

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1980

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate on the Throne Speech by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), he stated that the federal government would have to obtain the consent of all other provinces before agreeing to a constitutional amendment which confirmed our province's ownership of offshore oil and gas. Because this same erroneous statement of Canadian constitutional law is being used by others to excuse the present Prime Minister's refusal to confirm our Province's ownership of these resources, I find it necessary today to set the record straight. I refer to the basic text of Canadian Constitutional Law by Peter Hogg, entitled, Constitutional Law of Canada at page 20 and I quote: "The federal government has never accepted that the provinces always have a right to be brought into the amending process. There is no historical case for unanimous provincial consent, or even general provincial consultation, as a pre-requisite to request for amendments of the BNA Act, at least those which do not alter the distribution of legislative power. There have been fifteen important amendments to the BNA Act, which have been requested by the federal Parliament and enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament; of these only four, those of 1940, 1951, 1960 and 1964 had the unanimous consent of the provinces, and only one other in 1907 was passed after prior consultation with all the provinces and, in fact, in that case British Columbia did not agree but the amendment proceeded nevertheless."

MR. L. BARRY: The other ten of the fifteen amendments were requested by the federal Parliament and enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament without prior consultation with the provinces." I have arranged for supporting statements from the book entitled, Favreau, The Amendment of The Canadian Constitution to be distributed and made available to hon. members. Hopefully, hon. members opposite will now agree that it is only a matter of having the political will to do so, which is needed to permit the present Federal Government to make the same confirmation of our offshore rights as was earlier given by Prime Minister Clark in the

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - in the document, Mr. Speaker, the supporting document which will be distributed in a moment to hon. members. There is an excerpt from the relevant pages of this text which was prepared by the hon. Guy Favreau, who was a Liberal Cabinet Minister, and in fact he was Justice Minister under Mr. Pearson, and in fact we have a complimentary introduction by the hon. Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada. So I would submit that the contents of this text should have some particular weight for hon. members opposite. And just briefly to conclude I would like to point out that even when Newfoundland joined Confederation a resolution was moved in the House of Commons, this is referred to on page fourteen, which is going out to members, "A resolution was moved in the House of Commons urging that this amendment, to include Newfoundland within Canada, not be proceeded until after consultation with the provincial governments." What the resolution meant by consultation was not clear. However, the amendment was enacted without such consultation and without any of the provincial governments formally objecting to its enactment, though one or two provincial governments stated publicly that consultation should have taken place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in my years in the House I have always understood that Ministerial Statements, and in this I am bolstered by the citation in the most current edition of Beauchesne, 262, "where for the purpose of conveying information, not of conveying debate." And of course the minister's statement is simply a cowardly way of entering into a debate, because I am not allowed to debate it in return.

MR. BARRY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is
unparliamentary language.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order.

MR. BARRY: I suppose it is to be expected from the
hon. member when he is caught out in such - whether it is a
deliberate, intentional attempt to mislead the people of this
Province, or whether it is just simple negligence in not having
done his research. But I ask him to retract that reference to
cowardly. If there is anybody cowardly, Mr. Speaker, it is not on
this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is unparliamentary to accuse the hon. gentleman of doing something cowardly. I will however, raise a point of privilege and say that he blundered in his usual fashion by imputing motives and questioning the intentions and I would submit that is a question of privilege. And before, Your Honour, deals with the matter of a point of order he should first of all, he, the hon. gentleman, should be requested by Your Honour on the matter of privilege to withdraw the imputations about the motives which he attributed to hon. members here and then if Your Honour would deal with the question of whether or not the conduct is cowardly. The question is not whether it is cowardly or not, it is cowardly. the question is whether it is unparliamentary for that term to be used. But first I would ask Your Honour to deal with the question of privilege which, of course, under our rules must be dealt with first. It is the essence of an unparliamentary procedure, it is a grave breach of privilege to question the motives of hon. gentlemen no matter on what side they are. We have already had talk of traitors from the gentleman from St. John's North (J. Carter) and of treachery. Sir, the demeanor of this House will fast be dragged down to the level of a beer garden by hon. gentleman if they keep this up.

MR. BARRY: To the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege.

MR. BARRY: If there is anything unparliamentary here as the hon. member has indicated in his course of logic, it is obvious that it is misleading -what he has said from my statement and the supporting documentation. If, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BARRY: there is anything unparliamentary in drawing the logical conclusion that that is either intentional or negligent, and it would seem to me that these are the only two logical conclusions that would flow, I would, of course, withdraw them. But I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member withdraw the cowardly accusation of cowardice.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! To the point of privilege. I wish to reserve judgement on the point of privilege until I get an opportunity to check Hansard to see exactly what was said and then I will give a ruling on that later in the day. To the point of order. I believe the reference to the word 'cowardly' has been termed unparliamentary in the past and I would simply ask the hon. from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) to withdraw that and that should dispose of that particular point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course I do, Sir, without any reservation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the hon. gentleman's statement in a substantive way, which I intend to do and I will be no more lengthy than he is, first of all, Sir, I would make the point that the hon. gentleman's assertion that something is so does not make it so and his assertion that the Constitution of Canada is amendable by the procedure which he has adverted to does not represent the reality nor does it make the reality. My hon. and learned friend cited one of the texts on constitutional law. I do not have others here but perhaps the government would oblige by putting down the text on constitutional

MR. E. ROBERTS:

law. In the meantime, for the benefit of the smirking Premier, he might want to look and he might suggest to his colleague -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: - that in tabling the first pages of Monsieur Favreau's White Paper, he might also wish to table several other succeeding pages and in particular to look at the proposals which represent the current wisdom set forth on Page 35 of The Powers to Amend the Constitution of Canada in a particular Section 2 of the draft act, and the hon. gentleman might wish to note Section 3 -

MR. L. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to debate and so I cannot. I said, 'the proposals which represent the current thinking'. Furthermore, I would point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that all of the recent amendments on matters of this type - and those are the words which I used in the debate - all of the recent amendments have been unanimous, and I would simply conclude this by saying two things: First of all, I would invite the government, if they believe in the intellectual integrity of their position, to put a motion down on the Order Paper so it can be debated in the appropriate fashion and at length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is down now.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Where is it down?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Private members' resolution.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I said a government motion - private members' we have twenty minutes each for two days. That is not - let us go by the regular (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Let us go by the rule of government time. If this matter, Mr. Speaker, is of such importance as the government would claim, then let us use the time of the House for that, because surely, if it is of the essence of this Province, as I believe it is, there is nothing more important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

It should not be relegated, Sir, to a private member's motion.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

So it is in the Speech from the Throne. So are all sorts of things that will never see the light of day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has half the time of the minister to respond and I believe we should allow him that opportunity.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I find it marvellous that those hon. gentlemen opposite who are so confident, they tell us, have to try to convince themselves by blackguarding members on this side - hardly the mark of confident men or men who believe in their cause.

Let me conclude by saying that I would invite the government to set up a procedure whereby some of the eminent constitutional authorities of Canada can be brought before this House or before a committee of this House -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I am sorry, the Premier - I did not hear him. The Premier apparently said something but it did not mean anything - at least he does not want to repeat it - some of the eminent constitutional authorities, some of the spokesmen learned in this matter to set the matter at rest and let us test the opinions of the experts. I do not hold myself out to be any more of an expert than does the gentleman from Mount Scio (Mr. L. Barry), but I hold myself out to know at least as much as he does, Sir, about this subject, and I would say that nothing in his statement, Sir, has changed in one jot or tittle the reality and the substance of what I said and what I stand by. And finally, I would rely on nobody less an eminent authority than the former Prime Minister of Canada, the

MR. E. ROBERTS:

right hon. Joseph Clark. And I think if the hon. gentleman looks back he will find some interesting references from Mr. Clark on the need to involve the provinces in constitutional amendments of this sort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

There will be no constitutional amendments in Canada, Mr. Speaker. There will be no constitutional amendments in Canada of this sort without the unanimous consent of the provinces. Whether it is expressed by a resolution of a legislature or by a decision of a government in a province is another matter, but there will be - there have not been for twenty years and there will be none, Sir -

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) law.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

There will be none. The law of the Constitution is like international law, it is what is accepted as such and my learned friend would concur with that.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I see.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, that is the law that there will be no amendments on matters of this sort without the unanimous consent of the Provinces. The governments can whistle as they wish to pass their graveyards but, Sir, that is the fact, that is the reality, that is the best legal advice that I have been able to obtain, better than my learned friend opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Are there any other statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the events that have just transpired and in view of the supreme importance of this matter and all of its ramifications, not merely the question of the techniques that might be employed to maximize Newfoundland benefits and the like, but because we are getting piecemeal ministerial statements in the House and outside, as well as news reports and the like which are very much lacking in substance apparently in some cases, will the hon. Premier in the interest of Newfoundland and in the interest of having members on this side - apparently he does not feel that we are sufficiently well informed. I would hope to get as much information as possible - will he now indicate his attitude with regard to the proposal for the establishment of what I would assure him would be a non-partisan or a by-partisan committee which would have the ability to examine these matters not with invective and the like but in the sensible way that surely both he and I should agree at least that we should go at this question of the offshore issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question but let me say to him clearly and unmistakably and hopefully it will not give rise to this question again, that this matter is so important to me personally and I think to hon. members on this side that it is not a question, it is not a matter of a select committee studying whether in fact Newfoundland

PREMIER PECKFORD: Labrador owns, should own, must own, has some claim to the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. This party and this government has won an election based on that as one of it's tenants, one of it's principles. We go forward from the day back in June, 1979, until the next Provincial election, confident in the claim that we have the ownership rights to the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. That the Oil and Gas Act and the regulations that have been written as a result of that act are/is the policy of the government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and that all the benefits that flow there from are in place and will continue to be the policy of this government. There is no question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is not a matter of questioning, it is a matter of fact and of policy of this government and so there is no question of who has control or who has ownership, because with ownership comes control. We own the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. We have an act which says that. We have regulations which govern the offshore development of our mineral resources. That is our position and we solicit the support of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and all members opposite in this on-going battle to win a chance to be at least, if not first-class citizens in this Confederation, as close to it as is possible over the next twenty or thirty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the last part of the Premier's statement, let me say that he has the full support of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON:

- and I suspect of the vast majority of Newfoundlanders. I also say to him, by way of preamble, that this is not in the least argumentative. I am simply asking the hon. the Premier not even to argue the point, if he is going to do it through ministerial statements, it is obviously inadequate. What I am asking is, will he establish a select committee so that full details of why he feels as strongly as he does, and that of his associates, can be laid out in a manner which will enable us to understand a little more, a little more fully. He may feel that he has all of the answers but obviously as recently as yesterday, there was a question that arose. I happen to agree with the government, by the way, in its position with regard to the Continental Shelf.

This, again I emphasize is not a question of debate or of argument. I am saying that this is the biggest issue, obviously, for the future of Newfoundland that has been

MR. D. JAMIESON: around in a long time and are the hon. members opposite suggesting that we are incapable of in a reasoned manner just simply finding in detail some of the implications that are present, that have not been answered, with the greatest of respect, except to the satisfaction of members opposite who as the government have access to a great deal of information which is not available to us or to the people of this Province. Now, I am not asking him to change his mind, I am not even saying that at the end of the exercise it could be a position where we might fully and totally agree, I simply saying that if our support is to be solicited, if there is to be a request that we back up whatever it is the government is stating, it cannot be in generalities we must know something a little more about what the legal premises are on which it is based and, also, if we can find out in a reasoned fashion, I repeat, what some of the other details of this problem are with regard to environmental control, with regard to a whole range of international questions.

Mr. Speaker, if I cannot do it through a select committee I can assure you that there are 100 questions we can ask here in the House.

MR. S. NEARY: Well said.

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

PREMIER BECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a select committee is not set up to inform the Opposition, it is to solicit information and views of the public. And as I understand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) now he wants a select committee so that the government can inform the Opposition on the position that we have as it relates to the offshore mineral resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what the Leader of the Opposition just said, Mr. Speaker, and I can only take him at his word and what he says. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition is serious and if the Opposition is serious in this approach, a select committee is not the answer. A select committee is established to gain and garner public opinion and input into policy decisions the government is about to make. We have already made a decision that we have ownership of the mineral resources, there is no point of a select committee on this. The government has made a decision and will rise or fall on that decision in the electorate of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the Leader of the Opposition is saying now that he fully supports the government on its position of ownership of the mineral resources, then let him come out clearly and say that. that the Liberal Opposition supports the stand that we take on the ownership of our mineral resources. Then we can begin to talk to the Opposition about the matters- important, significant matters that flow from that policy principled decision. But let there be no mistake about it

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is no point of establishing a select committee to decide on whether or not Newfoundland or the government of Newfoundland should take a position on the ownership of the mineral resources because this government is willing to stand or fall on that issue. And we have made a policy decision over four years, I have personally made a policy decision over four years towards establishing this particular policy as a firm and absolutely unshakable principle that the government, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador own the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. So that, therefore, select committee is not the answer. What is the answer?

If the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Opposition presently existent in this House of Assembly will come out clearly and unmistakably on the side of this government in its ongoing battle to ensure that we have ownership of the mineral resources, we will make whatever is available to the Liberal Opposition on an hour to hour basis, twenty-four hours a day, so that they understand all the control mechanisms, all the other things that flow there from. But there is no question on the principle. There is no point of a select committee on the principle because we will rise or stand, in this House, outside this House on the principle of ownership which is a major significant plank in this administration's policy as it relates to resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I understand the rules well enough to know that I cannot be argumentative even though I suspect or suggest that the Premier's answer was really more rhetorical

MR. D. JAMIESON: than anything else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Insofar as a select committee is concerned, there is ample precedent for a select committee being appointed to examine the policies of a government and to ask questions about those policies. So that I see nothing inconsistent with that.

Insofar as the second part is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier if he is unwilling, and quite frankly I find it quite incomprehensible that he would not be willing to, in a select committee answer questions, will he at least take from us a list of questions which we would be prepared to- I will write him a letter, it can be personal and confidential, if he so wishes, on some very fundamental basic points on which, regardless of the decision that he has reached, that the basis on which he has reached that decision is clearly one that there is some argument about.

What we are asking, just simply asking is, what was the response or what is the attitude with regard to certain other stands that have been taken, outside of this House all together, and how does the government or the Premier choose to deal with them? Now I repeat, once again,

MR. JAMIESON: that I am not doing this argumentatively, I am genuinely, as I believe many Newfoundlanders are, concerned when there are statements made by reputable authorities which do not seem to square with the position that the Newfoundland Government has taken. Now to ask us blindly to give support without knowing what the position is of the government in response to those other reputable authorities, not saying to change your mind, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the government has taken a position, I would like to know in a calm, dispassionate kind of way, what answers the government gives to some of these other points of view, and some of the reservations which I legitimately hold myself, and if I may say so, I think that there are surely some grounds for saying that I have some competence in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) has any competence in this matter. I am not questioning that. I understand that. And I also understand that there are certain questions that might arise from time to time in the minds of members on this side of the House, as well as that side of the House as it relates to the working out of the principle of ownership. And we are willing to, either in a public letter from the Leader of the Opposition to me, answer every and all questions as to how we want to relate that. But it does not dispute the policy objectives and firm stand that this Party and government takes as it relates to the ownership of the mineral resources, that there are problems in working out those things, obviously there are. Obviously there must be. But we are willing to answer every and all questions that the Opposition has or any other member of the public or the press has on this issue openly, and freely, in whatever form the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to take. But I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that

PREMIER PECKFORD: he present his questions to us, or to me in writing, and let us publicize it. Because I wish to answer any and all questions which the Opposition finds confusing on this issue. No question.

MR. STIRLING: What are you afraid of in a select committee?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The select committee does not answer any questions on that whole - The regime is in place.

MR. STIRLING: Well what are you afraid of?

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are afraid of nothing, Mr. Speaker. We are afraid of nothing. And the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), albeit he is aspiring to be the new Leader of the Liberal Party, after the present Leader leaves his office, will not gain any points at all, brownie points, backbench points, frontbench points on taking that kind of an approach. The fact of the matter is, this is more serious than his aspirations. It is more serious than all our aspirations. And I try to answer the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) in the spirit in which he asks the question. I am willing, able, and wanting to answer all questions that might lead to confusion on behalf of the Opposition as it relates to this whole issue. Because as the Leader of the Opposition says, and as I say, and as I think a lot of people will say on both sides:

PREMIER PECKFORD:

of the House, it is an issue of great import, not only for today but for generations that will come afterwards if we are serious about trying to solve some of our problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Windsor -

Buchans followed by the hon. the member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry), or possibly in his capacity as Minister of Industrial Development. He could answer in either capacity, really. It relates in a sense to the offshore and the regulations under which we are operating. The activity in drilling right now is probably as high as we will ever see and over the next Summer and onward there will be as much offshore drilling of oil wells as we could expect to see in a development situation. I want to ask the minister why it is, Mr. Speaker, that we are not living with those regulations? - and one of the products that is used all the time in offshore drilling, barite, why it is that the offshore drilling companies are not using the barite that is so readily available in Buchans - that he is aware of - that the two companies concerned have been doing studies on for the past three or four years while there is known to be a ten or fifteen years supply there, where the market is right off our own shores, where the work force is going down the drain in Buchans - why it is that we are not in the business and why those companies are not in the business of producing and selling to the offshore the barite that is available in Buchans? - and the effect, of course, would be to buy up the economy of that town.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying that I hope the hon. member is going to be able to explain to his constituents in Buchans why he is supporting a position that was taken by the federal government which would not in any way permit this Province to

MR. L. BARRY: influence the materials that would be used offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I would ask you to examine the preamble to that question which clearly indicates that there is some kind of motivation behind the question, and which in no way whatsoever has the hon. member on this side said anything with regard to whether he is supporting policy or anything else, he is asking questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. L. BARRY: I did not impute any motives and I merely refer to the speech the hon. member made - I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition was in the House, but the hon. member made a speech the other day, the direct thrust of which was that -

PREMIER PECKFORD: No jobs for Buchans.

MR. L. BARRY: - he questioned the

MR. BARRY:

policy of this government and in fact attributed anti-confederate motives to our attempts to get local materials and local labour applied offshore.

MR. MORGAN: He was opposed to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: He was opposed to it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Any further discussion or debate on the point of order? In respect to the point of order I would rule that there is not a point of order in this particular case. If an hon. member is not satisfied with the answer to a question then there is a certain procedure which he may follow.

I will ask the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) to answer the question please.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, just to go on. This is the very reason why we are asserting that Newfoundland ownership and control be recognized and confirmed by governments, by the federal government and by companies who are operating offshore. And we have regulations in place, Mr. Speaker, which require companies to give preference to local materials -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is only as long as our regulations apply.

MR. BARRY: - as long as our regulations are the ones which are recognized as applying.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is arguing?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite asked, who is arguing? The party which is in power in Ottawa, which is of the same political persuasion as the hon. member opposite, is supporting a position which would not permit this government to apply those regulations.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the company in Buchans has carried out a pilot project and my understanding is that that pilot project was successfully carried out. Negotiations are being held with a worldwide supplier of barite and because we have our Newfoundland local preference regulations in place, that company in Buchans has the opportunity of saying to this international supplier of barite, 'Join in this venture with us because otherwise you will be at a disadvantage when it comes to supplying materials such as barite to the offshore.' Now, we have set, Mr. Speaker, this government has set the environment, the proper environment which gives an advantage to local companies. It is now up to the company at Buchans to strike their deal, to strike their deal either with this international company they are now negotiating with or another or to do it themselves. Mr. Speaker, there is still a place for private enterprise but we have prepared the groundwork, we have set the regulatory environment which gives the local preference and we ask hon. members opposite to recognize this and to support us in making sure that that remains the law of this Province and of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the minister's answer was a red herring and a cop-out. The minister should know, Mr. Speaker, that the barite situation arose in Buchans five years ago, long before - while he was still in Halifax being paid by this government to advise -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) before it started, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member is beginning to

March 11, 1980

Tape No. 274

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): drift into the area of debate.

I would assume that he has a supplementary question and would direct him to ask that question please.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the company that the minister refers to as the supplier, the major supplier of barite, the fact is that as far as Buchans is concerned

MR. G. FLIGHT: ASARCO and Abitibi Price will be the suppliers. Barite of Canada he is talking about is the marketer.

MR. W. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Maybe the hon. member finds difficulty in framing his supplementary question -

MR. G. FLIGHT: I do not find it difficult, boy.

MR. W. MARSHALL: -but the hon. member, I think, -

MR. G. FLIGHT: I find a lot of difficulty -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. member has been -

MR. G. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) that is what I (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. member has been called to order, Mr. Speaker, for the way he was addressing his question, entering into debate, and he then proceeds albeit in a little weaker voice, not as strong, not as emphatic but he still is continuing on in the same vein. I would suggest to Your Honour that if he does not frame his supplementary question that he be asked to take his seat.

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

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: First of all, I am sure my learned friend opposite did not mean to be as offensive as he was when he said he suggested that Your Honour should act in a certain way. That is a most improper thing for my learned friend to say, he ought to know better. He does not direct the Chair.

Now, I would like though to speak specifically to this point of argument in questions because I think the questions that we have heard, the questions are provoked

MR. E. ROBERTS: by the answers because the gentleman from Mount Scis (Mr. L. Barry), who above all others ought to know better has been, I suggest, abusing the rules. The rules are clearly set forth in Beauchesne. The citations are 357 and 358 and I think it is common ground and I would hope that perhaps all members would heed. Your Honour has ruled on this, I believe, on a number of occasions. Let me just read 358 (2) and in so saying I will say that a similar admonition applies to questions, the one I read now applies to answers, "Answers to questions should be a brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate." Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not say that every question asked on this side is perfection itself but I will say, Sir, that the answers have been even less perfect than the questions. And what concerns me is that the Question Period, Sir, is turning into a debating period and not into a question period. And I would suggest that the point of order, if it has any merit at all, is equally applicable to all members of this House and I mean I am as much under the rubric of sin in this matter, I would submit, as is anybody. But the fact remains, Sir, the Question Period is turning into a debating period. There is nothing wrong with debate, heaven knows, but that is not the purpose of Question Period. The authorities make it crystal clear and I would suggest, Sir, that nobody on the government side should be the first to say a word and I would cite, and I will end on this, I would cite in support of that statement that nobody on the government side should object the biblical adage that 'He among you who is without sin should be the first to cast a stone'. And there is nobody on the other side, Sir, in any position to cast any stones on this matter at all.

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I do not want to get into Scriptures as the hon. gentleman there opposite did a moment ago - perhaps we could call it into force here for our benefit. But if the hon. gentleman was talking about the answers, you know, the answers can not provoke debate. There is no doubt about that quotation in Beauchesne but the fact of the matter is look, I am up on a point of order now with respect to a question that has been asked. If the hon. gentleman objects to the manner in which questions have been answered or in which any debate is emanating from this side of the House he is perfectly at liberty to object, of course, but he has to get up at the time that that statement is made which he is objecting to. And I would submit to Your Honour that the question before

MR. W. MARSHALL: Your Honour, right now is the manner in which the hon. gentleman is framing his question which continued along in exactly the same vein as the manner in which the question was asked originally and to which Your Honour called the hon. member to order.

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

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: I assume Your Honour is following the age old principle of tit for tat, and we have had the tit and now we can have the tat. Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. S. NEARY: We would be better off having the Question Period.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I agree completely that we would be better off having the Question Period. And in fact, there is a citation in Beauchesne that my learned friend opposite might want to look at. It says, 'Matters of order should be decided at the end of the Question Period and not during it'. And that is a good practice, I would say.

But, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that my hon. friend was not asking a question, he was asking a supplementary question. The supplementary question was part of the warp and woof of the substance of an answer given by my learned friend's colleague, the gentleman for Mt. Scio, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) and therefore it is quite appropriate to speak as I have. I am grateful to my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) for his gratuitous advice. I will treat it, Sir, with the same value I would give any gratuitous advice, it is worth exactly what one pays for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the original point of order raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) I believe I did direct the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to ask his question. I will continue to do that as soon as I make one other comment, and that is, with respect to the points raised by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) with respect to Question Period, answers and questions being rather lengthy; rather than take the time of the hon. members, during Question Period at this time, I would like to give some general comments on it at tomorrow's session.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in a very short preamble I would say to the minister that the barite is in Buchans, ten or fifteen years supply, the market is offshore. miners in Buchans are losing their jobs and stand to go out of business altogether by next August. Now I would ask the minister to inform the House if he is aware that barite will indeed be brought into production, Will there be an industry established? What does he know as Minister of Industrial Development or Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) about the possibility of a process being established in Buchans that would mine the barite that is there and create the jobs that will come as a result of that development? Are we about to get an announcement in this Province that there will be a new industry based on the production and sale of barite in Buchans as a result of the work that has been done this past three or four years by the companies that he has referred to?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to ask the hon. member when he gets the opportunity to apologize for his initial reference to the fact that the first discussions of the barite potential of Buchans occurred while I was out of the Province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would wish to check out this point, he would find that it was when I was Minister of Mines and Energy that I, in fact, brought to the attention of the officials of ASARCO the fact that they had a potential for barite -

MR. G. FLIGHT: That makes it all the worse.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: in the tailings which had been ignored, Mr. Speaker, by the company until I brought it to their attention that in light of the onshore exploration there was, in fact, a potential for a thriving, viable industry. Mr. Speaker, my knowledge is that the company at Buchans is presently in negotiations with at least one international company that is involved in the supplying of barite to offshore drilling rigs all around the world, that this is a very large company, that the negotiations are serious negotiations and when I have something further to announce to this hon. House I will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FLIGHT: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for one quick supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Could the minister indicate whether the companies concerned have asked either this government or the federal government for either research information or funding? Is there a possibility that DREE have been asked to have some input or make some contribution towards getting this industry off the ground? And if so, what has been the reaction of his government?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Would he be aware of any DREE possibilities in helping that industry get off the ground?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this government would be very sympathetic to assisting in any way that is practical, if in fact it is shown that such assistance is necessary in order to make the industry viable. To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, we have not had a request for assistance -

MR. G. FLIGHT: From DREE?

MR. L. BARRY: And I am not aware that there has been any requests gone to DREE but it could have without being brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker. But I would say that our position, generally, is that we like to be shown that an industry needs government assistance in order to be viable before the government's assistance, the taxpayers' dollars are offered. But if it is, Mr. Speaker, if it is requested and shown as necessary in order to

MR. BARRY: get an industry started, we would be very sympathetic to any such proposal.

MR. FLIGHT: They need some pressure that you have not given yet.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time for oral questions has expired. I am sure hon. members would like to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from Birchy Bay, Mayor Otto Pope, and Councillors Canning, Mews and Mews.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated on Friday of last week that I would table a report, as soon as the maps became available, on the survey of the sports fishing in Labrador.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills,

"An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels, And Compressed Gas," and

"An Act Respecting Amusement Rides."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled,

"An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973 With Respect To Government Printing."

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between The Government And Burgeo Fish Industries Limited And Others."

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I presume it is all right to present a petition, is it?

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. NEARY: I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to table and have it referred to the appropriate department to which it relates and it is in connection with a request from the people in the tiny community of Petites in LaPoile district.

Petites, Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, is an isolated community, you have to get there by boat.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) there.

MR. NEARY: The Premier landed in a helicopter there I believe.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And by boat in 1964.

MR. NEARY: When I go I have to go in a boat from Harbour Le Cou, on a longliner, to Petites.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I went there on a longliner in 1963.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and went there in 1979 in a helicopter.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: With Mr. Cabot Martin in tow.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And during that visit, Mr. Speaker, a promise was made to the people of Petites and it was made in 1975 and in 1972 by the then Tory candidate -

MR. MORGAN: In '68 and '66.

MR. NEARY: - that the people of Petites would get -

MR. ROBERTS: We would have kept it if we had been in.

MR. NEARY: - the people of Petites would get a water system. They have no drinking water in that community of Petites. As a matter of

MR. NEARY: fact, the Department of Municipal Affairs employed the services of Mr. Trepista, I think it was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Terpster.

MR. NEARY: Terpster or Trepista, to do a study, to work out a plan for the implementation of a drinking water system for Petites, the same as they have in LaPoile and in Grand Bruit.

This petition is signed by fifty-two residents of Petites, Mr. Speaker, and that is, as far as I know, every voter, every resident over the age of nineteen years of age in the community of Petites .

The people on the Southwest corner of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are beginning to believe that they are being discriminated against by this government for voting Liberal. I hope that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, but the feeling is there. We saw recently where the Industrial Development Office in Port aux Basques had to be shut down because the government cancelled its grant. They will not do anything about the industrial park in Port aux Basques. They will not construct a new hospital in Port aux Basques -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They will not give a water supply to the people of Petites.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The hon. member should confine his statements, I think, to the prayer of the petition.

MR. NEARY: Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people feel they are being discriminated against for political reasons.

I will read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker. Probably that is the best way I can get the message across to hon. gentlemen.

March 11, 1980

Tape No. 277

NM - 4

MR. NEARY: "We, the people of Petites, in the district of LaPoile, would like to present this petition requesting a water supply system for the residents of this community. We think the time of bringing water with buckets is over. We also feel

MR. S. NEARY: feel that we are equal residents to all others in the Province and should have some sort of water system. We, the people of Petites, do not like the idea of our children going to a school that does not have a sanitary supply of water for sewerage and drinking within it, alone in our homes. When you have a group of children within a building not having a sanitary water supply in this day and age, we think that is a bad situation.

We, the undersigned members of the community of Petites in the Province of Newfoundland, would like for you, as a government, to take this petition in good faith and provide funds for a water supply system for this community."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of that petition is self-explanatory, and I do hope now, Sir, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Neil Windsor) or whatever department is involved - I think the local water committees and the water supply system still come under the Minister of Municipal Affairs - will take this matter seriously, Sir. It is a crying shame in this day and age when people have to go out in the middle of Winter - it is bad enough in the Summertime, but to have to go out in the Wintertime and lug water in buckets, I think that is terrible in this day and age. And here we are here now on the East Coast of this Province talking about oil booms and what have you and everybody expecting to wake up some morning with a Cadillac out in his back yard, and there are the people down in Petites still carrying their water in buckets.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Sir, I would like to support wholeheartedly the plea from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for a decent drinking water system in the community of Petites. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every single member who represents a rural riding in this House can sympathize

MR. F. WHITE: with the people in Petites who do not have any water to drink - or water to drink, I suppose, but they are not sure of its quality and neither sure of its quantity.

MR. S. NEARY: Right.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have, for example, a delegation - I know I am not allowed to refer to another community when I am talking to this petition, but I have a delegation here today from Birchy Bay who are also looking for water. And there is a very serious situation there with water. The bit of water that they did have was spoiled when a new road was put through some years ago and it became polluted with salt. So on behalf of the Birchy Bay town council and other places throughout Newfoundland, I am sure those people feel a part of the plight that the people in Petites feel, and Birchy Bay in particular, since the Premier made a commitment that that would be done, and I am sure that commitment will be kept this year.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition brought in by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I do hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Neil Windsor) gives some attention to it.

I also hope, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly hope that when the government find out for sure that the oil is there, that they borrow all the money they can get their hands on to put water services in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would like to welcome to the galleries today again on behalf of all hon. members, the President, Mr. Tony John, and the Vice-President, Mr. Calvin White, of the Newfoundland Indian Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to stray away from the petition because I cannot get away with it like my good friend from LaPoile.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I would like to rise and present a petition on behalf of the 520 voters of the communities of Riverhead, St. Stephens, Peter's River and St. Shotts. I will just state the prayer of the petition. It says: "We, the people of Riverhead, St. Stephens, St. Shotts, are forwarding a petition to the House of Assembly on behalf of the pasture committees, community councils, all livestock owners and people of our communities. We are requesting that government own and operate the community pastures as it has done in previous years."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: Sir, the people in my district feel that this is one of the things that government has done an adequate job with. They feel that their cattle have been treated fairly. Well, some people seem to think that they cannot pay more for the service they are getting, but the general feeling is that the government have done more than an adequate job and they would like to see it continued in the future as it has been in the past.

I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House

MR. D. HANCOCK:

of the House of Assembly and directed to the department to which it relates. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act", carried. (Bill No. 22)

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973", carried. (Bill No. 23)

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975", carried. (Bill No. 11)

On motion, Bill No. 11 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act", carried. (Bill No. 26)

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Bay St. George

Community College Act", carried.

(Bill No. 5).

On motion, Bill No. 5 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975", carried. (Bill No. 25)

On motion, Bill No 25 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Income Tax Discounters Act", carried. (Bill No. 4)

On motion, Bill No. 4 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976", carried. (Bill No. 7)

On motion, Bill No. 7 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting the Garnishment Against The Remuneration of Public Officials", carried. (Bill No.3).

On motion, Bill No. 3 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Members Of The House Of Assembly (Retiring Allowances) Act," carried. (Bill No. 24)

On motion, Bill No. 24 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And The Conservation And Use Of Ground Water, carried. (Bill No. 28)

On motion, Bill No. 28 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Consumer Affairs And Environment Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 27)

On motion, Bill No. 27 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 1. Address in Reply.
The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: I only have fifteen minutes left so I will not take up too much of it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I said on Friday all that I have to say for the moment anyway about the administration of justice in this Province. There are a few other matters that I would like to get on to. I think it is becoming quite evident, quite clear and quite obvious the game plan from the other side of the House, just exactly what their game plan is. We saw on Friday where - and it is a sad,

MR. THOMS: from the study that I have been able to make of the legal ramifications in connection with oil and gas. But for the moment I will leave the oil and gas because I am concerned when we hear somebody from the other side of the House, albeit he was forced to withdraw the remark, call somebody else on this side of the House a traitor. And that is the game plan. That is obviously the game plan of this present administration. Everybody over there is a good Newfoundlander. Everybody on this side of the House is not, somehow or other come up short of being good Newfoundlanders.

Now I am not going to stand on my feet and say that I am a good Newfoundlander. I believe that, certainly, and the people of my district know that I am a Newfoundlander, know that I was born, bred, dragged up in the outports of this Province. I am not going to get up here and apologize for it. But neither am I going to sit in this House and be called a traitor, and a Judas Iscariot.

Just for the sake of those who were not listening when that particular member, and you saw shades of it coming out when the President of the Council spoke first in this debate, you saw shades of it, you saw shades of it when the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) spoke in this debate, that somehow or other - and this is the game plan to make everybody on this side of the House something less than Newfoundlanders. I will never apologize for being a Canadian, and I will never apologize for being a Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: But just listen to what is coming from the government side. Now, this is after calling us traitors and saying that we were being treacherous, referring to my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). "I think that their position is a most unacceptable one", and I am quoting Hansard here, "I hesitate to use the word Judas Iscariot but this keeps popping into my mind, thirty pieces

MR. THOMS: of silver". Even the suggestion of hanging comes to mind. Even the suggestion of hanging comes to mind. I mean, what a sad, sad commentary when a member on this side of the House can stand on his feet and disagree with a legal opinion from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) without being called a traitor, a Judas Iscariot and, presumably, somebody who deserves hanging. That is what happened in this House on Friday. You know, you oversimplify it. The Premier gets up in the House of Assembly and he says, "There is no question about it, our position is very simple, we own, we control the offshore oil and gas." We believe that, too. The Liberal Party of this Province, for this last ten, fifteen years, has been saying that Newfoundland owns the offshore resources, owns it. But, look, let me again quote from Hansard of yesterday when the Premier said, when we were talking about the landlocked countries claiming some ownership in the offshore oil and gas, here is the Premier's exact comment. He says, "Some of these landlocked and otherwise somewhat imperilled people of the world who are suddenly after a resource which, first of all, we do not know if we own". That is exact. There it is in Hansard. Those are the Premier's words. Today he gets up and says, "Oh, we own it. It is ours." I believe it is ours, too. I believe we own it, but I also believe that it is an oversimplification to just say

MR. L. THOMS: that we own it. We have a legal right to what is out there, whatever is out there, we have a legal right to it. Now, let us proceed on that basis, let us not in this House have a situation like we saw Saturday or I believe that is going to backfire on the members on the other side of the House if it continues, if they continue trying to give the picture, in this Province, that the Liberal Party, that members on this side of the House are somewhat less than Newfoundlanders. We are not less than Newfoundlanders. But I can tell you something; I am afraid and I am deeply afraid and I am genuinely concerned-and this does not apply to all members on the other side of the House - that everybody may not be a good Canadian. That may be quite true. I think we are getting indications of that. We got an indication of that in a speech by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). We got a clear indication, I think, from the speech by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) whose anti-confederacy has been known far and wide for the last thirty years. And I am genuinely concerned with the separatist leanings in the government of this Province and the Progressive Conservative members of this House. You get it - read the article in Insight where our Premier was interviewed. Every now and then you stop and say, 'By God, there is a separatist leaning'. I can remember reading a letter in the paper, the Evening Telegram, a few days ago, which stated that if we had a vote on whether to stay in Confederation or not only 5 per cent of the people of this Province would vote to stay in Confederation. I think you can take that and turn it around, I think you would find that 95 per cent of the people of this Province would vote to stay in Confederation. But I do not like that feeling that I am getting from some members of this government, that they would just as soon pluck Newfoundland,

MR. L. THOMS: simply because it has got oil and gas in abundance, pluck it out of Confederation and we go our own way. I do not think that is true of the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House) or Humber West (Mr. Baird) or Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart)-I can go through, but you see it in this nationalistic feeling that you get - sometimes from the Premier of this Province and always from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). They would take this Province out of Confederation like that! And would love it! They would like nothing better! But if you ever want to see a Confederation battle just try it!

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Trudeau spoke before the students at Memorial University and there is no doubt about it that he jammed them into that building, there were a lot of students there. I was

MR. L. THOMS: extremely disappointed, Mr. Speaker, extremely disappointed in that rally. I was not disappointed in Mr. Trudeau, I was not disappointed in the position that he gave on offshore oil and gas, a position that I fully support - fully support.

MR. J. CARTER: A 'give-it-all-away' policy.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Trudeau's? I would like to tell you first what disappointed me.

MR. J. CARTER: Give it all away.

MR. L. THOMS: Why does not the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) read what Mr. Trudeau had to say at that rally?

MR. J. CARTER: I heard him.

MR. L. THOMS: You heard him - you heard nothing.

The Premier's executive assistant who went there to heckle reported incorrectly to you, as he would. Here is the full text of what Mr. Trudeau had to say at that particular rally.

MR. J. CARTER: Send it over.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that really disappointed me. Mr. Trudeau spoke for some ten or fifteen minutes on the fisheries in this Province. What did you get from a certain element at that rally? - 'Man cannot live by cod alone.' They sneered. There was a certain group led by the Premier's executive assistant who sneered at the cod fishery in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: The fishery is dead.

MR. L. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you one thing, no matter how much oil and gas is 200 miles or 400 miles off from St. John's, the people of Grand Bank do live by cod alone. They are one hundred per cent either directly or indirectly dependent on the fishery. Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is the same way, Fortune - Hermitage is the same way. And here we had Newfoundlanders, I am ashamed to say, attending that rally - and it is irrelevant to me, it could have been Mr. Clark speaking about the fisheries - and all they could think about, their whole mentality is oil and gas. 'To hell with the fisheries! We do not need the fisheries, we have the oil and gas out there.'

MR. L. THOMS: Now, what was Mr. Trudeau's position?
I am not going to go into the legal ramifications. Mr. Speaker, you know, as I sit here and as I have been listening to the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) and my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts), I was thinking to myself, What a pity you are not a judge, a real honest-to-goodness Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada! We could have had all this settled. We have heard the arguments back and forth, the adversary system. We could then get a judgement from Your Honour. We would have it all settled.

There is a question of ownership, there is no doubt about that, or we would not be asking, we would not be debating it. The Premier would not be getting up and saying, 'a resource which we do not know if we own'.

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

MR. L. THOMS: If I can just take a second to clue up?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, very simply put,
Mr. Trudeau's position is this: If Newfoundland owns its offshore resources there is no problem - it owns it, it controls it, that is it; it is finished. The question of ownership must be decided, and there is a question. The Premier says there is the question - yesterday, of course, he indicated - maybe it was a slip when he said, 'We do not even know if we own our own resources.'

MR. L. THOMS: But if we own it there are no problems. But then he says, "If, under the Constitution you do not own the resource, then we will guarantee you 100 per cent the maximum benefits from the oil and gas until you become a have province". And we only have three have provinces in Canada - Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER: Four, is it not?

MR. L. THOMS: No, just three as I understand it. It could be four, Saskatchewan could be one now, I am not quite sure.

I know we have at least these three. "When Newfoundland becomes a have province then we will expect you to share your good fortunes with the rest of Canada." That is a position that I can support and I can be proud of it and I will continue to support that position. Mr. Trudeau also said at that rally that as far as the court case is concerned to determine the ownership, let us go in, we will not contest it, it is not a contested case it is a reference, that is all. It is not a contested case. He said that he would not contest it. 'It would be an uncontested case' were his words.

Now, that is a position that he has taken. If he goes back on that then he will hear from me, at least he will hear from one member of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. If he goes back on that position one jot then he will hear from me. But it is a position that I can support, it is a position that I do not think I deserve to be called a traitor for. It is not a position that I deserve to be called a Judas Iscariot for and it is not a position that I certainly would not deserve hanging for, as was suggested on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, very simply put that is Mr. Trudeau's position, it is the federal/Liberal position, having said that, as I said earlier, I believe that we have got a legal right to the offshore oil and gas and I think we should go ahead and have that right confirmed. In the meantime, we have Mr. Trudeau's undertaking, in case we do not own it, that is all. And he

MR. L. THOMS: did say at that rally that there were an awful lot of the constitutional experts who agreed with Newfoundland, that Newfoundland does, in fact, own the offshore oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House's indulgence, running overtime, and I am sure we will hear much more about this subject before--although I wish we would get ahead with doing whatever has got to be done. You know, there are an awful lot of problems in this Province that are being ignored while we are waiting for the oil and gas to come ashore, either here or somewhere else. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) for giving such a eloquent speech. By the same token, if there is any game plan to downgrade or to call the Opposition traitors or no good Newfoundlanders, I certainly know nothing about it. And I would like for these things to be removed from this hon. House as quickly as possible. I feel, in fact, we are all good Newfoundlanders and, hopefully, all good Canadians as well.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would like to start my address by congratulating the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews). He is not in the House at the moment but he is around somewhere I assume. And also,

MR. L. WOODROW: I would like to congratulate the newly appointed Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power), the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe). I am sure that each will find his respective portfolio to be both a challenging and richly rewarding experience.

I was particularly delighted that my colleague for the District of St. George's (Mr. Dawe) received the Tourism portfolio, as there is a tremendous potential in the tourist field throughout the West Coast and with his thorough knowledge of the region, I am hopeful that the minister will take a special interest in the needs and development of the West Coast of the Province.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, he is not in his seat at the moment with us again during this session of the legislature. I noted his opening remarks on the Throne Speech with great interest and welcomed his comments on his party's desire and willingness to cooperate fully, where possible, with the government legislation to be brought before this House for our consideration.

With this in mind, I am looking forward to a productive session in the best interests of our Province and people. In fact, I think, Mr. Speaker, to date things have been going fairly good. Unfortunately it got a little rough the past couple of days when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was out of this House. I dread to think what is going to happen if he should decide to retire early and naturally a new leader would take his place. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention our leader and Premier who has worked tirelessly to effectively develop and protect the interest of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: I feel that what the Premier is doing is not for political reasons. I feel that he is speaking from the heart. He is obsessed with a love for Newfoundland first

MR. L. WOODROW: of all and its people and he is trying to do his utmost to get the best for Newfoundland as would any other Premier. The Premier of Alberta, the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of Ontario, they are all trying to get the best for their Provinces and they have to be congratulated for acting in a manner like that. Mr. Speaker, I can say without exaggeration - the Premier has just arrived - that wherever one goes throughout this Province, everyone echoes the same sentiments about the hon. Premier, they say he is the one man to make Newfoundland and Labrador a have Province within the Canadian framework. In fact, I had a visit just a couple of days ago from a lady from Placentia and she said the very words, "The Premier has the makings of a great man". I think all of us - I am sure we all are, on this side of the House, giving him our full and complete support. If there are any doubts on the opposite side I am sure these doubts will be dismissed in due course. I am also, Mr. Speaker, pleased with the government's continuing policy to hold Cabinet meetings at various centres throughout the Province. And I was particularly pleased with the most recent meeting held at Corner Brook which certainly was a success.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, to show the interest of people in the Bay of Islands district, they had eighteen briefs presented, and I feel sure that each brief, wherever it came from, will be given sympathetic hearing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rather than dwell at length on the Bay of Islands district, which I feel has been treated fairly since 1972, I would like to delve more deeply into the important initiatives and matters of interest raised in the Throne Speech, such as the continuing offshore oil and gas exploration off our coast and the Northern cod stock issue. I may not be able to use the - not exactly the flowery, but the legal language that our good friend from Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) used, but I assume, perhaps, when some of our lawyers get up they will probably be able to answer him better than I can.

Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry is today the single most important industry in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW:

This, Sir, was brought out yesterday.

I had to admire the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he spoke so eloquently about the fisheries in his speech on the Environment Act, not simply because of its direct contribution to our economy but also because of its social, historical and cultural values embodied in our people. The development and protection of our Northern cod stock is vital, therefore, to the future survival and growth of the many communities that dot our rugged coastline, communities that depend on the fishery for their lifeblood.

Now, I was counting up yesterday and I think we have thirty-four rural districts in this Province and in all those rural districts, either directly or indirectly they are in some way involved with the fisheries. So therefore, the fishery then, is certainly very important.

I am therefore very encouraged by our government's firm stand on the Northern cod stock issue and the

MR. L. WOODROW: reaffirmation in the Throne Speech that the fisheries are the backbone of our economy and society and will remain the major component of any permanent solution to our economic problems. I believe, Mr. Speaker, just getting back to the Premier once again, we have to be firm, we have to mean what we say. And if the Premier gets up and shakes his arms, he means, by God, he means, 'I am sold on what I am saying! I mean what I say!' And I think if all of us would take that attitude perhaps in our present positions, we would be a lot more meaningful to the people who send us to this hon. House of Assembly. This basic firm principle will assure the long-term future of rural Newfoundland, which forms the very fabric of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, coming to the oil, as our Province moves even closer to an offshore petroleum industry becoming a reality - and, in fact, it is almost incredible; who would ever say ten or fifteen years ago that we would be on the verge now of an oil discovery? In fact, at the present time we can almost feel it flowing to our shores. Our

MR. WOODROW:

People are looking more than ever before with optimism to a bright, secure future and thanks be to God. We have been in the doldrums, we have been a have not Province long enough. And, hopefully, starting off now as we are in the 1980's, in another decade, I feel sure that if we are not already, then we will certainly be on the way to being a have Province. Fears have also been expressed that a full-scale petroleum industry will cause serious social upheaval. Then as the famous Irish writer, W.B. Yeats put it, "A terrible beauty is born".

Mr. Speaker, our government has indicated to all parties that this will not be the case. The resources will be developed in concert with the fishery for Newfoundland by Newfoundlanders where possible. In fact, I certainly, again, admire and go along with the Premier on the stand he took towards employing Newfoundlanders. It was kind of rather unfortunate when he was on Cross Country Checkup on Sunday night that the three people who disagreed were Newfoundlanders.

MR. MORGAN:

Must be Liberals.

MR. WOODROW:

Absolutely. In fact one was I am sure. One was a gentleman who is a dyed in the wool Liberal up around the Port Saunders area as my good friend - he is not here - from that area knows. So really I think that a thing like that, it was almost incredible, to say the least, it was sickening.

Oil companies have come to realize by necessity that our way of life will not be compromised. I do not think this is going to be easy. In fact, the pace and manner of offshore development is more important to this government than the fact that development rushes ahead as was the case in Scotland.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, I would like now, first of all, to continue on the oil. In the weeks and months ahead we will continue to plan responsibly towards the day when the first barrel of oil is landed on our shore. Having said this, I would hope that members opposite will become involved and indicate to the people of this Province exactly where they stand on the all important question of offshore ownership. Mr. Trudeau, regardless of what the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) has said, was very evasive on this when questioned at Memorial University during the brief campaign visit. I feel that members opposite have been equally evasive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a little about Bowaters and the budworm and the like. And I am very happy to be able to say at the present time that Bowaters are going ahead with a planned expansion, \$118 million over a five year plan. This really speaks well for the West Coast of the Province and it also shows they must

MR. L. WOODROW: be in agreement with the government's position on the budworm. Living in a district where seventy-five per cent of the population is either directly or indirectly involved with the Bowater Paper Mill in Corner Brook, I am very concerned with the Province's forest resource and the serious problem of the spruce budworm infestation. Mr. Speaker, earlier in January my colleagues the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), present in the chair, and I, met with officials of Bowaters in Corner Brook and needless to say the picture painted at the time was a dismal and a frightening one. While I do not doubt the authenticity of the statistical information raised, the picture was simply the paper side of the spruce budworm problem. Now, on January 2, 1980, the following appeared in the editorial of the Western Star concerning the budworm; "The companies claim that the insect threatens the newsprint industry in the Province and it must be checked. There is no doubt that the budworm is destroying thousands of square miles of prime wood, but nobody is sure if the spraying really works and if it is worth the risk that medical experts claim go with the spray. And finally The government is in a dilemma, they are damned if they do and they are damned if they do not." That is what the editorial said. Mr. Speaker, I was, therefore, not surprised that the companies at Corner Brook and the paper companies throughout the Province were upset with the decision not to undertake a spray programme during the coming summer. I knew when it took so long at the Cabinet meeting to put the final touches on the decision that the Premier wanted to examine fully all details surrounding the spruce budworm issue before making a definitive statement on the spray programme. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the decision not to spray this year was a very responsible and correct one, given the long-term

MR. L. WOODROW: unknown effects on our vegetation, wildlife and people. I welcome the establishment of a royal commission, as it will provide invaluable information and recommendations aimed at long-term solutions for the forest industry. A number of areas, including the viability of an extended spray programme, this is of major importance to the Province, especially to the West Coast, and I look forward to a productive commission.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Concerning (inaudible)

MR. L. WOODROW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member from Burin (Mr. Hollett) can determine my position by what I have already said.

MR. D. HOLLETT: I do not believe you are going to get it.

MR. L. WOODROW: That would be - Very good, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few points about the district. There are a few matters I would like to attend to. Just one of the things, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was saying today that the government looked after P.C. districts only, but I will tell you what happened in mine. A while back the government took a tractor, and I am not saying they did anything wrong, they took a snowplow from my district and sent it down to the hon. member for Eagle River's district (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. NEARY: That is where all the snowplows are this winter.

MR. L. WOODROW: That is right, yes. So you can see in my mind there is certainly no distinction

MR. WOODROW: House by whether it is a Liberal or a PC district, and I think that is a good thing. No doubt that is the way it should be.

MR. HOLLETT: Is either one of your friends out there (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Did either of my friends do what?

MR. HOLLETT: (Inaudible) one of their subcontracts.

MR. WOODROW: Well, I have no rich friends like the hon. member probably has down around Grand Bank. My friends are like the hon. member from Lapoile's, I go along with the humble. I think we have a lot in common.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The toiling masses.

MR. WOODROW: Believe it - the toiling masses, right.

MR. NEARY: Thank you.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, very good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking of snowclearing, you know, there is probably no other place -

MR. HOLLETT: Just wait until the minister comes back, he will let us know.

MR. WOODROW: Fine, very good.

I do not say, Mr. Speaker, there is any other place in the Province where we get more snow than on the Western end of the Province and along up the Northeast Coast and so on. So this year, in fact, it was probably worse than any other year. It seems to be getting a bit worse each year or so, but I feel that the government has done what they could. People, and I suppose you do not blame them, they want instant action like the instant porridge we have once in awhile. In the old days we used to boil the porridge. It would take about a half hour to cook it on the stove.

MR. NEARY: The minister says that this is the worst Winter we have had in 25 years. Does the hon. member agree with that?

MR. WOODROW: Looking back, well, I would think that it has been a very bad Winter.

MR. NEARY: It is not even the worst Winter we had in the last ten years, let alone 25 years, according to the weather office.

They said -

MR. WOODROW: Perhaps not over here on the East Coast, that is true, you know.

MR. NEARY: Everywhere in Newfoundland, it was all over Newfoundland.

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: (Inaudible) hon. member (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: In any case I feel sure that perhaps the worst has gone now. We will have to have probably St. Paddy's Brush -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) good Tory, boy.

MR. WOODROW: - I suppose, but I hope the worst has gone and we have gotten over the hump. That is the main thing.

Mr. Speaker, I said in the beginning that I am very happy and I say this again, I am very happy with what took place in my district since 1972. I would like to say again before 1972, speaking of the North Shore of the Bay of Islands, they had over there the Ballum Bridge and they had a little road over there, not much road at all, but in any case, since that time, it is a new North Shore altogether. There is water and sewer in almost, practically speaking, every community over there. I am not saying it is completed, but what I am saying is that there is a good start on it and I hope that it will continue, I might say, within the boundaries of reason.

MR. NEARY: What happened at (inaudible)?

MR. WOODROW: I beg your pardon?

MR. HOLLETT: (Inaudible) government department.

MR. WOODROW: Getting ready for it, everybody is ready. My God, after all, look what they have? People, in fact, do not expect government to give everything for nothing. These people appreciate water and sewer. I wish we had had it when we were growing up.

MR. AYLWARD: Back in the Liberal days.

MR. WOODROW: I also, Mr. Speaker, want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) - he is probably listening outside somewhere - that the

MR. WOODROW: road on both sides of the bay, the road leading to Lark Harbour and the road leading to Cox's Cove - I am very glad I am getting the attention of the hon. members, I think I must be touching a point and I am delighted with it - it is badly in need of recapping, and I hope that when he sits down with his officials - he probably has already - well, when he starts

MR. L. WOODROW: talking about paving and recapping
he will think about the Bay of Islands district.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I am
sure the hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. R.
Dawe) - I am hoping that this year we will be successful in getting
an ice plant in the arena over at Cox's Cove. That is a very -

MR. S. NEARY All you have to do is take the
plant out of Dunphy's fish meal plant at (inaudible) and
put it in the arena.

MR. L. WOODROW: Well, that is a possibility.
Any advice -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a red herring.

MR. L. WOODROW: Yes, I know that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: Any advice is greatly accepted.
Well, I think I know the hon. member -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) green.

MR. L. WOODROW: In any case I hope that we will see
this a reality because the skating, hockey - it is a very popular
hobby, a very popular rink or stadium as the hon. member from Humber
West (Mr. Baird) knows. If he was not over there at least his
children were over there playing hockey and the like. It is very
popular now and, in fact, people from both sides of the bay, at least
from Corner Brook right down to Cox's Cove, they are really using
the ice surface and it certainly is needed, the ice plant
is needed.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the population there?

MR. L. WOODROW: Roughly speaking you are looking
at - what?

MR. L. WOODROW:

From Hughes Brook, which is in the hon. Minister of Health's district (Mr. W. House), I suppose you are looking at maybe 5,000 or 6,000 people. That is the number but, of course, as I said, it is used by others as well, even by people as far out as Lark Harbour on the South shore, they come over there to play hockey and the like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, also in the field of recreation, plans are under way to put a municipal park in Cook's Brook, one of the beauty spots in the Bay of Islands. Already an application has been made to the Department of Social Services for a community development project. And I hope if you come - and, in fact, there is a lot of enthusiasm over this project also and I hope that when the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. T. Hickey) makes his budget up, when he is considering these projects, these make work or whatever you want to call them, community development projects, he will keep this one in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am going to just about conclude now but I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is indeed once again a pleasure to be in this hon. House of Assembly and I think we all realize the importance of the offshore rights. I think this is the most important issue that this Province ever faced and I hope that when the debate is finished we will be all of one mind on this very important issue. But I would like to end up my speech, Mr. Speaker, with a little saying from -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A prayer.

MR. L. WOODROW:

Oh, yes. This is what a former Newfoundlander wrote me from Toronto, very simple, but I thought it was a good way to end up a speech. It is about the flag. He says,

MR. WOODROW:

"I think now is the right time to come up with a distinctive symbol for the Island, now that Newfoundland stands so confidently before the future. With a firm identity and a bright future, a distinctive flag seems right." So I want to wish the Committee well also, in their choosing of a flag. And now, Mr. Speaker, there are other things I had to say but I will leave them. We will be having an opportunity of speaking in the Budget Speech and I thank hon. members for their attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for St. Mary's-

The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

First of all I would like to congratulate the member opposite on an excellent speech. Sir, he hit on some very good points and some points that are well taken. We share a lot of your sentiments. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. I think they did an excellent job. Unfortunately I was not here, I was away and I could not make it. Before I start, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am very grateful to the people of St. Mary's-The Capes for the confidence and the trust they have put in me by electing me to represent them in this House over the next three or four years. I am very grateful for that. And I also have to thank all members on this side of the House for the excellent response they gave me during the by-election. Without the excellent speeches and the dedication that Mr. Jamieson showed towards me, Sir, I would not be here today and to him, Sir, I am very grateful and I will always remember the things he did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: A lot of people, Sir, could not figure out how I won that by-election which was, I guess, one of the major upsets in Newfoundland politics. Sir, the only thing that I can attribute it to is we had the right candidate and we had the people on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: So I think the day is over, Sir, when you can send a townie out around the bay and get him elected. I think those days are just about finished. Sir, I would like to thank the people here who got out. The simple fact of the matter is that we outhustled the government side which has almost twice as many members as we have. To each and every one of you I am very thankful for the job that you have done.

Basically, the things that I am going to talk about this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, are the problems in my district. I realize that government cannot solve all of the problems and I think sometimes the people in the district have to get more involved in internal problems and figure out what is wrong and work in conjunction with one another to determine what aspects they are going to take and what roles they are going to step forward in to overcoming the problems in their district.

Sir, the fishing industry; I guess it is not only the main industry it is the only industry that we have in our district and I would like to dwell on that for a few minutes if I could. I was pleased with the announcement by the new Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Looking back over some of the problems we had with the Fisheries Loan Board over the years, I wonder was it actually the minister's fault or was he given too much leeway by the Premier or whatever? Sir, one of the main problems we have in our district right now

MR. HANCOCK:

is pertaining to the herring quota. There are fourteen licenses issued for 650 metric tons of herring to be caught in St. Mary's Bay and they are fishing right now. The people are very upset with the quota system. One boat can go in and actually catch 600 metric tons of herring if it is lucky enough and the other twelve licenses are there it cost them in the vicinity of \$10,000 to \$15,000 to prepare for the herring season, to get ready, to get their boats ready to go out and catch the herring and they could end up with very little or no herring at all. And they are very disturbed over this matter and they would like government, or work in conjunction with the government, to set a boat quota. If there are 650 metric tons and there are ten boats, each boat then, be allowed to catch in the vicinity of 65 metric tons.

Sir, last Summer a very disturbing thing happened in my district, in particular, where a lot of people who came to my establishment were using the phone day after day after day trying to get rid of a load of squid which to them, Sir, was a day's pay, and an honest day's pay, and a hard day's work, and they could not

MR. D. HANCOCK: get plants anywhere in the district or outside of the district to look after the squid that they had caught that morning or that night. And Sir, that is the same as taking, if you had a \$100 dollar bill in your pocket taking it and just throwing it out the window. And here we have a plant in Admirals Beach that is approximately two hundred and fifty feet long which is only half or a little less than half developed. And Sir, it does not cost a heck of a lot of money to develop that plant, to put running water in another section of the plant to tube squid which there is a market for. I would like to see this in my district, and other districts I am sure, around the Province, improved in the upcoming season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: Is there a number of slipways that have been built in my district with very little consultation between the fishermen or the fishermen's committee in that area and government or the contractor, for that matter, whoever is responsible for putting the slipways there. Usually a tender is called for a slipway. Just take Portugal Cove, for example, on the Southern Shore which is the beginning of my district. There is a slipway in that community right now and the fishermen tell me the only way they can use it is if they have a hovercraft or something to get from the landwash up onto the slipway. It is very disturbing Sir, and there has been a heck of a lot of money used, taxpayers' money. I might add, our money, the money of everybody here to put that slipway there. It is just like taking the money and throwing it out the window.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: Sir, we have no other industry, as I stated earlier, only the fisheries and we have to improve and enlarge. We have, I guess, over the past few years, grow greatly in the fishing industry, and rightly so, because that is all we have. And the people in my district unlike the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who states that "The Premier and all the members opposite have all their eggs in the one basket", are not saying that he has all his eggs in the one basket pertaining to oil, they are saying

MR. D. HANCOCK: he has the hen, the rooster and part of the barn all in the one basket.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: What disturbs me Sir, is I have been here since October, we have not dwelt on fisheries half as much as we should have dwelt on it. Everything has been taken up by oil. We have all been sucked in by oil, God love it, I hope we get it some day. But we cannot neglect or forget about the fisheries, because that is the thing that got us where we are today Sir, and if we neglect that our heritage and our lifestyle goes down the drain along with it.

So, the tourist industry, or I should say lack of the tourist industry, I am sorry the Minister for Tourism is not here.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is down here.

MR. D. HANCOCK: He is down here, is he? So we have great potential in my district for the tourist industry, but there has been very little or no development. You take the bird sanctuary on the Cape Shore I am sure, Sir, that if it were developed in a proper manner it could attract thousands or literally hundreds of thousands of tourists to my district which would bring revenue not only into the Province but into my district which I am concerned about mostly as I am sure all members on this side and the other side of the House are. We also have the lighthouse in Cape St. Mary's Sir, we have great salmon rivers that could be developed but are not developed in the proper manner. So I would beg the Minister of Tourism to look at the potential that we have in our district somewhere down the road. It is hard to get a tourist I know, Sir, to come into a district that is approximately one-third unpaved and with no restaurant facilities. If we bring a bus tour, for example, tomorrow to take in the bird sanctuary on the Cape Shore. first of all, if you tell them they have to go over a section of approximately forty miles of dirt road that is enough to turn them off in itself. But then if you also tell them they have to pack a lunch, Sir, to go into that district, they will be very disturbed. There is only one restaurant in the whole district

MR. D. HANCOCK: and you have to travel one hundred and eighty miles right through the district, come out of my district and into Placentia to get a bite to eat. That, Sir, is very disturbing in this day and age. Like I say, government cannot rectify all the problems, Private individuals probably have not been given enough incentive to start up something that would be a viable operation and provide a living for them and their family.

Sir, we talk about the ambulance service in Labrador. There is part of my district that is covered adequately by ambulance. You take Trepassey, for example, has two, St. Vincent's has two, St. Mary's has two and then you leave St. Mary's and you go approximately one hundred and twenty miles, one hundred and thirty miles to Placentia before you come across another ambulance. Last summer I was at the scene of, first at the scene I might add, of a fatal accident that took place in Mount Carmel, in my community and there was one individual killed and there were seven people in that car. I was there and I got transportation for some of them, the ones that could be moved to the clinic in St. Joseph's. But there were four of them or three of them, I am not sure now, that could not be moved at the time for they had back injuries or spinal injuries or whatever and we had to wait an hour and thirty-five minutes before we reached an ambulance, from the time the R.C.M.P were notified until the ambulance arrived at the scene of that accident. This to me Sir, is not good enough. If an accident.

MR. HANCOCK:

occurred in North Harbour or in Branch we have to wait for Placentia, we have to wait for Riverhead which would take them an hour and a half or two hours to get there especially this time of the year.

Recreation in my area is another grave concern. We have in some places too much, as you might say, and I will be the first to admit it. Take the communities of St. Mary's, Point La Haye North, and Gaskiers which are in the vicinity of a three or four mile radius. There are no less than three soccer fields or softball diamonds, soccer fields now, they are converting one of them into a softball diamond. Sir, it is nice to apply for a Canada Works or a LIP programme or whatever and put a field in a community but it is also nice to educate the people to best utilize the facilities that are already there. There is no need of those three fields there now. I was on them last Summer during the election and there was grass on them then about two feet high. Obviously they had not been used for a number of years and it disturbs me, Sir, to see the taxpayer's money of this Province go down the drain. In other areas of the Province there are very little or no recreation facilities. We had to fight like heck this year to try and get - if not for the election we would not have gotten it - a grant for the softball diamond in Mount Carmel which I can assure this hon. House will not be set aside to be used by cattle or whatever. That field will be used at its uttermost, Sir.

There are a number of outdoor swimming pools in the area which - in a radius I am talking now, of eight or ten miles. Each of the communities has its own identity or likes to have its own identity but it is also

MR. HANCOCK:

nice to have something that can be used the whole year round. Mount Carmel has one and I think approximately \$135,000 was spent on it, a swimming pool, Sir, and you could not get your ankles wet there if you tried. And the same applies to other sections of the district. It would be a lot better, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if we all put our heads together and came up with an indoor swimming pool, something that could be used for the school systems and the youth of our district and be used the whole year round rather than just used in the Summer. Our Summer season could last two weeks. It has been gravely neglected, Sir.

Some of the smaller problems that exist in my district, that a lot of members here would not even be aware of because I was not aware of them until I moved back there, coming from the South Coast years ago. Then I end up back in Mount Carmel some fifteen years later to find out that we had the same problems that existed on the South Coast twenty years ago, they have been overcome, some little problems that people in Conception Bay North, Conception Bay South would not think of. We have one bank in the district which is located in Trepassey and you have to go all the way through the district, 180 miles later or 200 miles later, to get into Placentia to another bank. That is a disturbing factor to me, especially when you run out of change on a Friday evening and it is four o'clock on five o'clock and it costs your twenty dollars to get a guy to go to town to pick you up \$120 worth of change for the weekend. We have no restaurants at all. There is one restaurant, again in Trepassey, which, I guess, population-wise would warrant it, but there are also other areas of that district that could support a restaurant. I am not saying that government can go out and stick a restaurant here or a restaurant there but they can probably get somebody interested enough to set up a restaurant or a little workshop or something next door so

MR. HANCOCK:

that he can make a living at it. There is no public library, no theatre, no supermarket. There is not one supermarket in the whole district where you can go in with a cart and push it around and come out and get your groceries the same as you can in many of the other districts around this Province. No drugstore. We had a drug dispensary on the Cape Shore which serviced a large area, as I stated yesterday, and for some reason the government decided to take that out of it. I do not know if the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has a share in the drugstore in Placentia and he has got some influence to get the people to go into Placentia to buy their drugs. I do not think it is true but it is something that could happen.

There is no cottage hospital. There is one RCMP station. No hotels. And you talk about the poor T.V. reception we are getting on the South Coast. You should come out to my district and talk to some of the people who spent literally hundreds of dollars to move an antenna 600 feet up on the cliff to have it blown down with the storm. They put up another one so they could pick up the things that we in other parts of this Province just take for granted. There is little or no response from NTV. I have tried since I have been elected and I have written to the CRTC and I am waiting for a reply back from them to see what they are going to do on the matter.

Sir, Canada Works programmes; they are great programmes. They are badly needed in some areas, especially in my district, because in the Wintertime when fishing stops we have no other alternative but to go and put something in the community that is going to benefit the community. But, Sir, the thing that distracts me and disturbs me about the Canada Works Programme is the money that they pay for the wages that are paid out in Canada Works.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

A person came to me the other day, a married man with four children, six of them in the family. He was working with McNamara here in town and he got laid off for the Winter months, so naturally, he had to go and register with Manpower to receive his unemployment. He is taking home \$152 a week, if I am not mistaken, in unemployment. Manpower phoned him just shortly after Christmas and said he had to go to work in Canada Works. The man is now taking home \$129 a week, trying to maintain a new home and support four children. So that is little better than slave wages, and I would like to see the wages improved on these Canada Works programmes. The programmes, like you say, are badly needed, very badly needed, but we also need to look after the people who are working on those programmes.

MR. S. NEARY:

The provincial government, by the way, is partly responsible for that.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

It does not surprise me with wages the way they are.

Sir, pasture lands are another grave concern to all the people in my district. That is why I presented the petition today on their behalf from one section, and I have more to come. They feel that the government has looked after those pasture lands, they have kept them up, the cattle has been more than looked after by the time it comes back to them after two or three months on the pasture lands. They would not want to see a private individual obtain or look after the pasture lands because they are afraid the private individual would start to cut corners and if he cut corners and cut dollars their livestock will suffer and they will not get a fair return. They realize, Sir, that the money they are paying is more than reasonable. They should be paying a bit more and they would be the first to admit it. You cannot put a sheep on a pasture land for three or four months and expect the government to operate it at \$1.50 a head, I mean, it is a bit ridiculous - I would be the first to admit that. Charge them \$5 or \$6, but make sure their livestock is looked after. Because in my district, in particular, Sir, this is a great savings to the people concerned.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Sir, the road conditions in my district - well, I live in a district which is still approximately one-third unpaved. And I will give members on the opposite side of the House there all the credit, there has been a lot of work done in the last six or eight years with regard to road work, but, Sir, there is still a lot that needs to be done. Like I say, I am living in a district which is still approximately one-third unpaved, and you try to tell a guy living in Branch that it costs him \$300 more every six months or two months to maintain a vehicle than it does if you were living in St. John's and he would soon tell you where to go. He realizes that he has to pay in the vicinity of \$1,500 to \$2,000 extra every year to maintain a vehicle going over that section of dirt road.

It was only as early as yesterday I was talking to a trucker. 'Dick,' he said, 'I am caught between hell and high water.' He said, 'If I go from Point Lance around, which is a larger section of pavement than if I come the North Harbour way, I burn \$40 to \$50 more in gas.' He said, 'What do I do? Will I take a chance and go over the dirt section of the road and break a windshield or lose a tire.' He said, 'What would you do?'

So the people of that area would like to see the roads upgraded. You take, for example, the communities of Colinet, Harricott, Little Barasway, Big Barasway, Ship Cove, Path End, Point La Haye and North Harbour which do not have pavement in their communities. There are not too many communities around this Province which do not have pavement actually in the community, itself. I went over that road last night, over to North Harbour to attend a meeting of the concerned citizens in that area who have to send children a distance of forty miles by return trip to school every morning. I would like to ask hon. members here how would they feel if they had to get up and get their children ready seven o'clock in the morning to send them off over a section of twenty miles of dirt road? I know I would not want to do it with mine, I can assure you of that. And I am sure hon. members opposite and on this side of the House would not want to see their children neglected in that way.

MR. D. HANCOCK: When I first got elected, I said I was getting so many phone calls I figured it was just the P.C.s trying to drive me off the head over the road conditions, but then I put two and two together and I said to my wife one day, 'Girl, there cannot be that many P.C.s in the district so the road problems really do exist,' and that is virtually what we are up against - no pavement, no upgrading. And the snow clearing this year, Sir - I am glad the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett) is here - has been utterly ridiculous in my area to say the least.

MR. NEARY: All over.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Sir, we had two pieces of equipment in Trepassey, a small plough and a grader with two operators, with some of the worst sections of road from Trepassey to St. Vincent's to St. Shotts to keep open. You can go through that section of road and ten minutes later you have to go through it again to open it up, and here we were with two operators. They are not bionic men, Sir, they cannot operate twenty-four hours a day. I would not like to see that happen in the future and I am sure you would not, Sir, if you were living on that section of road and had to travel over it every day.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right. I would not.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long I have been speaking, but my father said to me one time, he said, "Some politicians can say in thirty seconds what it takes others thirty minutes to say", and I agree with him after listening here. I was listening to an open-line program the other morning and the calls were pertaining to "What do you think of Mr. Smallwood compared to Mr. Peckford?" This one caller came on and the comments got around the club and they were talking about it after that night, but he was saying, "Yes, Sir, we do need a fighter to lead us into the eighties", this caller calls in. He said to Mr. Sterrett, "We do need a fighter, Sir. We need a Mohammed Ali if we can get him", he said, "Sir, we need him, we definitely need him. This Province needs him to lead us into the eighties. But", he said, "Sir, we also need a Mohammed Ali with a bit of common sense who can sit down and reason and thrash things out not only with his fists," he said, "but with what is upstairs." So sometimes I think the Premier goes a little bit overboard with going on like this and jumping up and down or whatever. That is only an attention grabber, Sir, that is not the logical way to go about getting things.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the eighties have not started off that bad. Thank God that the Canadians saw fit to put the Liberals back in government. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour for me to address this hon. House in my first time of speaking in the House, and I would like to congratulate the newly elected member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) also in his remarks.

There are three major issues I feel that were raised in the gracious Speech from the Throne. They are issues that are certainly going to be very important to Newfoundland and have been important to Newfoundland in the past; the issue of the Labrador hydro, which is not being managed properly at the present time; the Northern cod stocks and the fishery as a whole, which is not being

MR. ANDREWS: managed properly; and the whole issue of gas and oil that we have heard so much talk about and I am sure we will in the future days, but we have good management coming in place with gas and oil.

My district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, I would say, Mr. Speaker, can be described as one of the forgotten districts in Newfoundland also. It is one of the last areas in Newfoundland where communities are not connected by highways, and boat travel is the most common means of transport. The situation was eased somewhat last Fall when the new highway connection was opened to Burgeo from St. George's, and I am looking forward to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) having that probably paved by the end of the Spring. There are two distinct regions in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. On the Western end there is the Town of Burgeo and the Town of Ramea and Francois, Grey River and MacCallum, which are largely fishing communities, 100 per cent fishing communities. There is almost 100 per cent employment in most of that district, and it comes from the fishery. There are two big fish plants, one in Ramea, John Penney and Sons, and the other in Burgeo. As a matter of fact, that part of the district is importing workers from other parts of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and other districts throughout Newfoundland. There still exists the problem of transportation, of course. The residents of Ramea, in particular, are all working. They are all taxpayers, Mr. Speaker. They are a little bit disturbed about the fact that the road throughout the town is in a very deplorable condition and, as a matter of fact, there is no material left on the Island to even repair the road and repair the potholes in it. Similar problems with roads, if you could describe them as roads, that you could have around communities like Francois and Grey River, where it is hardly wide enough to even build a road, I think that something should be done as soon as possible in those communities.

The whole business of transportation is a very serious one. The CNR coastal boat service has improved somewhat in the Summer months, but the Winter months present a very serious situation.

MR. H. ANDREWS: coastal boats at this time of the year are often storm-bound at least two or three days at a time, sometimes longer, and it is difficult to fly in any kind of fixed wing aircraft or helicopter. These are difficulties that can be overcome, I believe, with modern technology and a better boat service.

I would like to talk about the problems that the fishermen have on the Southwest Coast. There is need now in the trawler plants for trawler replacements and that will have to come very soon. There is a need for a large influx of federal and provincial government money there. The inshore fishermen have probably the worst fishing facilities in any part of Newfoundland, I would say, and in many cases some of the worst fishing boats. I know of a man who is fishing today out of Ramea in an open motor dory and I think that goes back, Mr. Speaker, into the last generation.

The transportation problem, as I just referred to, Mr. Speaker - We must continue to improve transportation methods and in this regard I would like to compliment the government on calling tenders for a new car ferry to serve the people of Ramea connecting them to Gray River and to Burgeo. And the people in those communities are looking forward to having access to the new Burgeo Highway.

In the Eastern section of my district, Mr. Speaker, we have St. Alban's, Milltown, the Head of the Bay, Morrisville, and Conne River. But I think here we have even a larger problem, and it is a problem that affects many places in Newfoundland as in Atlantic Canada, and that is unemployment. The main resource here is the forest industry. We have two sawmills struggling, and they are struggling with small timber which is a natural handicap in this Province. They are struggling with the poor timber

MR. H. ANDREWS: that is sparsely spaced and the cost of transportation to the mills is a very high one. They are also struggling now with the spruce budworm and the possibility that, down the road somewhere, the forest industry in Bay D'Espoir may have to close. God forbid it, Mr. Speaker, but it is a possibility. On this point I must say that I am in total agreement with the government's decision not to spray for the spruce budworm, at least this year, until we have more information. It is a very serious thing and we must have more information before we move on this matter. This, of course, will be debated in the House at a later date.

There is a vessel construction business in Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir District, mainly in Bay D'Espoir and, of course, like many of the boat yards is having some difficulty. But I will say this, that some of the best boats in Newfoundland and Labrador are built right in Bay D'Espoir. And on this point, I think, I have been talking with a lot of boat builders and this is a problem that affects everybody because it does not matter how good or vibrant a fishing economy you have, there are going to be periods where boat building is going to be slack. I would encourage the boat builders of Newfoundland to look at other things besides fishing boats. There is a great potential market throughout Canada and Eastern United States and even in Europe for wooden pleasure boats. And I know our boat builders can build them and they can build them well and this might be something that could take the slack periods when, for a number of reasons, there are not enough orders available or not enough money to go around to build them. On another scene Bay D'Espoir, the economy of Bay D'Espoir has been buoyed up over the years by hydro development and now in more recent years and years to come by the Upper Salmon project. This power, of course, is needed

MR. H. ANDREWS: by Newfoundlanders and there is no doubt about that, but I am very concerned about the environment as is everyone in this House. There is a delegation from the Conne River area here this afternoon in the House and I assure them I will do my best to support them in their desires to protect the environment.

The hon. member from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) spoke on the problem of television and that is a very serious problem for the people who live down there. It is okay for those of us who have cable television, we can have three, or four or five channels. It is okay if you live in an area where there is two. I have written the CRTC also, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to receive a reply

MR. H. ANDREWS: and on that case I do not think the CRTC is fulfilling its function. If members of this hon. House of Assembly communicate with that federal agency they should at least expect the courtesy of a reply. And I will write them again, possibly tomorrow.

Gas and oil, Mr. Speaker; I am not the first one to speak on the subject and I am sure I will not be the last, but I would like to pick up on this whole issue of what is called confrontation. I think that confrontation can work and I do not think that anybody living in any society today can survive without some form of confrontation in their private lives or their business lives or in their political lives - certainly in politics. I look back over our history in the past thirty years and there have been periods of a lot of confrontation, periods where the ex-Premier of Newfoundland, one removed, fought with Ottawa for our benefits. You may not have agreed with him but he did receive some benefits for us over the years. A time when there was confrontation over the Upper Churchill development with the Province of Quebec, there was confrontation with Quebec, there was confrontation with Con-Ed, there was concession to Quebec and then there was a con job and we lost. But over the years we, I think, gained confidence and then we had confrontation again. And hopefully that confrontation or the present one with Hydro Quebec and with the Province of Quebec hopefully will lead to concession from Quebec. And there were indications in this past week that Premier Levesque is willing to talk on the subject. That is a move that we got from confrontation. So confrontation does work. If we are going to be the nice guys there is no hope for Newfoundland in the future, Mr. Speaker. We have to become prosperous and we have to take a stand on these issues.

The same principle applies, I

MR. H. ANDREWS: think, with our fishery. What we are asking for in the Northern cod is only something that we already own so if we have to confront somebody who is going to steal from us or take from us in whatever manner, we have to confront them and we have to say, "This is wrong, we do not agree with that." And this is what we are doing with the Northern cod. I am sure the Nova Scotians would not be too happy if we decided here in Newfoundland to outfit a half a dozen scallop draggers and go up off George's Bank and start catching scallops in their traditional fishing grounds. I do not think we should and I am sure they would not be too happy about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. H. ANDREWS: So if they can - not scallops on George's Bank. We have no continuity of traditional scallop fishing on George's Bank in any quantity.

Mr. Speaker, there are some grey areas, I believe, in the Cabot Strait and the gulf area around Cape Breton, the Southwest coast where Nova Scotia did have traditional fishing rights and we are not arguing those issues. But we must not permit the fishing policy of Newfoundland to be designed in Halifax or in Fredericton or in Quebec City, and if Ottawa is ever thinking about other major changes we must be consulted and permitted major input in these decisions.

On the fishing industry, I would like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, about this year's outlook. My understanding from people in the industry is that the market outlook is not good for a lot of frozen products, that the prices are soft, that the markets are soft. We certainly must diversify in our product development. And on this point I think we have to go back in history a little ways. The cod-fish market is very soft, the cod block market is about a dollar a pound right now and it has remained at that level for the past three or four years, fluctuating a nickel or two either way.

MR. H. ANDREWS: But the market for salt fish is tremendous. As a matter of fact, the traditional markets of Spain, Portugal, Italy, and now in South America, and in the United States itself can not obtain enough salt codfish. The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation came on the scene about, I would imagine now about a dozen years ago, fourteen years maybe to overcome the difficulties of marketing and quality control in the salt fish industry. And from my point of view, Mr. Speaker, they have failed.

MR. ANDREWS: The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation has failed to improve quality, it has failed to improve production, and I think the time is now for us to seriously consider whether we need the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation in Newfoundland and throw it open to private industry once again.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things I would like to talk about, particularly in the realm of the fishery which has been a pet of mine for some years. I will be debating these at a later date and I guess the House will on my private member's bill, but offshore gas and oil certainly appears to be commercial now, and I think we have two basic routes that we can go as a Province. One is to say that it is a national resource, a Canadian national resource, but the other is to say that, as Newfoundland is a part of Canada, it is a Newfoundland resource and a Canadian resource through that route. That is the route I think that this House should follow and -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: Pardon? Yes, well I am agreeing with you. If we all agree that we need management control, we also agree that we need ownership, that we should fight as a House for ownership, that we should present our case without any doubts that we have ownership. Unless we do that, we cannot have management control. There is no question of talking about regulations or control or management of that resource. The same applies to our Northern cod stocks. Once again, we are not asking for something that we do not own. Without a position on Northern cod the resource would just vanish before us, and the same with the gas and oil off our coast. We have seen this happen so many times in our history, Mr. Speaker, with the Labrador hydro, with the forest industry, a century ago with our minerals in Labrador, and with other industries and resources that we have attempted to establish and develop here. We did not take a firm stand in many cases. We should have. It has been too late in some cases. Hopefully, we can recover our losses in the years ahead. Ownership gives us the position of strength that makes management control so much easier, and this is not going to be an easy job that we have ahead.

MR. ANDREWS: The fishery has to be protected, Mr. Speaker, and who better to do it than Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. These jobs must be protected. We must do it and we must extract the greatest royalties possible and not let somebody else decide how rich or how poor we are going to be for the next 20, 30, 40 or 50 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, that is about all the remarks I have for my first presentation to this hon. House. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member from St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the gracious Speech from the Throne and welcome the new member for Burgeo-Pav d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

It was not very long ago, just a few years, probably five or six or seven or eight years ago, that I heard the then President of the Newfoundland Board of Trade suggest that we had too many people on the Island of Newfoundland. Some of you may remember and there was a suggestion at the time that probably 125,000 should move off the Island. It kind of disturbed me, and I went to the news media, to the airways, and I suggested at that time that if, indeed, we do have 125,000 too many on the Avalon or elsewhere in Newfoundland, other than the Northern Peninsula where I have grown up, lived and made a livelihood and a good one, Mr. Speaker, if, indeed, we have too many people on the rest of the Province, on the Island part, probably they should move up to the Northern Peninsula and be turned loose from government regulation, red tape and all the rest of the things that stymie people's movements to make a livelihood. If these people, Mr. Speaker, could not make a living and develop

MR. BENNETT:

the resource that we have in that Island part of the Province, which is the access to Labrador which is becoming so wealthy in its own right, if indeed these people could not make a living we should cut that off and let a bunch of people from Japan or China or some other foreign country come in and develop probably to the extent of a million people and they would make a living there. I feel they would at least. I think they would make a living. I think they would develop the resource that we have in that part of the Province and they would support an awful lot more people than even we have on the whole Island and Labrador Province because we do have the resource. We have the resource, Mr. Speaker, without - and it is great to live in anticipation of oil offshore mind you - but I feel that we have the resource, Mr. Speaker, even without offshore oil or even onshore oil, which we have samplings of on the Northern Peninsula in the Parson's Pond-St. Paul's area. And I understand up around Port au Port we have samplings of oil. We have seen great changes, mind you, in the last twenty-five years, but twenty-five years ago, if I remember correctly and I think I do, twenty-five years ago unemployment was unheard of on the Northern Peninsula, unemployment was unheard of. A man could pick up his bucksaw, his chainsaw and go in the woods and chop trees to make a living and a good one. He could hop into his motorboat and go fishing. He was a free man. He could go fishing. He could acquire a piece of land and grow vegetables to supplement his income from the trees and from the fishery. All of this way of living seems to have disappeared and I am inclined to feel a lot of it has disappeared because of the regulations brought about by various levels of government, not only provincial mind you, it is a federal as well as a provincial regulation. It seems to slow down the ongoing development and the opportunity to make a living on a rock. We like to refer to it as a rock but

MR. BENNETT:

when we do we must remember that it is rich and very, very rich. In many, many things it is rich. The Gulf of St. Lawrence, over towards the Labrador shore, all of you must be familiar with the geography I guess, The Gulf of St. Lawrence in itself is a fish pool and is loaded with just about every species that you could mention from a whale to a prickleback. It is a fish basket of the Northern part of the Atlantic that we live on the border of.

The Speech from the Throne is suggesting, or the Premier is suggesting that we need a White Paper again on the fishery. I am not knocking the suggestion that we should have a White Paper on the fishery again but I think everybody knows that we have fish. I know that we have fish and I think everybody in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, is aware that we have fish, number one. I think they are also aware that we have numerous species; halibut, mackerel, caplin, lobster, all the valuable ones, shrimp. We just seem to have every species of fish. Wildlife on the land and fish and seals, we seem to have it all and still we have unemployment. I do not think for one minute it is entirely the fault of those people who are unemployed. I think there has got to be something wrong with the system somewhere along the way. There is something wrong with the system. We have a healthy, ambitious, energetic and educated group of young people coming on stream in this Province and they are leaving like flies and going out to Fort McMurray and out to other parts of mainland Canada to become employed, to make bread and butter to send back to their families. In all of the Province, not only on the Northern Peninsula, all over the Province they seem to have left. In one little town like Trout River in Bonne Bay, one little town alone this year there have been about seventy people who have left and gone out to

MR. T. BENNETT: the mainland while the fish are biting at our shores. And we have Bonne Bay, one of the most beautiful bays that you would ever find around the Province, and indeed, anywhere in North America for that matter, with all kinds of fish. I was catching them myself through the ice - codfish - a few Sundays ago, codfish in there now this time of year. These codfish will move out, mind you, and they will be swept away by the draggers and they will not be processed in that area and provide employment for the people who pay the taxes in that area to this government and help to pay the wage structure of those who administer.

I think that we need to take a real hard, hard look at what we have at our disposal as we go along the road to develop oil, minerals, hydro. We seem to be carried away, Mr. Speaker. We seem to be on a trip on the oil hike. Well, okay, it is good. I am glad that we are aspiring to make this Province a 'have' Province. But let us not get carried away to the extent that we overlook everything including the people today who have to live on social welfare because they do not have employment. And they do not have employment in the area I represent, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we need it at this time - I am not quite convinced that we have it, but we certainly do need an active government more than we ever needed it, in my opinion, because of the regulation and because of the more sophisticated way of life that our people have been led into down through the years. We are not anymore - some towns still have to use water buckets, mind you, but we have been led into a more sophisticated way of life and it takes more money to go around. It takes many more dollars to go around and build the kinds of homes that people today want to own after having travelled outside of the isolation that they endured, travelled outside and seen what their neighbours in mainland Canada have had down through the years, a good number of years. Our people now are aspiring to have better homes. And they are ambitious. Let us not condemn them for it. They are ambitious, and we have the resource and we need to turn it on. And we need a government that takes a look at the resource that we have at our disposal and go to work and develop it.

MR. T. BENNETT: I believe that ten years ago we could buy a barrel of oil over in the Middle East for \$2.50 - I stand to be corrected - \$2.50 a barrel.

AN HON. MEMBER: When I was over there, one dollar.

MR. T. BENNETT: One dollar a barrel - I have been corrected. Okay, well, we will still hold on to the \$2.50. Fish was 1.5 cents or 2.5 cents or 3 cents a pound; consequently, we were in no position to develop offshore oil or even oil on our shores because we could buy it at that time for a lot less money than it was costing to explore and go after it. We did not need to. As long as the other man on the other side of the world provided us with oil at \$2.50 a barrel, we were better off to buy and use and let his resources run out and we would hold on to our own. It might sound a little mean and selfish but that is a fact of life. I hope the price of oil does not go back down to \$2.50 in the next ten years because all of the countries around the world seem to be aspiring to getting away from the use of oil. Even I, myself, think in terms of putting up a wind charger or some source of energy so that I can get away from the high cost of hydro and the high cost of furnace oil in my home. I am looking at the possibility of getting away, because it is hurting to heat a home today by electricity. Wherever you go around the Province, you see people going out to cut trees to make fires in their homes to cut down on the cost of heating.

I think that we need to most certainly take a look at what is on the horizon. Sometimes, you know, we can learn from past experiences and latch them on for future lessons, if you will. Because we did pay a lot less money for oil at one time, and with every country in the world aspiring today to find oil, every country that has any chance at all

MR. BENNETT:

and if they are not aspiring to find oil they are most certainly aspiring to find an alternate source which could be wind, solar, just tides, anything and everything. So while it is great that we should think in terms of having such a lucrative find of oil on our doorstep, while it is great, I just hope that we can soon start taking advantage of it. So like so many people have said in the past we have become a have Province but I would rather continue my trend of thought and say, 'Let us be a have country', because we were a little tiny Province for so many years, and I remember some of those years, when our people could not afford to buy a jigger and a jigger line to go fishing but today those very same families, the offspring, at least, can afford today to get with aid of governments, mind you, both levels, can afford to get into \$500,000 fishing vessels to go after the fish that we have on our shores.

I have seen too many of our young people leave the Province and go out in search of jobs on the mainland. A few years ago there was a great emphasis placed on the brain drain. The government was educating our young people with the establishment of better universities and trade schools and high schools and there was a great emphasis then being placed-or concern, I should say, for the brain drain that we were experiencing, and we are still experiencing it more than ever before. I feel that we are today experiencing the brain drain more than ever before and it is not only the brain drain, it is the brawn drain as well. Men and women are going out to the mainland where they can make a decent wage, and where they cannot make a living at all in Newfoundland, because of the tie up of our resource and because of the regulation. They are not able to make a decent living on the Island, in the Province, and they have to go out to make a living, to support their families and a lot of them never come back because they find

MR. BENNETT:

greener pastures. Some of them will come back, many will, but I am very much afraid it is the ones who are the most ambitious, I am concerned in case it is the least ambitious who continue to come back and the ones who are the most ambitious, the better qualified, they reach such a level of earnings with our competitors on the mainland in business, with the competitors that we have in the oil and other resource, the better qualified and the better equipped men and women stay on the mainland and Newfoundland suffers again.

I feel that we need in the district that I represent, and indeed probably around the Province, many, many more facilities, much more facilities and more emphasis placed on the resource that we have at our disposal at this time. And it seems to me that the most lucrative one at this time is the fishery, without a question. Although in the district of St. Barbe on the Northern Peninsula we do have lucrative mining going on, we do have lucrative forestry, we do have arable land, we have lots of fish, we have a reasonably good tourist potential and still we have the highest rate of unemployment and it seems we have the highest rate of unemployment in Newfoundland, not only across Canada. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me a total surplus, a very grave surplus of fish being dumped or at least directed toward the existing fish plants that we have like in Port aux Choix and St. Anthony. We have not got fish plants in the area North of the Bay of Islands that can accommodate or take care of, or a process, whatever you would, that can take care of the fish that we have at our disposal, that we can catch and bring to the shores. Many times during the Summer, Port au Choix plant - and it is a good one, it has quite a payroll that comes into Port au Choix. It is probably second to none in the Province for its size - many times during the Summer the overflow of fish has got to be taken away from Port au

March 11, 1980

Tape No. 301

IB-3

MR. BENNETT:

Choix and carried out to another area like St. Anthony or
even up to Port aux Basques. Right now the fish

MR. BENNETT: plant is in operation with fish that is being hauled down from Port aux Basques because our fishermen cannot fish in that area at the moment because of the ice conditions. I feel myself there is certainly room for expansion in the processing of the fish that we catch. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, we find ambitious, energetic young men in the Province, and I can put my finger on quite a few of them over in the district of St. Barbe right now, young men who want to get into the fishery and they find it very, very difficult. I am thinking in terms of the processing at this moment. Of course, there are lots of others who want to get into the boats to catch the fish that we have. When we find, Mr. Speaker, men of that calibre and that desire and that ambition, I think we should nurture them. I think we should chase after them, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should have the names of these men, and he should drag them into St. John's, if need be, and find out what they have on their minds, because they know, they know what they want to do. Basically all they want to do is make a living and in making a living they contribute to the livelihood of dozens of others around them. When they are kept down, because of the lack of three-phase power or because of the lack of ten miles of bad, terrible road, some little spur branch, I would like the various departments in government to put their heads together - not too hard, mind you - but I wish that they could put their heads together and pick an area like the district that I represent, to zero in on it, zero in on an area that has the potential. I am sure that the hon. gentlemen across from me must be aware of the potential all around the Province. I am not sure that they are aware of the potential that we have in the Gulf and up the Northern Peninsula, from Bonne Bay North. I guess most of the hon. gentlemen have travelled up there. We have a lot of resource. We have a lot of men aspiring to develop that resource. We have at this moment companies who want to get in - and I understand there is one that has already done work up in the St. Barbe area - to go in and get deeper into the fishery. I know there are little conflicting views between the federal and the provincial authorities. Mr. Speaker, I would like for our men in

MR. BENNETT: authority to stop crying over spilt milk.

I would like that we should stop condemning the past completely. We have to look back; we have to reflect and not make the same mistake over and over, but I would most certainly like to see a government that would aspire to developing the things that we have not got developed at this time. I would like to see them go after Lower Churchill instead of condemning the other part of the Churchill development, the Upper Churchill, instead of continually - the breath that we waste on condemning the performance of past administrators could be used, in my opinion, in future development or development for this days that we need money for our bread and butter issues. We have in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, 52 men, 52 hon. gentleman - ladies and gentlemen, I should say - we have 52 hon. members with a great obligation to the people of this Province. We have a grand people, we have a great people, ambitious, energetic, and we have the resource, and I think all we need is just to go out and go to work at it, go to work. . .

When we find people who are ambitious and energetic to develop, I think we should make sure that they have land at their disposal, number one. We should make sure that they have a way to get into the fishing boat. We should not be tying them down with red tape. Not everybody in the Province finds it easy to make a livelihood, not everybody. When we become oil-rich, and we have become rich regardless of oil, at this time I would like, and as we go into the budget that is, hopefully, going to be presented, I would like to

MR. T. BENNETT: suggest to the hon. ministers, especially the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), others as well, mind you, but a few days ago I had a call from a couple, elderly people. The gentleman was getting \$335 a month old age pension, federal pension, mind you, they are now in the twilight years of their life and they are finding it very very rough, very tough to survive. They have one young man at home unemployed. So they gave me a break down, and if you could bear with me I would like to reveal the figures that I have in front of me: grocery bill of \$250 a month, water rate of eight dollars, light, forty dollars, telephone, twenty dollars, church, ten dollars, and heat, fifty dollars, total of \$378 to be paid for from the old age pension of \$335, I am not sure if there is a supplement comes in there somewhere, but the lady of the house is I think fifty-one so she would not qualify. She would not qualify for any supplement yet. They had nothing leftover, they cannot even buy decent food to support themselves on that kind of money.

MR. HANCOCK: They cannot even heat the house.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot see how they can heat the house on fifty dollars.

MR. T. BENNETT: They cannot heat their house. I have done a little bit of research since I have been a member of the House of Assembly, and it seems to me that the average, or just about the average that a social recipient receives would be in the order of \$2.50 - \$2.40 a day a person

AN HON. MEMBER: One dollar and seventy-nine.

MR. T. BENNETT: One dollar and seventy-nine is the average. Okay, I am very generous to suggest two dollars and forty. But even it is two dollars and fifty, Mr. Speaker, it is still a meager amount to expect a person to survive on. The

MR. T. BENNETT: lady who called me said, "Mr. Bennett, is there any way that the Social Services can help us? Is there any way?" She said, "We cannot buy a quart of paint, I cannot buy cleaning fluid to clean my home. There is absolutely no social life for us, absolutely. I cannot buy new linens for my beds -

MR. NEARY: But we are going to have a new flag!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: - just cannot do it. So I hope the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in his wisdom most certainly takes a look at some of the discrepancies that we have. Now, when we find ourselves rich, as hopefully we become a little more prosperous than we are at the moment on the overall picture, but when we do I hope we do not hurt these people more than we hurt them today. These people cannot afford to pay one dollar and fifty cents for a gallon of furnace oil. They are paying now over there. This lady tells me she is paying eighty-nine cents a gallon furnace oil. But with the cost of everything else escalating, that family will have to pay one dollar and fifty cents, probably two dollars and fifty cents for heating oils and they just cannot afford to do it. On top of all this, and the thing that prompted this call was the fear of having tax inflicted on their property in a small community and these people were paralysed. "What are we going to do, Mr. Bennett? Will we lose our homes?" These are people in the twilight years of their life, Mr. Speaker, who deserve more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: But they are going to give them a new flag. That is the answer to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn the thing.

MR. T. BENNETT: I know the old age pension is federal, thank the Lord for that. I would hope our Provincial authority could come and help to supplement these people's

MR. T. BENNETT: incomes to make life more bearable. Mr. Speaker, while the grass is growing, let us not let our people starve because to me we are reaching that stage at this time. At this time we are reaching that stage, Mr. Speaker, where people are finding it very, very difficult while we fight in this House of Assembly over who owns the oil and what the price of oil should be up in Ottawa, being fought over up there, our people down here, outside of St. John's - I am not sure how they manage in St. John's; they might be very well cared for in St. John's - but in the outports I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, all around the Province, people need, they need -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please;

MR. T. BENNETT: - that our departments in government should take another look and before I take my seat I would like, right now.

MR. T. BENNETT: the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), not here at the moment, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. J. Goudie) and the hon. the Minister of Tourism (Mr. R. Dawe), now these are the ones whom I would really like to see take a real hard look. We need the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett) and all the rest of the ministers - we need them all. Because we need our transportation upgraded in the rural areas. But, Mr. Speaker, these seem to me to be the key people whom we need to take a look at the area that has so much resource as we have that we seem to be leaving - well, like I am saying, while the grass is growing the horse is starving. And these hon. gentlemen, I wish that they would take a real hard look, especially at an area that has as much to offer as the district I represent.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the adjournment of the debate.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Private Member's Day.

MR. W. MARSHALL: -Private Member's Day tomorrow - at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1980 at 3:00 P.M.