our objections. This is what we did and this is what we prevented. Now, we think that the best possibility for the re-establishment of this refinery, for the establishment of secure jobs in the Come By Chance area through the refinery, through Hibernia-despite what they say and we will not get in with that yet. There are attempts made, you know, to denigrate that, that the oil from Hibernia cannot be used -

MR. NEARY: That is right. It can be used, yes, but not economically.

MR. MARSHALL: - but the best opportunity for the re-establishment of the refinery is and remains through Petro-Canada. And that is what the government is attempting to do and, Mr. Speaker, I speak on this resolution mainly to point out, as I say, that the continued championing by certain people of the Shaheen interests are nothing but to have a detrimental effect on these efforts because, as far as the government is concerned, you know, we are not concerned

MR. MARSHALL: with championing Mr. Shaheen as certain other people are, but what we are mainly concerned about is the establishment of jobs for Newfoundlanders in the best manner possible. We are concerned with Newfoundlanders and their jobs. Others, Mr. Speaker, can be and remain concerned with Mr. Shaheen if they so wish to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Will you permit a question now?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I will permit a question before I sit down.

MR. STIRLING: What are the implications of the -

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you.
MR. NEARY: The \$75 million, what is the implications of that?

MR. MARSHALL: The implication is -

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: But what are you saying? Are you saying there is wrongdoing or what?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to speak in this debate because it was a very clear cut case, ^{one} of the cases in which we could have unanimous agreement in this House. But the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) could not resist the temptation. And he knows the rules of this House better than anybody else and he knows how to use them, skate around them. He has found that the position that they had taken on Come By Chance was very weak, a position in which they gave up on Come By Chance. They turned it over to Petrocan, this same Petrocan that they were going to throw out of existence the federal -

MR. NEARY: Tories.

MR. L. STIRLING: - PC Party by their great leader. How quickly they can switch when it is to their advantage. How quickly they can say, 'Oh, yes, anything prior to this administration was the previous administration'. And to quote their leader That everybody before this administration 'was a dead loss'. Then they can come back in and pick and choose things that they want to comment on.

Now let us just deal with the motion, and it was a good one, one in which I thought we were going to have unanimous agreement once we got rid of the reference to a political party. Even the member for St. John's East had established the precedent, to that out of there. So let us have a look at what we are really saying in this resolution. We are saying in this resolution that the provincial position, the position of the Liberal Party after 1949, provincial government, that position was

MR. L. STIRLING:

that we owned the offshore.

The position of the next government, the government of Mr. Moores, which they do not want to be associated with but it was a government that did some good things for Newfoundland, and one of the things they did was to continue the position that we own the offshore. And the Johnnie-Come-Lately leader has done a very good job with Public Relations to create the impression that he was the first one to create the idea that Newfoundland owned the offshore. Everybody has always agreed on the provincial position that we own the offshore, and therefore the resolution is a good resolution. It has some more things in it that some people should take a look at and it has to do with the control, the rate and type of development. There is not a Newfoundlander or a Labradorian that does not agree that that has to be under the control of Newfoundlanders, to have it under the control of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Let us not debate that anymore.

Now let us take a look at one thing at a time. Now

let us take a look at the Come By Chance situation. You know, somebody said the other day there has been a debate and a debate is going on between two deaf people - I think it was Mr. Barry and Mr. Barube and their discussion - we are having a debate between deaf people. If you listen to what the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just did is he was showing his bitterness against one of the people who have made proposal, and he gets so wrapped up in

MR. STIRLING:

that bitterness that he says certain things that have never been said. Now, he knows the difference, of course. If we were outside the House, I would say that he misrepresented, but I cannot use that expression in the House. If I were outside the House I could say that he had distorted what was said.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, you can say it.

MR. STIRLING:

But in the House I cannot say that, and therefore I will not say it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, you can.

MR. STIRLING:

No, outside the House, I could.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should not say that.

MR. STIRLING:

Now, if you carefully look at what was said -

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

I do not know the exact reference in Beauchesne, but it is suggested that you are not permitted to say indirectly what you cannot say directly. This is exactly what the hon. member is saying here: 'I could not say it'- in his references to what he could not say in the House, but he would say it outside the House. So the hon. member is completely out of order and he should learn the rules.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, it is just an attempt to interrupt.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, again I have to apologize. I did not hear exactly

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): the comments of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition because I am trying to prepare some notes because the amendment has to be put prior to 5:40 P.M. I did not exactly hear what he said, but I will review Hansard and make a ruling at a later date.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: And what I said, Mr. Speaker, is that - and I had to get up on a point of order to clarify what it was the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who is an absolute master at it. Whatever it is he is doing that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was so concerned was out of order, he is an absolute master at it.

Now the truth of the matter is that the questions asked in this House of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was: has Newfoundland washed its hands of Petrocan? And, yes, that is the case. Petrocan has now been given a carte blanche to do whatever they want - by accident. What a piece of information the member for St. John's East blurted out. He did not mean to blurt it out but it is in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and we will come back to it. The member for St. John's East blurted out 'If Petrocan' - the same federal Petrocan that the people on the other side would have had thrown out of existence and who have secretly said that they would get them out of the offshore, the people who are senior partners in the development out there, what the member for St. John's East blurted out was if it were not for Petrocan Come by Chance would have been scrapped by now. And that is in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. He did not mean to say it. He said, you know, 'We would have protested'. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker,

MR. L. STIRLING: is that this government washed its hands of Come By Chance about two years ago. This government has not spent a nickel on Come By Chance in the last two years. They have never contributed to it and they have been like the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) taking the little press releases that come in and reading them as if he had contributed some new information or put the oil in the offshore. The contribution by the government has been to read what other people have said and done on Come By Chance. And they have washed their hands of Come By Chance and they written it off.

Now they have found a new found interest. They have a new found interest, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the truth of what we are seeing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: - is that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, what the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just admitted - and it a shocking admission - is that the questions that we asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) about the last offer which was presented in court, regardless of who it came from and my understanding was that it was not from Mr. Shaheen. It was from another company and that Mr. Shaheen had no financial interest in it - my understanding is that that offer has not been looked at by anyone, including this government. And what the member for St. John's East just said - and he is so bitter, he gets so wrapped up in the bitterness that when the people watch him on television they see it squirting out, it

MR. L. STIRLING: just squirts out, he gets to a position where he cannot see anything. And what he has now admitted is that nobody has looked, nobody, either the first mortgagee or the receiver has looked at this last offer. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is on the record as saying, 'Well, thank God we do not own Come By Chance. We have nothing further to do with it.' Now what has happened? What has happened to change their attitude, Mr. Speaker, in the last two weeks. I do not suppose it has anything to do with the fact there is a by-election and suddenly they have now said, 'We had better take this back under our arms, our wing and let us see what we can do to create some more confusion. Because the most senior member on the government side instead of debating the offshore retreated to talking about Come By Chance, Instead of dealing with the resolution, now he did it in accordance with the rules but he did not deal with the resolution,

MR. STIRLING: that fine resolution brought forward by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) that we can agree with, we want to vote with; there is no need to debate it forever, we agree with that position. Now what we would like to see the government do is to get into the position of saying, What are we going to do with the environment? What are we going to do to train Newfoundlanders to take those jobs? What kind of control are we going to have on the multi-national? What kind of partner do we need like we had with LCDC? You know this horrible federal government. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) spit it out - did you hear him spit it out? - Canada is going to take it away from us. Our birthright, Canada is going to take our birthright. The old anti-Confederate rises his head again. Mr. Speaker, that is the same government that on one hand spits at Canada and says, 'Of course, the only hope that we have in Come by Chance is Petrocan, the federal government, the federal Petrocan, that is the only hope that we have.' And then on the total energy development, Mr. Speaker, the total energy development, this government admit it, and it has been in the worst kind of manner that they admit it, that this Province is bankrupt, that this Province cannot develop the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, and they had to go to Ottawa.

MR. BARRY: Did you say this Province is bankrupt?

MR. STIRLING: This Province with the Lower Churchill Development Corporation -

MR. BARRY: Did you say that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition only has a couple of moments left and I think he has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I must ask hon. members, please, to respect the authority of the Chair. I have asked hon. members to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition the right to be heard in silence. He only has two minutes to conclude his speech.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this government went to the federal government and they have control of a corporation, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, fifty-one per cent shares, and if the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) would like to read it, it is set out there very plainly that Newfoundland does not have the resources to develop any of the Churchill sites and it can only develop it with the support and the guarantees of Canada and without that, Mr. Speaker, this Province cannot go any further. This Province has got to admit that they have to go to the people of Canada so that the complete inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) on one hand saying, Canada is taking away our birthright. Point number two, Petro-Canada is the only hope for Come By Chance. And point three, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), LCDC with a guarantee from Canada is the only way we can develop. What utter, utter deceit, what utter deceit, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

... It being twenty minutes to six, Standing Order 53(3) indicates that the member introducing the motion has the right to close the debate. Therefore I shall have to put the question on the amendment now prior to the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) speaking to close the debate on the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The amendment is that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after, "Therefore be it resolved that" and replacing them with the following, "This hon. House supports this Province's historic, moral and legal claim to own and control its offshore mineral resources."

Those in favour of the amendment please say "Aye", those opposed "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye"

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Ayes" have it. We are now back on the main motion. The hon. member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the various speakers on both sides of this House and I am delighted to know that the Opposition are going to support this resolution, being good Newfoundlanders, as they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: As amended?

MR. PATTERSON: As amended, yes, we just confirmed that there. We could have easily taken care of that one. We could have gutted that rapidly had we wanted to, but seeing the Christmas season is here we are not going to do that.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I would like to respond to the remarks made by each speaker there, but I think I have. I am not a prophet although there was a prophet one time named Broadhurst from Placentia; he went over to England, he tried to claim the throne over there. So I do not claim to have any of his traits but I was figuring what you people were going to say so I put some comments together and I think that we have covered everything that was said on that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATTERSON: I think this is a very, very serious resolution and I think it should be dealt with in that manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, as I have previously mentioned, there is no question that the federal control would mean that the offshore oil and gas resources would be developed and managed at a rate that would reflect the needs of Central Canada and not those of this Province. Revenues accruing to the Province from our prospective oil and gas fields under federal regulations would amount to 20 per cent, the federal share being 45 per cent. Such an arrangement is unjust and unacceptable. Under Newfoundland and Labrador regulations the Province's share of revenues from offshore would amount to 40 per cent, the federal share being 25 per cent; that is 5 per cent more than Alberta's contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is sharing in the Canadian tradition. There is no attempt to horde and grab the wealth that may flow from our offshore resources. Sharing must begin, however, with recognizing Newfoundland's traditional historic and moral rights, to the first crack at jobs and revenues from offshore oil and gas -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: - and the rebuilding of the fishery, where we must also have some say in how we manage this resource. Now, we are not alone in Newfoundland with the idea that we should share the control of the offshore fisheries and inshore fisheries.

MR. THOMS: Be consistent.

MR. PATTERSON: Just listen. No, we want total control. Is there anything now that you would like to ask?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: We are not saying we should have total control of the offshore resources -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Just as a few moments ago I requested silence for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), I would request the same thing for the hon. member for Placentia West who has the right to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PATTERSON: I am not saying that we should have total control any more than we have total control of the forestry and the mines. The feds get their share out of it. But why should we go and wrap ourselves in burlap bags and go up to Ottawa and say, look, we are willing to go to court to prove - you do not have to go to court tomorrow to prove you own your house, do you not? We are consistent. And we do not want full control of the fisheries, we only want some say in the management of the fisheries. And we are not alone in that respect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PATTERSON: I think your great Liberal paper here, The Daily News, I am quite sure this is where it came from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: And it says, 'It must gall the Government of Newfoundland and the fish trades and the fishermen

MR. PATTERSON: that so many decisions are made in Ottawa and elsewhere affecting them and they have no say or input. They are not consulted. The 1979 decision to impose a cod ban or near to it on the Grand Banks, and then in 1980 to lift the ban almost before it went into effect are examples. The reduced quota for this year's herring fishery with Mr. Morgan, our provincial Fisheries Minister, doubting the accuracy of the scientific information on which it is based.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATTERSON: Now, do you want to leave everything up in Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. PATTERSON: In fact, just about every decision made in Ottawa or by NAFO or by any member of the people affecting the industry that is the life blood of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: - of Newfoundland is done without prior consent or knowledge of the people most affected by it. That is simply not good enough. Now here is your Liberal rag saying this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PATTERSON: - this is not Bill Patterson.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring 'Bill' home for good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PATTERSON: 'It has gone on far too long under all governments. We are not among the extremists who insist that Newfoundland should have complete and absolute control over the fishery.' Now hear that. Here are your friends saying that,

MR. PATTERSON: Your friends are saying that we do not want full control, we just want partial control. 'That just will not work in this nation of Canada. If we look on it as a nation with a federal government with duties and responsibilities and jurisdiction' -

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, with maw mouth I cannot hear the speaker over there.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! I believe those terms would be appropriate on both sides.

The hon. member for
Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: He says, 'That just will not work in this nation of Canada if we look on it as a nation with federal government, with duties and responsibilities and jurisdictions. But at least the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador should be consulted when major decisions are being made.' Now do you agree with that? Do you people agree with that? When major decisions are being made, do you not think we should be consulted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: This has nothing to do with New York.

MR. THOMS: The Premier was in New York painting a picture -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
'We just do not think that outsiders should be deciding what amounts to our fate without our knowing about it. That is the short and sweet of it. He went on to say, ^{that} until Ottawa wakes up to this realization they will continue to be bombarded with demands from us for more jurisdiction over fishery matters.'

MR. THOMS: You have to answer my questions on principle (inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON: Well, that was a lengthy answer you know. Probably you could ask me the time and I would tell you how to make a watch, but time is short so, you know, I really do not have time to give it to you in that kind of a way, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that our government's preferential hiring policy -

MR. ROBERTS: It is a good policy.

MR. PATTERSON: Okay, it is a good policy.

The member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts) over there says it is a good policy. The Liberal MHAs say that it is not, there is nobody against the laws or that the Liberal Party is against it Roberts said. "Newfoundlanders First" has always been the Party's cry. So it should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: "He said the Liberal Party made sure on the Churchill Falls project that 98 per cent to 99 per cent of the men and women who worked on that project were Newfoundlanders. And if there was a job that could be filled by a Newfoundlander, then no one from outside this Province went into that job."

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. PATTERSON: The member for the Straits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: I am encouraged that our government's preferential hiring policy for the offshore is being welcomed and appreciated by an ever increasing number of members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: I know the hundreds of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently working on the oil rigs and supply vessels appreciate our realistic policy. And I wonder therefore why members opposite have not joined their colleague from

MR. PATTERSON: Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) in denouncing Prime Minister Trudeau's unilateral patriation of our constitution which threatens to destroy our initiative in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: There are two of you members over there, two former leaders siding with the Tories. We are soon going to make room over here. If we agree that regulations serve our people well, as they do, we should collectively work together to ensure that they are protected. Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) would have us believe standing firm for the rights of our Province and to ensure a bright economy and social future for our people, does that make us any less a Canadian? Does it? Mr. Speaker, being proud Canadians entails being proud Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. We seek a partnership relationship with Ottawa based on equality of treatment within Confederation. No more, no less.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of ownership of our offshore oil and gas resources will determine the future destiny of our Province, economic, social and cultural. We must be the masters of our own destiny. We must plot the course that will determine the shape of this Province in the years to come. Only through ownership and control of our offshore oil and gas resource and a say in how our fishery develops can we be contributing members of Canada and assure the progress as our people would wish to see it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: The problems of jurisdictional diversity did not hinder, did not deter the Government of

MR. PATTERSON: Australia from agreeing that each state would administer their respective adjacent offshore area. This arrangement has worked well administratively. Again the State of Texas exercises control over the offshore petroleum operations in an area extending three marine leagues, approximately ten geographic miles, under the terms of the Submerged Lands Act, an area which extends far beyond the United States three mile territorial sea. Indeed, state control of the offshore petroleum operations out to nine miles in the Gulf of Mexico evidently has proved no particular problems for the United States federal government.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) United States federal government.

MR. PATTERSON: It has no control there. The Canadian Federal Government has also made much of the fact that under Newfoundland's proposal each coastal province would administer its adjacent continental margin. Five individual regulatory bodies, it is said, would represent administrative problems presumably for oil companies, apart from the fact that the oil companies do not seem to be unduly disturbed by separate provincial jurisdictions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: This objection is irrelevant from a practical point of view. Newfoundland's continental margin comprises over 80 per cent of the total offshore Eastern Canadian petroleum potential, with offshore Nova Scotia accounting for a further 15 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: If you would listen, you would learn over there.

MR. PATTERSON: Administration by each coastal province in practice would mean the two regulatory systems, not five that the Liberals are talking about, those of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, and with its extensive sea ice and icebergs management of Newfoundland's large continental margin will call for a different regulatory response than that of the management of Nova Scotia's semi ice waters. Finally, Ontario exercised jurisdiction over and has property rights in the extensive producing oil field under Lake Ontario. The hydrocarbon resources beneath Lake Erie are not inconsiderable, can underlie some 3.1 million acres in the Ontario sector. As of October, 1969, fifty-nine offshore wells have been drilled off Ontario. It is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that the equivalent and operational techniques utilized in necessary regulatory and administrative systems are similar to those used offshore in Newfoundland. Lake Erie is also subject to a highly complex international obligations regarding - this is taken from a report prepared by Mr. Martin, some of it, but if you people would read a little bit you would learn a little bit. But you do not. You get up and you yap and you yap and you criticize and you tear it down and you distort and you twist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: And you listen to your new leader there. And as Oliver Goldsmith said, "And still they gazed and still the wonder grew/That one small head could carry all he knew". He knows nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Lake Erie is also subject to highly complex international obligations regarding pollution control, fisheries, navigation control and defense, including the boundary waters treaty and is within the jurisdiction of an

MR. PATTERSON: international joint commission.
Yet the federal government does not question Ontario's legislative ownership rights. Why do you not go to your counterparts in Ottawa and say, "Look, why are you discriminating against Newfoundlanders? Is it because they came into Confederation thirty years ago and Ontario came in thirty before that?" Why should they have special rights? We are not begging. All we want is to be treated as equal Canadians in an equal partnership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: With respect to these offshore resources their development has gone forward under the normal federal provincial division of powers and there is no quarrel there. In fact, there has been a high and a very effective degree of co-operation and co-ordination between the two levels of government as events have shown. Newfoundland has not been so fortunate. And I can assure you gentlemen opposite that we are not going to go to Ottawa begging for what we own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: I would think here is a golden opportunity for you gentlemen now to not only support this resolution, not in the confines of this room where we have four or five people who will know about it - the press will not mention it - so you can go back to your districts -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: You can go back to your districts and you can say, 'Oh, we are all for it'. But you are not for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: Not for it, not for it. You voted the other day. You voted against the resolution the other day which encompasses all these things, the rest of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: But in case I do not see you gentlemen again, I wish you a happy Christmas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The motion as amended now reads:

'BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House supports this Province's historic, moral and legal claim to own and control its offshore mineral resources.' Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? Those in favour "Aye". Contrary, "Nay". In my opinion the "Ayes" have it and I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three of the clock.