

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1960

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) a question, but in her absence I guess I will have to ask the Premier. When people's minds in this Province were focussed on other matters such as the federal election, Sir, and the offshore ownership and so forth, the big oil companies nudged up the price of gasoline in Newfoundland, and it varies apparently from region to region, from anywhere from three to four cents. It seems to me to be rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that the oil companies on the same day, same date, put up their gasoline prices by three to four cents, exactly the same amount. I would like to ask the Premier if he is aware of this—that is apart now from any increase that is proposed by Ottawa, whether it is the former government or the present government—if the Premier is aware of this and if he directed the Department of Consumer Affairs to look into it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I shall consult with the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) this afternoon and ensure that if there are any inappropriate, improper procedures being followed by the companies as it relates to this very important matter that we will get right on top of it and keep the hon. member informed.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his answer, but the hon. gentleman knows that this is a federal matter which falls under the Federal Combines Act and is a practice that has been going on for a good many years, I presume, not only in this Province but probably in other provinces of Canada. I think the provincial government and the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) should take a look at the Federal Combines Act and see if there has been a violation of that act because it is too much of a coincidence and the practice has been allowed to go on for too long, the oil companies putting up their gasoline prices on the same day, same hour, by the same amount and I would like to ask the hon. -

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is being out of order. His question has already been answered. He is out of order because of the fact that he is asking the ministry here a question for which it is not responsible and I refer to Beauchesne, page 130, paragraph 357, sub-paragraph x where it is prohibited to ask questions dealing with an action of a minister for which he is not responsible to parliament or with matters not within his official knowledge. The next one; raise matters under the control of local authorities not responsible to government or to the Legislature. So the question is really out of order despite the fact that it has been answered in substance already. And also the second point is that the hon. member is also making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I would rule that there is a point of order in this particular matter and further to that the hon. member, I believe, was beginning to

MR. SPEAKER:

offer opinion as well at the preamble to his question. If he has a question which he would like to ask and rephrase it in a different manner, I would ask him to direct that question now.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, if

MR. S. NEARY: the provincial government would undertake to do a study in this Province to try to determine why the price of gasoline differs from one part of the Province to another, why there is a difference of almost ten cents a gallon in gasoline, for instance, in Port aux Basques compared to gasoline here on the East Coast? That study was done once before and the Minister of Consumer Affairs - this is provincial, by the way, in case the hon. gentleman does not know - the Minister of Consumer Affairs merely came back and said, 'Well, what they need is self-service stations, they need stiffer competition.' Well, that is not good enough, Sir, and I would like to ask the Premier if he will direct his Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. H. Newhook) to undertake an in-depth study to find out why we cannot have uniform prices of gasoline in this Province and to enforce any regulations in that regard that the Minister of Consumer Affairs provincially may be responsible for?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we will do all in our power to ensure that if there is a difference in prices in different geographic regions of the Province which is not justified, that the appropriate authorities are so notified, and if, in the process of establishing that, it is to be found that laws or regulations under the purview of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador or under this Legislature are in violation, we will ensure that those people who have broken them will be taken to task and that it will not happen again.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. Could he confirm reports that he is likely to be in the near future meeting with representatives of the federal government, including perhaps the Prime Minister? Has he initiated any sort of arrangements for such meetings and can he advise the House if anything specific has been settled?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process right now of communicating with a number of ministers in the federal government, and, in that regard, have been also in communication with our minister in the federal Cabinet, hopefully I will be talking to him over the weekend. And we are in the process, as I say. Nothing has been firmed up for dates yet of a possible meeting, in the first instance to meet with the minister responsible for DREE to try to expedite a number of DREE agreements which were ready for signing and had just about been signed, really, when the federal election came about; and then during the campaign it was felt then by the government of the day that they should not be signed during the campaign. But they are all ready for signing and have passed through all the appropriate agencies and bureaucratic processes of the federal government.

I want to meet early with the Province's representative in the federal Cabinet and with the minister of DREE and we are in the process of also seeing whether we can arrange a meeting with the Prime Minister.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I thank the hon. the Premier for his answer. In connection with what might be described as a First Ministers' meeting, is it the Premier's thought that it would be merely a sort of an initial informal exchange? I have in mind that the prior meeting was based upon a document of subjects for discussion which I believe the Premier laid on the Table of the House, at least it is a public document. I am just curious as to whether or not it is just sort of informal at first or would the Premier prefer, for example, or would he suggest to the Prime Minister that it be on the basis of some kind of formal agenda?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I would like to see it on some kind of formal agenda basis. And on that score we are now updating the presentation that we made to the former government highlighting the major issues which face the Province and obviously face the federal government also in our ongoing relationships. So that updating will be finished in another four or five days, we will then send it to the Prime Minister and to the appropriate ministries, but it will be capsuled for the Prime Minister and it would be those issues that we would want to then address ourselves to when we met with the Prime Minister and would give him sufficient time to have that information before in fact we have the formal meeting.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. D. JAMIESON:

On the very practical point of getting the DREE agreement signed, because I have no doubt that many of them will involve both employment and improvement of services and that type of thing, the package, if you wish, that is in a sense

MR. D. JAMIESON: ready to go ahead, who within the provincial government - is it the hon. the Premier as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs responsible, in other words, the Premier would be directly dealing with DREE on this matter? And is it, for instance, practical to think that it might be feasible to that particular matter off, in a sense -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - to say, look, let us get that signed and get it out of the way so that work can begin in, let us say, the current season.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is what I am trying to do. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting. I do not want to bother the Prime Minister with DREE agreements. I would rather deal directly with the minister responsible for DREE and the minister in the Federal Cabinet, then have them deal with pushing that through so that does not become - There are more major long-term issues with which I would like to speak to the Prime Minister and I am hopeful that in my communications now ongoing with DREE and with the new minister and with the minister in the Federal Cabinet that the four agreements that are there, that everybody agrees on: one, the forestry agreement, which is overdue now and which could be done.

The second one that has gone through the full system is the Coastal Labrador agreement; that is ready and it has gone through the full system and everybody is in agreement. There are two minor ones: just an interim one for NORDCO for a year until they have a five year proposal and package for both governments put before everybody; and a land and mapping one, a very minor one. So there is really only two there, the others are ongoing, have been



PREMIER PECKFORD: when the hon. gentleman was, and he understands those, remembers seeing those before. And even the forestry one is just an ongoing one.

MR. S. NEARY: To the Outer Ring Road in it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Coastal Labrador one is the only new of those four which are priority items to get signed because everybody has agreed to them. Then come a number of new agreements that are presently in the system, or are about to be in the system. The industrial development one, for example, is -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: - a high profile one -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and other like agreements, the transportation agreement, that have to be.

MR. S. NEARY: Outer Ring road, \$35 million.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, there are many, many roads around the Province that -

MR. S. NEARY: Are you (inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: - would have to be done before that could be.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and it relates to the political poll that was paid for by the provincial government, the \$56,000 poll. I wonder if the minister would undertake to table that document in the House so that the members could have a look at it?

MR. S. NEARY: They tabled it in Ontario.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that that would be available to the Public Accounts Committee. I am not sure -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, even if he will not allow me, I will finish answering the question in my own manner. The hon. gentleman for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) does not mind me finishing it.

MR. F. WHITE: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. minister has been asked a question and I think he should be entitled to answer it.

MR. STAGG: Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Who, the minister? Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no problem in the document being tabled. I would certainly assume that the Public Accounts Committee will be asking for it and that is a committee of the House and, as far as I am aware, it can certainly be tabled in the House as well. There is no problem with that. I will undertake to have it tabled. Strictly speaking, it really does not - you know, I do not know why it is me more than anybody else, but I will table it.

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

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, just as a preamble to the supplementary I would say to the minister that the poll obviously would become public next week at the Public Accounts Committee and I thought that the House should undertake to have it tabled first, before it becomes public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: There is certainly no problem in tabling it in the House and I would point out, of course, that tabled in the House, obviously it does become public, and tabled in the Public Accounts Committee that, naturally, is the prerogative of the Committee although most material, as far as I am aware, which has been tabled and discussed in the Public Accounts Committee is public as well. As far as I know, the only in camera meetings they have are those which decide on procedural matters or going through the draft of their report before it is completed, that kind of thing. So, certainly, you know there is no problem there.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (J. Goudie). In light of the latest news release stating that six veterinarians employed by the Provincial Government have resigned their positions effective April 9, would the minister enlighten the House any further on why they resigned?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from five veterinarians, not from six, who have indicated - the date of the letter, by the way, was the tenth of March. They have indicated that unless certain things take place within thirty days, then I am to consider their letter as a letter of resignation.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, could the minister enlighten the House further on what some of things were they would like to see take place between now and April 9th.?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the letter there were two particular issues identified; number one, the hours of work that the veterinarians in the Province have been going through in the last year, and in some cases more than a year, and the amount of remuneration they received for that. So one is a monetary issue. The other one relates to a suspension of one of the six veterinarians which occurred last week.

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

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in view of those resignations, has the department looked at any plans to have new veterinarians recruited or advertising for veterinarians in case a resignation does take place on April 9th.?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I met with these veterinarians about three weeks ago to discuss their problem. As a matter of fact, I was so concerned about their problem I invited them from their various areas of responsibility and discussed the monetary consideration with them. Until that particular meeting there had been no suspension of one of the six veterinarians. However, the process that I put in place after that initial meeting three weeks ago I think is going to resolve the monetary consideration prior to the

MR. J. GOUDIE: effective date of that letter should it become a letter of resignation.

The other matter, the matter of suspending one of the six veterinarians, is now in the arbitration process and I do not know what the outcome of that is going to be.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). In view of the government's pre-occupation with oil and gas activities, and rightly so, and in terms of this government's policy of preferential hiring, what steps have the Department of Education taken to ensure that training programmes are in place to acquaint young Newfoundlanders with the skills needed in the coming years, particularly at the post-secondary level, the College of Trades and Technology, trades schools and the university?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A committee involving representatives of the Education Department, of the three colleges in the Province- the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology and the Bay St. George Community College- as well as representation from the Department of Labour and Manpower has been at work for about a year. During that period they visited training institutions in Alberta, in England, Scotland and Norway. They are finalising recommendations for appropriate responses on the part of our Province's training institutions to prepare our people for jobs generated through offshore activity.

MS. VERGE: In addition to that committee there have recently been established a couple of other committees under OPIC to look at education and training. And I just came from a meeting in Stephenville of representatives of the Education Department which administers the vocational school system and the three colleges, looking at specifically better co-ordination and better preparation to train and educate people to share in jobs generated through offshore exploration and development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, as a preamble, I am quite aware that we have committees being set up everywhere in the education field; however, it is a great way to put things on the back burner to have committees who meet and talk and meet and talk. My question to the minister is what specific monetary proposals has this government made to Ottawa to get finances to pay for training programmes and what has been the response, if indeed there have been any finances asked for?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there are already in place several courses at the College of Fisheries and one or two at the College of Trades and Technology preparing people for offshore related jobs and some of these are funded through the federal government. I can provide specifics of these courses, which are now in place, tomorrow.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, since it is now public knowledge that the Government of Nova Scotia is negotiating with the Federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for a \$38 million subsidiary agreement for research and development aimed

MR. HODDER: at education, has this government taken any steps along those lines?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this government has been negotiating with the federal government for several years for funding through DREE for new facilities for the Fisheries College as part of our polytechnical institute and top priority is continuing to be assigned to the need for new facilities and new programmes at the Fisheries College which includes programmes for job training for offshore oil and gas exploration, development and spinoffs.

MR. FLIGHT: Could I ask a supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Suchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, how she feels about the fact that any young Newfoundlander right now who thinks about wanting to get involved in offshore, that the only courses available in this Province, when one looks at the proliferation of vocational schools all around Newfoundland, is in St. John's. Power engineering, for instance, a much needed course, twenty seats in St. John's. The only available seats that any young Newfoundlander can get to or the only courses he can take must be in St. John's. They must come from all over Newfoundland St. John's. How does the minister feel about that fact of life?

March 13, 1980

Tape No. 350

AH-1

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

MS VERGE: That is the phenomenon that is being evaluated now. However, there are many openings in the vocational schools which are throughout the Province, the sixteen schools throughout the Province, in basic trades courses and there are several courses which are beyond the one year trades level at the Bay St. George Community College in Stephenville. This very question is under active consideration including at the meeting in Stephenville that I just came from.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. HISCOCK: To the Minister of Education

(Ms. Verge): With regard to the grant given to students in this Province instead of the Manpower grant being twenty-five dollars a week, particularly if you have to come from areas outside of St. John's and living in St. John's and the price of rent going up, does the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) have any plans to increase this grant in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that there are any plans to increase the grant. That is one item that is being looked at now as government prepares the total budget for next year.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe). As the minister is no doubt aware, the former minister was articulating a policy of privatization of provincial parks and he was expressing the view that provincial parks, some or all of them, would eventually be turned over to private developers. I am wondering



MR. WHITE: if the new minister proposes to follow that same kind of policy?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, members of my staff are now compiling some statistics and information as it relates to the provincial parks, as it relates to policies that we have now with regards to private parks, as it relates to situations that are occurring around the province with campers and people parking in gravel pits and so. Once all the information has been made available and assessed, I will be making a full statement as to the direction that the department will be taking in that regard.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not really answer my question. What I would like to know is if the government proposes to move within the next few weeks or months in terms of turning over existing provincial parks to private enterprise and whether this could come before the parks open in May?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. DAWE: We will not be making a decision until the results have come back from the information that I mentioned previously. Until that information is collected adequately, compiled adequately and I have a chance to assess it, at that time we will make a decision.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the minister made reference to open areas in the Province such as gravel pits and

March 13, 1980

Tape No. 350

AH-3

MR. WHITE: so on. I am wondering whether or not the government proposed to bring in regulations this year concerning the use of those areas?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. R. DAWES:

A decision in that particular area will again be made after the complete report has been received by the department.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice. A few days we saw a Judge of the Supreme Court, Trial Division, of this Province being placed in the most embarrassing but necessary position of having to apologize to the public of this City and this Province because of the conditions of the court facilities here in St. John's. Could the minister confirm that the facilities are, in fact, as bad as I believe they are, and also what this government plans to do about court facilities in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would not really be able to confirm whether they are as bad or as good as the hon. gentleman believes they are, because that would be a very subjective exercise. No doubt, court facilities in St. John's and in other parts of the Province are in need of improvement and there are many areas within the terms of facilities for which the Department of Justice is responsible in need of improvement, as there are schools and other facilities as well. I will certainly agree that there are courtrooms in need of improvement, and we will do all we can in that direction with the funds available. I may not be very specific, but I do not really know whether I can be more specific than that.

MR. SPEAKER:

A new question, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, this question really could be termed as a supplementary to the one asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) a little earlier. I would like to ask the Premier, with regard to what appears to be price fixing by the oil companies when they do indeed raise their prices within a day of each other, I wonder would the Premier undertake to look into the questions raised by the member

MR. G. FLIGHT: for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)? Would he undertake also to look into the fact that when these increases occur they are applied to the oil already in storage? The major oil companies have storage all around the Province with millions of gallons of oil on which price increases have already been made, and with a new increase, the increase applies to the oil in storage, maybe millions of gallons, resulting in windfall profits by those oil companies. Mr. Speaker, I ask that question as a result of having worked for major oil companies and I know what I am talking about.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt that the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) has a fair amount of expertise and knowledge and experience in the whole question of price fixing as it relates to oil and gas products in this Province. I do not think anybody on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, yea, anybody in Newfoundland, would ever question the ability of the hon. -

MR. G. FLIGHT: Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the member for Windsor - Buchans to have that kind of information to his fingertips. And we will, in our ongoing study that I have already

PREMIER PECKFORD:

indicated we would do, consult with the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to ensure that the information necessary to make a value judgment on the question of oil already in storage when the price increase occurs is ascertained so that when we make our decision it will be based on the best expert advice available.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: In view of the Premier's answer I would like to ask him if he knows who to talk to to get the information he is telling me that he will give the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, can I get this thing down to earth literally and figuratively by asking a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs? During the Autumn session we had an exchange, he and I and I believe some other members, with regard to the ultimate disposal of a number of unused building lots around the Province, and the minister was explaining the complexity of the matter and said that further studies were going to be undertaken. I, of course, have particularly in mind Sunnyside, but I know that there are some others in the same category. Has any progress been made with regard to this? As I understand it, and perhaps the minister can confirm it, the lots are actually getting to be more expensive by the day because of interest rates and the like and yet the demand for them is such that the prices are not going to be realizable?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which we have been looking at very closely over the last number of months, as the hon. gentleman well knows.

AN HON. MEMBER: Years.

MR. WINDSOR: Perhaps.

A number of areas, as he said, a number of areas are actually starting to sell, believe it or not, some areas around the Province. Nevertheless, the interest is still adding on to the price of lots in other areas such as Sunnyside, which are not being sold. I cannot give the hon. gentleman a definitive answer at the moment. As he is, I am sure, well aware, it is a fairly major budgetary decision that we are now looking at in the budgetary process and hopefully he will be a little more enlightened in a few weeks time when my colleague brings down his budget.

MR. SPEAKER: There is just have time for a final brief question.

MR. JAMIESON: Yes, a very brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the minister correctly that it is possible that it will be involved in the budget, or will it be adjacent to or simply when the government finally gets the budgetary figures together? Will it be a separate announcement? Is that the expectation if something is going to be done?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say. Yes, I think it would be a separate announcement but obviously any announcement that could be made would be based on the budget and would be reflected therein, so both would be accurate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired. I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming to the gallery today Mayor Boyd Noel, Councillor Winston Johnston, Town Manager Wes Biles, from the town of St. Anthony.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the relevant acts I have pleasure in tabling the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation Annual Report, 1979, and the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Annual Report for the same year.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will drink to that.

DR. COLLINS: A very popular tabling I would say, Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burin -  
Placentia West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure  
that I rise to present a petition from the ninety-one voters of  
the Town of Rock Harbour in Placentia Bay.

The prayer of the petition is  
as follows, "We, the undersigned residents of Rock Harbour, do  
hereby petition the provincial government to pave the road from  
Spanish Room to Rock Harbour."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT: "Because of both terrain and  
elevation this section of road is very hazardous during the Winter  
months, causing great inconvenience to all, to all the school  
children who have to be bused, workers and other residents.  
We are confident that Mr. Lloyd Banfield, Superintendent of the  
Department of Transportation and Communications at Salt Pond,  
would agree that this is the most troublesome short section of  
gravel highway in his whole district."

Mr. Speaker, in connection  
with this petition and with your indulgence I would like to point  
out that Rock Harbour is a coastal community on the Eastern  
entrance of Mortier Bay and was a fishing community but now  
in reality is a dormitory town for the Mortier Bay area and  
the residents there now work in the shipyard, in the fish plant,  
they have to come over this very short section of road for  
all educational and recreational and medical services and it  
is a stretch which is less than two miles. And why I say it is  
particularly troublesome in the Winter months is because  
of the large mountain they have to go over to get down in  
their community and with the gravel road and so close to the  
seashore and the frost every mild day comes up and just builds  
up ice on ice.



MR. D. HOLLETT: There have been hundreds and hundreds of school days lost and <sup>man</sup> work days lost and several near tragedies there.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few brief remarks I ask that this petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it is related. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, having represented federally that part of the Burin Peninsula for many years, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition. I know that section of road very, very well and everything that the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. D. Hollett) has said about it is correct. It is only a comparative short stretch, less than two miles and because for all of the reasons the member has outlined I think it would be not only, by the way, an accommodation to the people and eliminate a hazard to do it, but I suspect that over a matter of two or three years the thing would probably pay for itself in the sense of the amount of added maintenance and the like that has to be carried on while it is in its present conditions. So I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order 1, Address in Reply.

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. J. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, the first thing

I think I would like to do in my few remarks is to offer my congratulations, along with similar sentiments expressed by many members of the House on both sides, to the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N. Doyle) and to the seconder, the gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. D. Stewart). I remember in 1975, I guess the Fall, having had the same honour that the gentleman from Harbour Main - Bell Island had and I think he did it with much more confidence and much more conviction than I did in 1975.

I want to keep my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, basically addressed to a particular publication which I released officially, shall we say, at the Labrador in the Eighty's Conference which was held in Northwest River the latter part of last week and last weekend and I would ask the Pages when they get the time after these documents they have now circulated, if they would - I am not going to table this particular one, but I will when I am finished - but the other ones perhaps can be distributed to hon. members so that they can have a look at the document as well.

It is a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labrador. It gives a rundown, recommendation by recommendation, what the recommendations are that came out of that Royal Commission in the early 1970's and it give an indication of the action taken by the provincial government

MR. J. GOUDIE: in matters that relate to the government in the Province. It also deals from a federal government level with some action which has been taken by the federal government and also by other agencies identified in this Royal Commission Report. The status report was prepared as an internal document by the Planning and Priorities Secretariat of Executive Council in June, 1978. At that time, of the 287 recommendations, the Province had taken action on 179, non-government agencies and/or the federal government had acted on 26, and 31 of the recommendations had not required any action at all. Only 41 - or 18 per cent - had not been implemented because they were not feasible, were contrary to government policy or were too costly for existing financial resources.

There have been many statements made, I think, since the Royal Commission presented its report to government, many statements made by various members of the public about the lack of attention being paid to the recommendations contained in that particular report, the lack of action on the part of federal government, provincial government and other agencies. But I think when hon. members go through this particular document, they will see that many of the recommendations have been met in a very real way, not only by the provincial government, but by the other groups concerned as well.

I think also when they peruse this particular document that they will see that some of the action taken would fall into almost a 'gray area', if I may use that term, and perhaps the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock) and the hon. the member for Tornqat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) would want to peruse this report themselves to see how they react to it and to the action taken. But I did want to give an indication that action has been taken in a very real way on many of the recommendations that were made by that Royal Commission.

I think perhaps what I could do is just select a few of the recommendations and give an indication of the way in which they have been dealt with.

MR. J. GOUDIE:

Number 159, for instance, 'The

Commission recommends that the Province through the Department of Rural Development initiate commercial utilization of the forest potential of the Kaipokok area, based initially on supplying lumber, power poles and wharf timber for development in Northern Labrador.' This issue relates particularly to the Department of Lands and Forests, as it is now called, and I understand that they are more than willing to co-operate with any efforts that people may want to put into place there.

'The Department of Rural Development encourage local sawmill operators to expand their activities in various areas.' And that is, I think, one of the most successful programmes, although it has only been in existence for a couple of years, that my department has been involved in in terms of the assistance provided to sawmill operators, and the payments made in return by the various operators in the Province has been the special Sawmill Assistance Programme. We have also assisted sawmill operators and owners in the Province in a very real way in terms of providing capital funding, or at least partial capital funding in some cases, as well. So we have taken action in that particular field.

Let us have a look at something else.

'The Commission recommends that the Province take the initiative in establishing a Planning and Advisory Committee for the purposes of creating an exploratory and development programme for the Labrador fishery and facilitating liaison between different agencies and fishermen and of advising on jurisdictional responsibilities.' We point out in the response to that particular recommendation and to other recommendations earlier on in the report, that a group known as the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, the LRAC, was established in January, 1976. They receive funding from the provincial government through my department and are playing a very key role in advising government and other groups about how the people of Labrador feel about the way resource development is either going or not going in the Northern part of our Province. I think the Premier might be able to

MR. J. GOUDIE: confirm this, when he was involved in developing the offshore oil and gas regulations, I believe they are called, the LRAC played a very key role in some of the regulations which were almost printed word for word, I think, in some cases.

So we consider that support that we offer to this group in Labrador to be money well spent and to be also an expression of very real concern on the part of the provincial government towards the aspirations, the concerns and the fears in some cases of the residents of Labrador.

I realize that hon. members in some cases may take exception to some of the things that LRAC might state publicly or some of the actions they take.

MR. G. WARREN: Do you mean me?

MR. J. GOUDIE: No, I was not suggesting that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) fell within that category. But I was just recalling that a few days ago when I spoke on, I think it was the hon. member's resolution a week ago yesterday, that one gentleman from Grand Bank, I think, was upset about something that had happened during the sitting of the Flag Committee involving the LRAC so obviously not everyone feels as positively about LRAC as I do and some other hon. members of the House do. But in any event, each hon. member - the reports have been passed out - each hon. member will have an opportunity to go through this progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labrador, can evaluate it for their own purposes and obviously make pertinent comments based on this document that has been tabled today.

Some of the remaining, forty-one, I think, recommendations we identified which have not been implemented are in some cases very costly to implement and some of them relate to the agreements referred to during Question Period today by the hon. the Premier in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson). One of them, for instance, would interest the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and probably other members of the House, and it deals with the upgrading and/or paving of the fifty mile stretch of road to the Strait of Belle Isle, a project which is - the road itself is sadly in need of some very large amounts of money for repair work to be carried out on that particular stretch of road and something which is badly, I think. So some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission fall within that category and many of them

MR. J. GOUDIE: are being dealt with right now, they have not been resolved yet. So it is an ongoing process on the part of the Provincial Government. I just wanted to draw that to hon. members' attention today.

Also I guess, to offer a couple of more remarks, Mr. Speaker, on the Address in Reply, it is a opportunity for members of the House to have a few comments on their districts, some of the problems that exist there and some of the hopes and aspirations they might have for their respective districts, I have pointed out before and I guess it would not hurt to point it out again that the district of Naskaupi, particularly the Eastern end of that district, Happy Valley - Goose Bay - Northwest River - Mud Lake, has probably been harder hit in terms of economics in the last four or five years than most districts in the Province, I think, I may be a little biased in this, to go through it again we have lost the presence of the American forces in Labrador. There are ten American forces personnel left in Goose Bay; the Gull Island Power Development unfortunately did not go ahead when it was supposed to go ahead, and I am sure a lot of hon. members have varying opinions to offer on that. The Labrador Linerboard mill was closed down which cut out 655 jobs directly and as a result, since I was elected in 1975, we have lost about half of the population of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. The only other community in my district, the community of Churchill Falls, is well off in terms of stable employment and other benefits. It is a company town, or at least identified as a company town although there are some problems there. One of the positive things that has happened there, I think, in the last couple of years is that a Citizen's Advisory Committee has been elected from the community, not appointed by the company but elected by the members of the community to advise the company on some problems they have

MR. J. GOUDIE: and to work towards some mutual solutions. So economics is a primary concern and the whole future based on economics of the largest part of my district is a very serious and real concern at this point in time.

And I think, just one closing comment before I take my seat, is that there has been discussion during this Throne Speech debate and on other occasions about the need for control of one's resources and ownership of one's resources. And I guess perhaps one of the glaring examples again which has been pointed out so many times before, but perhaps we should remind ourselves about it, is the



MR. GOUDIE: development of Churchill Falls itself and the lack of real ownership, or real control that this Province had over that particular project, and I think we are all aware of the situation that has developed as a result of not having full control and full ownership of one's very real resource in this Province. I do not think that we should be allowed to make that mistake again and I commend the Premier, obviously, for his stand on the offshore oil and gas potential and the stand he has taken in relation to its ownership, and I fully support him on it.

I just wanted to offer these few remarks during this opportunity for debate on the Throne Speech, and to -

MR. BRETT: You have a while longer yet.

MR. GOUDIE: Oh! I am told that I have a few more minutes to speak so let us see what we can do with it.

MR. NEARY: You will not have anything to say (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: Well, perhaps I could offer a comment on the conference, Labrador in the '80s, which was held in North West River the latter part of -

MR. NEARY: Talk about the land freeze (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: The land freeze? Okay.

MR. NEARY: Is the land freeze going to be lifted? Is the hon. gentleman going to ease the pressure for land grabbers and speculators?

MR. GOUDIE: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is not going to yield to the pressure to lift the land freeze. As I indicated on other occasions, there is a very real concern. It is highlighted, I guess, on the Avalon Peninsula area of the Province right now because of the potential for offshore resources or the development of our offshore resources. Many farmers on this part of the Province have been asking the question, Is the Province going to remain committed to the agricultural industry, and is the Province going to insist that the land freeze stay on to discourage these speculators?

I have had the occasion to meet with I do not know how many delegations now of farmers, of people involved in the dairy industry, of all aspects of the agricultural industry and in one case, one particular gentleman came into my office with the developer with him, just the two of them, and one said, 'Look, if I sell my land to a farmer I may get \$700 or \$800 per acre for the thirty or forty acres that I have here. However, this gentleman here sitting next to me is a developer and right now, if you say so, right now at this particular minute he will offer me \$30,000 an acre for that land.'

Well, that is all well and good if the only intent of this whole thing is to make sure that the farmers get a high price for their land. That is not the intent. We have five to six per cent of arable soil in this Province and it is not prime agricultural land, arable soil. Very little of it, as a matter of fact, is considered by national standards to be number one prime land.

MR. STAGG: All that is on the West coast?

MR. GOUDIE: A lot of it is on the West Coast, yes.

MR. NEARY: When the government starts to get the pressure from the big moneybags from the mainland, and the land grabbers and speculators, who are in here now, coming down in their jets and so forth, is the government going to cave in and lift the freeze and allow these fellows to go in and buy that land?

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no feeling that I know of anywhere in government which would allow us to give in to these - I have forgotten the term the hon. gentleman used.

MR. NEARY: Land grabbers.

MR. GOUDIE: The people with the money.

MR. NEARY: Speculators, moneybags from Upper Canada.

MR. GOUDIE: Land grabbers, speculators, whatever you want. Okay. There is no intent. What I was about to say is, that since we have such a small base of our total land in this Province on which to produce crops, then we think, if there is going to be any self-sufficiency in this Province at all, then the only way to do it is to retain that land for agricultural purposes and offer assistance programmes to people either in the business now or who want to get into the business.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well, it is good to hear the minister say that, but what happens when the pressure starts to come on and the politicians up in Ottawa and the Senators and his colleagues start to come and the pressure goes on the Premier and the money people come in and start using their influence?

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please!

The hon. minister  
has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. GOUDIE: I do not mind the  
questions, Mr. Speaker, that is fine.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate that.

MR. GOUDIE: There is no - I will  
say it again, there is no intention on the part of  
government to give in. The pressure is on now. It is  
not when it is going to come, it is here right now; it  
has been here ever since I have been a minister, eight  
or nine months ago and I do not know how long before  
that. But the pressure is here. We have not given in.  
There is no intention to give in, certainly not on my  
part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Our objective in  
terms of government's priorities for the future, is to  
encourage the agricultural industry to remain alive,  
to carry on, to become a viable operation and to allow  
this Province to become self-sufficient. That is  
probably an ideal goal. I do not know if we will ever  
become self-sufficient, but that is

MR. GOUDIE: the objective we have from the agricultural department's point of view, and that is the one we intend to stick to regardless of whatever pressures come on.

MR. NEARY: A pretty noble thought, I can tell you that now.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, maybe it is a noble thought but it is an objective with which we are working and I think an objective to which we should continue to work regardless of what financial pressures come on from either the federal government or any other developers.

MR. NEARY: In the meantime, we also have to try to provide building lots for young couples who are getting married and want to build a house, want to own a house. We have to look after them. Some kind of a freeze should be put on the cost of real estate and so forth because it is going sky high right now with these speculators around.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, the cost of real estate, Mr. Speaker, falls outside of my responsibilities and someone else - the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor), and perhaps the Lands and Forest Minister (Mr. Morgan) would have some comment to make on that.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will talk to them about that.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, I referred to the five or six per cent of land in this Province which is suitable for agricultural purposes, which leaves ninety-five, ninety-six per cent suitable for other developments to take place, not the least of which would be housing developments, industrial developments and commercial developments and so on. So there is lots of room to grow. The only problem we have right now on the Avalon Peninsula area is that there are large parcels of lands - seventy acres, thirty acres, twenty acres - owned by people who are in the agricultural industry and in many cases who have reached what is recognized today, or referred to today as the retirement age of

MR. GOUDIE: sixty-five, sixty-five years of age, as the gentleman indicated last night on the television show is a difficult age at which to continue actively farming and doing the heavy work that is involved in the business, and no one else in his family is there to carry on, he needs some kind of a retirement fund, and we in the agricultural department have been addressing that for several months and are now in a position to make certain recommendations, to offer certain alternatives to government collectively and it is something on which we are going to make a decision in the next month or two, I would think, the objective being to retain that agricultural land, particularly the land which has been cleared and used in the past for agricultural purposes, to retain it either under the present ownership or offer that owner of the land a real financial package, a package on which he can remain at least comfortable for his remaining years, and hold that land then within the agricultural zones which are established in some areas. And over the next two years we will have completed our soil analysis programme and land classification programme, the intent being to hold in perpetuity, for the lack of a better term, land which is suitable for agriculture, keep it there for agricultural purposes. That basically is what we are working towards in the -

MR. NEARY: That is the big weakness in the land situation (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: - in the department. Yes. But there is no intent, to reassure the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), of giving in to pressure and giving in to money and letting it all disappear.

MR. NEARY: I am all for that.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Sir, let me offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) who moved the Address in Reply, and the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) in seconding the motion. I think each of them on opening day spoke eloquently, Sir, and with sincerity about issues in the Province and in their districts as they see them.

I also wish to, publicly, although I have done so privately, to pass on my congratulations to the newly elected member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), and wish him every success in his efforts on behalf of his constituents. I want to say too that I enjoyed the hon. member's maiden speech to this Assembly only a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been I guess about a week or a week and a half since the Speech from the Throne was delivered and I have pursued this particular Speech from the Throne like I have pursued probably no other Speech from the Throne delivered in the five years that I have been here.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I suppose that if I wished I could criticize it chapter and verse but I am not prepared to go into that at the moment. I would say, however, though with a number of the principles, the broad general principles of philosophy that are contained in the Speech from the Throne, I would certainly have some difficulty in criticizing those. I speak today, Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian and as a Newfoundlander. I want to say from the beginning that I am proud to be a Canadian. I can think of no other country that I would rather be part of than the great Dominion of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: There seems to be some doubt expressed about that in the last number of days in certain speeches in this House and I say it is a privilege, it is certainly a privilege for me to be part of the Canadian family. But, Sir, a family often has its disagreements and members of a family often disagree with the head of that family. There is nothing new or unusual about that.

And so I find myself today, as a Newfoundlander, in disagreement in certain cases, with policy and politics as represented by certain forces in the Canadian Newfoundland family. It was only a week or so ago that our newly elected Prime Minister greeted us with that now famous quote, "Well, welcome to the eighties." And it might have been that that stirred my blood. It might have been that quote that got me excited as I watched him that night because I believe as one member of this Assembly, that it is absolutely vital that Newfoundland step into the eighties resolved to control its destiny within Confederation, not outside of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I believe that it is absolutely vital that we be determined to reverse our economic dependency on



MR. T. RIDEOUT: the rest of Canada and I believe it is absolutely vital that we be committed to becoming masters in our own house.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: To me, Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable, and I believe it would be criminal, if the eighties were to pass without our achieving those ends.

And that brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the crux of this Throne Speech. Our fishery is vital. We have heard great speeches in this legislature over the years about the fishery. The hydro developments and potential hydro developments are vital there is no doubt about that. But if we are to achieve economic independence, if we are to become full-fledged members of this Canadian Confederation as I believe we must, if we are to prosper and develop as we ourselves wish to, if we are to advance from being hewers of wood and drawers of water, then we have to take our stand now.

Down the road it might be possible to say - none of us have that, you know, hindsight is a great thing, we cannot project it now-but down the road it might be possible to say that fate has been kind to Newfoundland. We have never been noted for insisting, in my opinion, on maximum benefits for our resources, and I do not say that to be critical of past deeds, but I hope we can learn from past mistakes and I have no doubt that they were mistakes of the heart. I am not being critical whatsoever.

The fishery was for years, Mr. Speaker, scorned on in this Province. Now again it has finally come in to its own and is coming more and more into its own each year. But we must be careful to ensure that we derive maximum benefits from the fishery. Our hydro potential, at least at this

MR. T. RIDEOUT: point in time, has provided short-term construction jobs and nothing else.

We have attracted industries to this Province that in some cases take more out of the economy than they put back into it. But, Mr. Speaker, I said a few minutes ago that fate may be kind to Newfoundland because I believe firmly that we have another chance. We probably have many chances, but the most immediate chance lies in the benefits that could accrue to this Province from off-shore resources, oil and gas. If we are to take maximum advantage of that chance, if we are to derive maximum economic return from that resource that lies off our shores and I do not think there is any doubt anymore that it is there - I believe that it is absolutely essential,

MR. RIDEOUT: I believe that it is vital that we as a Province have absolute ownership and control over it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, ownership of that resource must be vested in this Province. How else can we ensure maximum economic returns? How else can we control the right of development? How else can we ensure maximum job opportunities for our people at a time when we have the highest unemployment rate in the country? If we do not own it, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if we do not own it, we do not control it and if we do not control it we become second fiddlers in our own backyards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Right on! That is our position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be a constitutional expert. I do not profess to be a constitutional expert whatsoever but I have come to the conclusion that if the political will exists there is no problem for the Government of Canada to recognize Newfoundland's ownership to our offshore resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I went home this weekend with a stack of documents and spent all weekend studying them, everything I could get my hands on relative to offshore ownership and jurisdiction and control and whatever else you want to talk about in that regard. I did so because I am concerned. I am concerned that we as Newfoundlanders may be denied our most promising chance to take control of our own destiny. I have concluded, as have many, many people in this Province, that Newfoundland has an excellent and unique legal case when it comes to the offshore resources, I do not think there is any doubt about that, but I do not believe that we as a Province ought to have to proceed to fight the legal battle. The Geneva Convention in 1958 recognized that coastal states own undersea resources to the edge of the Continental Shelf or as far as may be exploitable.

MR. RIDEOUT: Canada is the coastal state in this particular case. There is no doubt about that. However, Newfoundland itself was a coastal state until 1949 and Term 37 of the Terms of Union, as I understand it, expressly states that we did not transfer our offshore ownership to Canada when we joined Confederation. Now that is the legal argument. But why, I ask, should such an argument be necessary? There is no reason in my opinion why the Government of Canada cannot enter into an agreement with Newfoundland saying that "we will not contest your ownership to those resources. We believe they are yours," they can say, "and you can have them." Now if the government of some other province wish to contest that, which I frankly find inconceivable, or if the oil companies wish to contest it, which I again frankly find inconceivable, then, you know, we will let the chips fall where they may when that time comes. I believe that the Government of Canada can recognize our ownership. I am of the opinion that there is already ample precedent in the Canadian Confederation for such action. There was some reference made in this House a few days ago about the establishment of the three Western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They were carved out off Rupert's Land, I believe, in 1905. Now at that time in 1905 when those provinces were set up, Mr. Speaker, neither of those three provinces were given ownership to any of their resources. The ownership of those resources continued to be vested in Canada in the right of the Crown. None of those three provinces were given ownership in 1905 when the provinces were set up. But then, of course, as a result of that those provinces were in a financial strait jacket. They could not tax their resources, they could not derive any income whatsoever from their resources and it got to the point, as my research tells me, that the Province of Manitoba was practically bankrupt and they

MR. T. RIDEOUT: had to go to the Government of Canada and say to them, 'Look, unless we get ownership of our resources then we have had the biscuit, we might as well throw it in.' Therefore, in 1930, there was an amendment made to the British North America Act transferring the ownership from the Government of Canada to the governments of the three provinces concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, how was that done? It was not done with the unanimous consent of all the other provinces, it was done by enabling legislation passed through the three Legislatures in question and the same legislation passed through the House of Commons in Ottawa, and then those four governments, the three provincial governments and the federal government, made an appeal to the British House of Commons to have the British North America Act changed. That is how it was done. There was no great unanimity across the country. I do not know if provinces objected to it at that time or if they did not, but that is how it was done. And I say it can be done that way again if the political will exists in having it done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Come over here! Come on over!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there would be no Heritage Fund in Alberta today if that constitutional change had not taken place. The Heritage Fund would be in Ottawa, it would not be in Alberta. And one final point on that, Mr. Speaker, that change was carried out by a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The hon. Ernest LaPointe, I believe, was the man who sponsored the legislation through the House of Commons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is where I have to, in conscience, part views with the Liberal Government of Canada. Mr. Trudeau says that even if he wished, he could not give us ownership of the offshore, and I say in view of the case I just quoted that that is nonsense. I am no expert stacked up against him in those kinds of matters, but I firmly believe that that is nonsense.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Trudeau says we can have 100 per cent of the revenue from any offshore development until we become a 'have' province. I say that is very nice, but I say we also want ownership of that resource. It is ours. We can agree not to disagree on that. Surely, two governments can agree to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

We want to own it, Mr. Speaker. We want to control it. It is our birthright, it is our resource, and anything less than that I cannot accept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The ownership of offshore oil and gas, I believe is fundamental to this Province's ability to control the rate and type of development and to maximize the economic return from the resource to the people of the Province. The fact is that if we do not own the resource, we cannot control it on our terms. Without ownership, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will not be in a position to enforce the Newfoundland and Labrador petroleum regulations that were drawn up in 1977, regulations which permit this Province to decide when, where, to whom and under what conditions exploration and production rights should be granted, and I think that is vital.

In essence then, Mr. Speaker, without ownership, Newfoundland will be in the difficult position whereby the greatest economic development to take place in the history of this Province will be undertaken without a substantial provincial involvement or control. I say that because this Province would be defenceless in the face of a commercial oil and gas discovery if our regulations could not be enforced. And I say that for a number of reasons. The companies and their contractors must give preference to local qualified labour, to local creative goods and services as well as preference to local firms, organizations and companies. The companies must spend a certain amount of money every year on education, training, research and development. Also, the development of even a single offshore oil field will involve the investment of up to several billion dollars and would have a massive impact on this Province. All

MR. RIDEOUT: such developments must be controlled, the benefits maximized and the negative impacts minimized. Thus, a development plan must be submitted to and approved by the government of the Province before any development can take place. When a development plan is approved and the oil companies have earned two and-a-half times, I believe the regulations say, the cost of development of the well, the Province has a right to obtain a 40 per cent interest in that well and all the rights to sit on the operating committee which oversees the development of the well.

This committee has the responsibility for amending contracts on behalf of the group and thus the Newfoundland Government's representative would be in a position to ensure that local labour, goods and services are used to the maximum extent possible.

In order to ensure that offshore developments do not take place at too fast a rate, given the Province's social and economic lifestyle, the oil and gas regulations have a provision limiting the number of oil and gas discoveries under development and in production at any one time on the first round permits, and secondly, a public hearing process must be entered into in order to ascertain whether the issuance of more permits would be in the interest of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, these are some of the most important measures which this Province will not be in a position to take if we do not have the ownership of those resources. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is that this Province will not be in a position to enforce any regulations or measures

MR. RIDEOUT: relating to oil and gas if we do not have the ownership. We will be solely dependent on federal regulations which in no way reflect the social and economic objectives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Thus if the federal government persist in their claim, Newfoundland could then be deprived of the levers with which to create revenue and stimulate industrial growth and progress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say what I intend to say carefully. Because, Mr. Speaker, if that process or position that I have just outlined, if that is confrontation then I say sobeit, let it be confrontation. This Province, I would remind members of this House, was to a large degree built and has indeed developed and grown on the process of confrontation. There was confrontation right from the beginning in Newfoundland and Labrador with the English fish merchants with regard to settlement. There was confrontation with the Fishing Admirals. There was confrontation with the French around the French shore of this Province, my part of the coast. So, you know, confrontation is nothing new to us here in Newfoundland and Labrador, we have always, all throughout our history, had to confront somebody or someone, sometime, somewhere. So I am not really concerned or scared about confrontation. Now that is not to say, Mr. Speaker, let me make this abundantly clear, that is not to say that we should not first try the friendly approach.

MR. JAMIESON: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I suspect the Premier will meet with the new Prime Minister, and I believe he said something about it to my friend, the Leader of the



MR. RIDEOUT: Opposition (Mr. Jamieson)  
earlier today, I suspect the Premier will meet with the  
new Prime Minister very soon on this issue. Maybe he  
has already talked with him, I do not know.

MR. JAMIESON: Without the boxing  
gloves.

MR. RIDEOUT: I suggest that when  
they meet the Premier should ask Mr. Trudeau whether  
or not he is prepared to proceed along the lines of the  
agreement reached earlier between our Premier and  
Mr. Clark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the first  
question that should be asked. There is an exchange of  
letters, I believe, between the former Prime Minister  
and the Premier so they are there, they can be looked  
at. And that, as I understand the position, is complete  
ownership, jurisdiction and control of offshore

MR. T. RIDEOUT: resources to be vested in this Province. Now obviously the mechanical details, there will be constitutional details, environmental details, industry, trade and commerce regulations, the whole gamut - obviously the mechanical details would have to be worked out and many factors considered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once that question has been asked, if the answer is yes, fine, that is it. We can proceed and the strategy that was developed between our Premier and the former Prime Minister can continue. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the answer to that question is no, then I say the gloves should come off right there and then. And I will support that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I will support that, Mr. Speaker, if it comes to that. If there has to be confrontation at that stage of the game, - try the friendly approach first - but if there has to be confrontation at that stage of the game, then I say let us have at it.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes are too high and we must not compromise on this ownership issue. We can not afford to. Now I do not pretend to be speaking for my colleagues when I say those things; some of them, I know, agree with me, some of them may not. I may not see eye to eye with everybody, but that is how I feel about it and again I do not mind that kind of confrontation if it has to come about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak your piece.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Thomas Jefferson, a wise political war horse, Mr. Speaker, once said that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing. Well, I say that when it comes to this ownership -

MR. S. NEASEY: We are not Tories, we are a Liberal Party.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: - question, Mr. Speaker, the rebellion as far as I am concerned is on. I believe that we, as a party, must fundamentally shift our policy on offshore ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, that may well mean disagreeing in a fundamental way with our brethren in Ottawa -

MR. JAMIESON: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: -But the interests of Newfoundland dictates that we do nothing less.

MR. S. NEARY: It would not be our first time.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I would not suggest, as some people have in this House, I would not suggest that any members who have spoken in this debate so far are any less of a Newfoundlander than I am, I would not suggest that. But I say let us stand up for Newfoundland on this critical issue and I say, too, that in conscience I can take no other stand, whether everybody agrees with me or whether everybody disagrees with me, to me is immaterial. I believe this issue to be so vital, to be so much in the interest of Newfoundland that I am prepared to take my stand on it. And if that means disagreeing with political colleagues here or in Ottawa, then I say sobeit. If it means political trouble for me in my own district, then I say sobeit. If it means being scorned on and harassed by those who disagree with me - tough - sobeit, because the ownership, control and jurisdiction of our offshore resources can mean the economic revival of this Province. It will be a revolution that will mean, untold prosperity for our people. And if we have to fight to ensure that, I do not mean with guns or whatever, but verbal battles, then I am prepared to join in that fight.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: If it should mean fighting alone, as I do not think it will, but if it should then I will stand alone.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: And if it means differences with political friends and colleagues in my party or the party in Ottawa, then even then I will fight. I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to carry that fight to every corner of my district and explain it to every person in my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I am prepared to fight this issue in every part of this Province if we have to. And I am prepared to stand before any brother or sister Canadian in any part of this country and defend our position. And even, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis if I should fail, then I shall accept failure

MR. RIDEOUT: believing and knowing that I did right. For in the end, each one of us must march to the tune of his own drummer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I did have some perfunctory remarks as related to congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) and my colleague who has taken over my duties as Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe), but in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, I am so humbled by what has just taken place on the other side of the House, I am so humbled because it renews in me and maybe in the people of Newfoundland a simple fact, that people do stand up for their principles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: You know, there may be a lot of 'hear, hears' from the other side of the House, but I am the first member of this government who has stood up to speak in this Throne Speech debate who does not have to refute what was said before him by a member of the Opposition, that I do not have to stand up and say that the member of the Opposition who just spoke preceding me was wrong, that his fundamental belief as to how Newfoundland must develop, as to the fundamental belief, the basic philosophical principle of who owns our resources, that I do not have to get up and refute that.

The member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who just spoke, who says, in fact, that the ownership of that resource off our shoreline is ours, it is not to be shared, it is not to be given away, but it is ours, and my children's and the

MR. C. POWER: children of all the persons in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I can imagine what the member from Baie Verte - White Bay has gone through. The fact that he, as a member of a party, as a member of a caucus in conjunction with a federal party that is in power in Ottawa, which has a certain amount of control and maybe almost all of the control in their minds in Canada, that this member has stood up and taken a directly opposite position to what his party has been saying, both provincially and federally - directly, absolutely, unequivocally opposite to what they are saying!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow there will be certain persons in this House, and certain persons in this Province, who will not begin to fathom what has taken place today.

The press gallery, who were, for the most part absent, do not probably begin to appreciate what it takes for a member of caucus to stand up and go against his party's position -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: - but he did it on a matter of principle, a matter of belief.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: The fact that the member for Baie Verte - White Bay spoke as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, born in the same time in history as I was born, just before Confederation, who believes and fully appreciates what Canada can do and what it means for us, in the world community, to be part of a country as glorious, with as good a background and with the potential future that Canada has, but who believes that the bottom line has got to be



MR. C. POWER: 1400s when John Cabot and his people came and it was confrontation. You know, it is not so bad sometimes, I have been in a lot of confrontations in my political days and before that. But it is not so bad, Mr. Speaker, to be involved in confrontation. What is bad is for us as a Province to have always been historically involved in confrontations that we lost, confrontations where we gave away so much from Labrador, on which my good colleague spoke before, who knows so much for a feeling of Labrador where so much has been given away, where we know as Newfoundlanders, who live on my shore and who live in Labrador, and on all parts of the coastline and the cities of Newfoundland, who know that our life today is so difficult that we cannot do the things we would like to do in education, we cannot do the things we would like to do in hospital care, we cannot do the things we would like to do to develop our forests and our tourist resources, we cannot do it because we have lost so many of those confrontations. So often when the bottom line came down after a confrontation it was Newfoundland lost, Newfoundland give away, Newfoundland has got to go to somebody else to get its just rewards.

You know, I remember the good member for Kilbride, who preceded the member for Kilbride now, Mr. Wells when he was in this House, standing down there and giving an analogy of what the federal system means to Newfoundland, and he says, "Newfoundland is like a person who is drowning, and the federal government lifts you out of the water. They hold you up, they will not let you drown. Neither will they take you out of the water and let you stand on solid ground." And that to a large degree, Mr. Speaker, is what we are doing now. With our offshore oil and gas we are trying to find for the first time in Newfoundland's history that we will be on solid ground, that we will be the masters of our own destiny. It might be a cliché, but it is a cliché which goes to the hearts and souls of every Newfoundlander, the fact that we



MR. POWER: have to be, as Newfoundlanders, persons who can control where we go, when we go there and how we go about it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is almost led to believe sometimes in the Canadian scene - and I look at editorials of today in the paper where the former premier of Nova Scotia says that we should not be selfish, we should not be looking for jobs for Newfoundlanders first, that fact that we should be giving more to Canada. You would almost begin to believe that there are certain persons who have accepted, in their own minds, the fact that the only reason we want oil and gas in Newfoundland is to build up a Heritage Fund. Mr. Speaker, we do not want money for the sake of money. We want money so we can do the things that Newfoundlanders so badly need and so badly deserve. You know, this might sound as a little bit of an exaggeration but, to a large degree, since 1949 Newfoundland has been on a welfare system between here and Ottawa. We receive the benefits of Old Age Security, we receive the benefits of Unemployment Insurance, we receive the benefits of baby bonus, we receive so much in the form of little gifts that they give us to keep us alive, to keep us from drowning, so to speak, but what we are saying now, Mr. Speaker, is that we want more than that. We want as Newfoundlanders - and it is funny, you know, that sometimes, Mr. Speaker, that the most sincere motives of persons are the ones which are most oftenly misconstrued, the fact that we now in the Canadian community may be perceived by certain persons like the former premier of Nova Scotia as being selfish people, as people who are trying to grab all while the going is good. You know, the opposite is just the truth, that we, after 25 or 30 years of Confederation, want to finally give back to Canada what we know that Canada deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, we do not want, as a community in Newfoundland, we do not want to take more from the Canadian community at large. We want to be able to say to Canada, look, now that we have money in Newfoundland, now that we have paid our own way and are paying it and paying our debts, that maybe we would like to say, look, maybe

MR. POWER: there is a problem in Cape Breton Island with the forest industry. Maybe they want to develop an industry in Northern Ontario. Maybe we could lend something to the Canadian economy in that sense. Maybe by taking less Unemployment Insurance benefits out of Quebec and British Columbia and Ontario maybe we can give a little tiny bit back. We are not being selfish in Newfoundland. All we are saying is, "look, you let us stand on our own two feet. Let us as one Province of a Canadian country show you how good we can really be. Do not always assume the worst. Do not always assume that we are on the take for more little social welfare benefits. Just give us the benefit of the doubt just once. Let us take control of the offshore resources. Let us prove to the people of Newfoundland and to Canada what good citizens of Canada we can really be." Just the opposite to the member's remarks from, I guess, Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight)

MR. C. POWER:

the other day, who says that our claim for offshore oil and gas is some kind of seditious plot that has been lurking in the minds of all Tories since 1949. Now, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, when I was born in 1948 whether I was able to formulate that plan in 1949 or not. I am not sure that I could do that at the time.

If it did develop somehow or other that Newfoundland was in confrontation with Ottawa, that we as a group are supposed to again confront and then condescend and then just give up our rights to something, now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way the Canadian Confederation has to be, then there is something seriously at fault. There is something seriously the matter with that system of government which forces us as citizens to, I suppose, take that kind of attitude.

You know, with the money that comes into Newfoundland from oil and gas, there is so much that has to be done, there are so many things that have to be done. You know, I really laugh. I suppose the sincerity of the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout) was what really threw me off, because all of my first fifteen or twenty minutes of argument were trying to establish, I suppose, a rebuttal to what the Opposition has been saying on why we should have control of something. And as an example of the - I do not know if 'hypocrisy' is a parliamentary word or whether it is a too strong word, but the other day when the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy if we are going to force the persons offshore to use barite because we have some of it in Newfoundland, and then he stood up and gave a speech and said, 'But all the controls have to be in Ottawa,' now, Mr. Speaker, let me not be - 'hypocrisy' may be too strong a word, but my God, Almighty, there has to be a certain amount of common sense. If we are going to control that resource of the thing, if we are going to develop the resources in Buchans, if we are going to force somebody off our coast to abide by our laws, then we have to have some ownership and some control. I cannot, nor can the Government of Newfoundland,

MR. C. POWER: force any company to abide by laws if they are working out of British Columbia under British Columbia's jurisdiction, if they are working out of Sweden under Sweden's jurisdiction, and no more can we, as a government in Newfoundland, force persons off that coast to abide by our laws if they are under Ottawa's jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that have to be done. We talk so much about oil and gas sometimes that maybe somebody thinks that the real heart, body and soul of Newfoundland is not our fishery. I suppose, in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, a member is supposed to give a certain breakdown or run-down of things that he would like to see happen in his district and things that have happened and progress that is there. I started to break mine down into certain topics that I wanted to talk about and I came up with fishery and I came up with my district. They are one and the same, there is no distinction - that and my district that runs from Petty Harbour to Cappahayden are, in effect, one and the same. We have 5,000 or 6,000 people almost completely and solely to the man and woman living directly or indirectly from our fishery.

Now, it is not only a matter of offshore oil and gas with Ottawa when it comes to control of our resources, it is the Northern cod stock, it is a whole attitude of a government that says, 'We will keep you from drowning but we will not let you swim on your own and we will not let you get on your own two feet.'

There are so many things that have to take place in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and the speaker who preceded me from the Opposition of this Province - the official Opposition - who has taken a position fundamentally totally opposed to that of his party both in Newfoundland and in Ottawa, that says something to me and to all Newfoundlanders, that we are not the ignorant group that some persons think we might be, that we have an awful lot of potential that we are trying to develop.

MR. C. POWER: Today, I saw a letter, which many of you may not have seen, to the Editor of the Evening Telegram from a very old gentleman in Calvert, in my district, who says that he is an old, ignorant - he describes himself as uneducated -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. C. POWER: No, he is a humble person in the sense that - he is an 'uneducated Newfoundland noggin', he calls it. But still he begins to realize that at his age when he does not have any real children who are going to come after him, any person who is going to benefit from this thing in Newfoundland, he knows fundamentally that if Newfoundland is to develop, Newfoundland has to have control and ownership of its resources.

MR. C. BRETT: Perhaps the hon. member would like to read the headline there over the letter.

MR. C. POWER: It says, 'Will we crawl to Trudeau or stand behind Peckford?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: And if you want to go on with the issue then immediately above - maybe a humbling effect also, the fact that we have this from a humble gentleman, supposedly uneducated, in Calvert -

MR. POWER: and immediately above it in the Evening Telegram today, a column by Doug Fisher, one of Canada's leading columnists, that says, 'The Liberals are clever at camouflage'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: And you begin to wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there are not certain elements of truth in that argument. That by camouflaging the real issue in Newfoundland now, with control of our offshore oil and gas, with control of all of our resources - you know, I am very fortunate at this stage of my life to be responsible for the Department of Forests, Resources and Lands which is the only real renewable resource that we manage in this Province. Because we do not as yet have management capability of our fisheries, and as anybody who goes around my part of the coastline, or any part of the coastline in Newfoundland will realize, there are an awful lot of problems relating to the fisheries, problems that we as Newfoundlanders cannot even begin to use our potential to, I suppose, not only control but to change the situations, to improve on situations because you have to go to Ottawa to change some of those problems that are now being developed in Newfoundland and almost encouraged to develop by certain persons in Ottawa who simply do not understand the Newfoundland way of living. And all I will say, being in Forest Resources and Lands now, being responsible for a renewable resource, I begin to realize how much has to be done to make sure that 200 years down the road, not tomorrow, not in my lifetime, but 200 years or 300 years down the road we in Newfoundland will have a place in Newfoundland, a place to make a living for our great, great, great, great grandchildren of that time, that we will have a Newfoundland that is similar to what

MR. POWER:

it is today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in my district today, especially in the lower end, in Bay Bulls and Witless Bay, there is a very genuine concern of what the offshore oil and gas is going to mean to small fishing communities. Certainly it is a concern that we expressed as a government when we established the Arts Council last year that I was directly involved with, when we as a government began to acknowledge the fact that there is so much danger. Whenever in our society there is a great advantage about to take place, there is an equal and opposite disadvantage. There is certainly a very genuine concern in many parts of rural Newfoundland that we may lose certain aspects of our way of life which are extremely important to us.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I can only again say, as I did in my opening remarks, that what has happened today - the speaker that preceded me, by giving a position that is totally and fundamentally opposed to what his party is saying, he has done it because he is a Newfoundlander and a Canadian and has done it for issues of conscience. I can only laud him and praise him for his efforts. I understand and fully appreciate that with the persons like the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) Newfoundland is in good hands. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for

Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I follow the customary procedures of congratulating the mover and

MR. WARREN: the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I should also like to extend my congratulations to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) on his recent election to this House of Assembly. I cannot wish him a long stay in the House, but, anyhow, as long as he is here I am sure that we will get along quite well together.

Mr. Speaker, I think in this Throne Speech debate practically every member on both sides of the House has spoken of oil, oil and more oil. Hardly anyone spoke about cod liver oil.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move away from the oil a bit this evening, I am going to speak on things that are not in the Throne Speech, things that need much more attention than this government today has presently placed in its attention, and that is, as the hon. member said who just spoke, the cost of living.

MR. NEARY: Especially in Labrador.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, would you believe that you can go to the Dominion Stores here in St. John's and you can pick up a dozen of extra large eggs at a cost of \$1.41? You can go into Davis Inlet, to a store operated by this government and pick up a dozen medium sized eggs for \$3.10.

MR. NEARY: Almost three times as much.



MR. WARREN:- Mr. Speaker, now this is what this government is not addressing itself to.

MR. NEARY: Right on. Too interested in (inaudible) They want to play cheap politics.

MR. G. WARREN: The cost of living here in St. John's compared to the cost of living in communities along the Labrador Coast: ninety-four cents for a pound of turnip, ninety-four cents. Here you can buy four pounds for sixty-nine cents. Mr. Speaker, I am going to dwell a little bit on the conditions and the tribulations and trials of living in remote areas of this Province, in particular remote areas on the Labrador Coast. I would like to go back first and although I was not in the House yesterday I am quite pleased the government has decided unanimously to support the resolution concerning the air ambulance service. Since the Hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) spoke last Wednesday in this resolution, I am sure he must have had a good talking to by our Premier. He must have been persuaded by other members of his government that we need an ambulance service in Labrador, and with the statement that the Premier made yesterday in summing up, I am quite pleased that the government has taken such a stand and I am looking forward when the Budget is brought down in the next two or three weeks, that we will see a substantial amount of money allotted for medical evacuations in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, a medical problem in Labrador is only just a touch of the iceberg of the problems that we encounter in Labrador. To give you another example, in a nursing clinic in Hopedale, at the same time there could be a patient that due to being probably intoxicated, probably he had a cut on his leg or arm or something, is taken to that clinic, is placed into a bed, and at the same time in this same room, of probably a ten by twenty size room, there is another bed there and probably a lady is having a delivery at the same time. In one room probably a male and a female patient, this is not called for in this day and age.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to run through six of the communities in my district and express to this hon. House some of the concerns that have been expressed during the past several years by members

MR. G. WARREN: on both sides of the House, but very little has been done. The people in Rigolet asked for a new fish shed to be erected. Sure enough, last year the government - probably they gave tenders - anyhow the successful bidder was a former P.C. candidate in that area, he got the tender, he goes in and he erects shed, 1,000 bags of salt arrives in Rigolet later on in the Fall, they put the salt in the shed and the floor comes out. Now, that fish shed is down there with no floor, and I understand the company has been paid for the construction of this building without inspection. Now the bottom is out of this shed and the fishermen are wondering what is going to happen when the fish come in in July or August.

MR. NEARY: What about the salt? Is it spoiled or what?

MR. G. WARREN: No, the salt is still okay until the ice starts melting and once that happens then the salt naturally is going to go down on the beach and it is going to be gone.

We go further up the shoreline to Postville, and here I have to go back to the book we call the blue and white book that the hon. member from Naskaupi had released recently. He is talking about all the recommendations

MR. WARREN: that have been implemented, have been carried out by this administration. Mr. Speaker, if writing a letter to a federal department is carrying out a recommendation, we could have 5,000 of those done in one day if we had a secretary fast enough to write letters. Mr. Speaker, it says. "We contacted the federal government, it is a federal government responsibility, they have to implement it." Well, that is fine. I think there are about seven or eight here concerning the Department of Justice and where the Justice Department in those cases are federal monies the recommendation says that we have contacted the federal department and the matter has been looked into. Now, it is very easy to carry a recommendation like that. The recommendation has been looked into. Mr. Speaker, I only wish I had two or three days because I would like to go through those recommendations one by one. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to go through now, seeing that

I notice one of the two ministers left in the House now is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), I am going to drill a little bit on the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, if you will give me a second I am going to run through here.

Mr. Speaker, Recommendation No. 102, The Commission recommends that the Province negotiate with the federal government with a view to establishing a community based detention centre at Happy Valley-Goose Bay for native and Northern offenders." Mr. Speaker, about a month ago the Department of Justice chartered an aircraft from Labrador to bring twelve offenders out here to Her Majesty's Penitentiary in St. John's and to the Salmonier Prison Camp. Now, Mr. Speaker, that cost, I would venture to say, is between \$7,000 and \$8,000 for charter of a small aircraft, filled right to the gunwales, they call it. Now, if there was a detention centre set up in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, we are not only saving those extra dollars but are doing much more of vital importance, and that is, if a crime is committed - and usually

MR. WARREN: those people are in here for two or three months, probably six months at a time - now, if a crime is committed, if those people are placed in a detention centre in Labrador, number one is they are in their own surroundings. The language barrier is not a difficulty. Out here they are in completely different surroundings. The environment is different, the language barrier is completely in existence, because individuals from Davis Inlet who can only speak the Indian language probably and can say very few words in our English tongue, how in the heck is he communicating with a civil servant down in Her Majesty's Penitentiary? How would he be rehabilitated? He cannot be rehabilitated, Mr. Speaker. So, it will not only give us the opportunity of having the offenders rehabilitated in their own surroundings, and it will probably help this offender to go back to his own community knowing that he has been rehabilitated and been spoken to in his native tongue, and goes back to his own community and probably will start on a new round.

Mr. Speaker, there is another recommendation asking that an RCMP establishment be established in North West River. This was just wiped out, no comments about it at all, just saying that it was not practical.

Mr. Speaker, I have not got the time to go through all those individually, but I am hoping that in the course of this session of the House I will dwell on the ones that have not been implemented. I would say practically only about half of those recommendations have been implemented to the benefit of Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I am going to go from Postville now in to Makkovik, and at the same time I am going to tie in problems confronting Nain. In those two communities we have the two largest fish plants in my district. Now, those two fish plants have to close down in late September or early October because of a very simple expense, a very minor expense, and that is installation of a heating system in the working portion of the plant. Now, that is not asking too much, probably \$5,000 or \$6,000 for a plant to install a heating system in the working portion of the fish plant. As you know,

MR. G. WARREN: once you get up to Labrador the weather is not the same as on the Island portion of the Province. We get Winter up there when people are in their bathing suits in St. John's and once September comes we need some kind of warmth to keep us working and vigorously working at that. So that is one thing I am throwing out to this government now, and I am sorry the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is engaged in other deliberations down in Wesleyville but I hope that members of his caucus would pass this nice request along to him asking to spend \$10,000 or \$12,000 to install heating systems in the working areas of those fish plants.

Now on the subject of the fisheries department, on the subject of the Fisheries Loan Board which, I think we all agree, this is why the new minister is trying to bring in new policies, a new Loan Board Chairman, new members of the Loan Board, and a big racket about other things. So I want to just read a letter that I had from one of my constituents. No, I will not read the letter, I will just tell you what the letter is about. This constituent of mine decided he was going to purchase a boat on the Island portion of the Province. So this boat he picked out was \$13,500, the Loan Board has sent a person from their department out to Placentia Bay, evaluated this boat and said, 'Okay, this boat is worth \$13,500'. So the guy in Nain - you know, it does cost money for a person to come from Nain to come out to St. John's and rent a car - probably not rent a car but get a taxi or something to go to a small community in Placentia Bay. So he listened to the good advice of the Loan Board. After all, this was the purpose of the Loan Board, to give advice, so the Loan Board said the boat is worth \$13,500, so the guy says, 'Okay, I am going to have her'. So his loan was approved, the boat was sent up to him and he received the boat, he did not want it, it was terrible. It was not anything close

MR. G. WARREN: to the boat he wanted. And furthermore on top of that the mortgage that he signed with the Loan Board said that there was a Chevrolet motor in the boat. When he got the boat there was a Volvo motor into it. So he sent it back, 'Well, I do not want the boat or anything to do with it.' So he sent it back and here is the letter he received from the Loan Board - now this guy did not know if he should send the boat back to the original owner or to the Loan Board; after all, it is a very complicated process and the way the Loan Board works is really complicated to say the truth. It says here, "Today I was informed by CN officials that your boat purchase was sent back to the CNR premises for delivery to its former owner because you were not satisfied with the purchase. This indicates to the Board that you will not make any further payment on the boat and rather than let the boat deteriorate we will offer it for sale by tender as is and where is and any amount received for that boat will be credited to your account." That sounds logical, but meanwhile we must remember now five months before this letter was written the Loan Board okayed, the Loan Board verified that this boat was worth \$13,500. Now on January 28th, this individual person gets a reply back from the Loan Board after I interceded on his behalf and said,

MR. WARREN:

"Look, the guy did not want the boat. He has \$2,500 paid down on it as a down payment. Could he use that \$2,500 towards the purchase of a new boat later on when the time is right?" The Loan Board writes back to him and says, "In reply to your letter to the acting Chairman". Now this letter came back to me with an accompanying one to my constituent. It says, "The boat went up for sale, was on public tender and was sold for \$4,700." And it says that the constituent is not only going to get another loan from the boys until he pays back this \$6,700 that was cost of the boat in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member's speech, but if I might take a moment, although it is not quite five o'clock I can inform the House now that I have received notice of two matters for debate at five-thirty when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

Notice given by the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) arising out of a question asked the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the subject matter is barite production in Buchans. And the second matter, a matter raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford) and the subject matter is increases in gasoline prices.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

So, Mr. Speaker, you see that within a matter of months that boat was valued at \$13,500 and then the Loan Board sold her for \$4,700, and it says this individual guy is responsible for \$6,700. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a complete shambles, is a complete

MR. WARREN:

lack of knowledge by the Loan Board, lack of knowledge of the problems that are confronted by people not only in my district but other parts of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on further concerning bounty regulations. You know, we are not talking about a person who can get in his car tomorrow morning and drive into St. John's and sit down and have a meeting with the Loan Board. We are talking about people for whom that is impossible, not only with the Loan Board, with any department of government, it is impossible for them to come in when they feel like it and talk over with the department officials any problems that concern them. They have to wait for an inspector from Arnold's Cove to go down to Black Tickle or Cartwright to inspect a boat before they can receive the bounty. Last year it took seven months for an individual in Cartwright to get his boat inspected and at that time, after using his boat all the Summer, it took some convincing to make sure that that boat was new before he used it because the inspector was not in there to see it in its new state.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to look back over some of the other recommendations. Recommendation number seven - these are the recommendations by the Royal Commission on Labrador - it says here, a very simple recommendation, it says that the government should let the people on the Labrador Coast know when they are coming. Now that is not too difficult to ask. They are asking the government official, saying - Okay tomorrow probably the Department of Education is sending a group of people into Davis Inlet. Usually what happened maybe it is not happening today but what happened in the past was department members from the Department of Education would get on a plane here



MR. WARREN:

in St. John's, go to Goose Bay, probably take a charter from Goose Bay into Makkovik. Now all of the sudden the people of Makkovik see a chopper coming overhead. "I wonder who is that, I wonder?" It lands and out jumps a couple of people from the Department of Education. I do not mean any reference to Madame Minister or her department at the present day. I am just saying what happened probably the last six or seven months ago. Now, "Why did you not let us know you were coming?". "Oh, we did not know we were going to come today but seeing as we heard the weather was good in Labrador we came on." And this is the kind of attitude that departments were taking; we will go in there, we will do our business and we will get out of it as fast as we can. I remember the Department of Fisheries going into a community down in the Straits area, got in there for twenty minutes, recommended that a wharf will be built here - they never spoke to no council, no fishermen's committee - a wharf will be built here and took off back to St. John's again the same day with the recommendation and the wharf was built in that same place without even the people knowing it. So I think this is what we need, we need consultation with the people. There has to be consultation and with all the money that has been spent during the past years, and I am sure will be spent in the years to come, it is not going to cost that much for telephone conversations where there are telephones in existence or a telegram to that effect to go to the Chairman of the Council or to the Chairman of the Fisheries Committee and advise them that, you know, a delegation will be in to Black Tickle on Thursday morning, weather permitting. At least then they know they are going to be there if the weather permits you to do so.

MR. STAGG:

Who built the wharf?

MR. WARREN:

I beg your pardon?

MR. STAGG: Who built the wharf you are talking about?

MR. WARREN: Who built the wharf? I think it was under the Diefenbaker government.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) the provincial government?

MR. WARREN: Because provincial government

MR. G. WARREN: was involved with the designing of the plans where the wharf would go. I understand that there was in the past good co-operation between the federal and provincial governments in all matters pertaining to development in Newfoundland; that is why we joined Canada, that is my understanding.

And, Mr. Speaker, recommendation number 12 -

MR. STAGG: What did Diefenbaker's government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep quiet and let the man speak.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I like to talk without being interrupted but it is usual from this member, he is noted for that.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to be heard without interruption.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, recommendation number 12: the commission recommends that the Province give priority to expanding the Newfoundland Information Services to include a Zenith number to include the Coastal system of Labrador. Now this had not been implemented, they say because we have a government office in Goose Bay that entails some of the departments we do not need a Zenith number. I partially agree with that, Mr. Speaker, but there are three communities now in Labrador which still at this day do not have any telephone service at all and the least thing they could do is put some kind of a radio - telephore into those communities that would assist people to get in contact with the department that they are concerned with. So it is not asking too much, it is asking for radio - telephones to be put into those communities and also to be connected up with the Information Services.

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, on air transportation - now I am going to go back to the cost of living in Labrador, the eggs that cost \$3.10 a dozen. Now I have been in contact with the Department of Rural Development and I believe I have been given a fair and honest answer: it is the cost of the air freight. Now a dozen eggs, we will say, costs \$1.41 in St. John's; it is thirty cents air freight from here to Goose Bay, and it is forty-four cents air freight from Goose Bay to Davis Inlet, that will bring those eggs up to \$2.15 a dozen. Now I do not see why there is ninety-five cents added to a dozen eggs by the time the consumer buys them from the shelves in Davis Inlet. I believe this government has to look at this problem very seriously. There is no other way - if there were any other way to get fresh fruits and vegetables, and perishables into those communities, if there were any other cheaper way to do it I am sure that the people would take that opportunity, but there is no other way, there has to be air service. I am just wondering how much monitoring is done. I do not think that there is enough monitoring done. I am just wondering if when the aircraft leaves Goose Bay to go to these communities, is she filled to capacity or are they saying, 'Okay, she has 1,500 pounds on, would you write up the cost of the charter and add it on to the products'? I think this is what is happening, there are a lot of planes, a lot of aircraft, I know because I worked there. There are a lot aircraft -

MR. F. STAGG:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I am having difficulty hearing the hon. member.

I am having difficulty hearing

MR. G. WARREN:

I know, Mr. Speaker, especially when you get the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) talking.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I know there are many planes going into various communities in Labrador with government officials that are practically empty, that there are just two or three officials on there and they could take 300 or 400 or 500 or 600 pounds of freight. Now this flight is already paid for by the department that has the flight going in there, and the stores are government owned stores. So there is no reason why, if there was a monitoring system set up, that some of this freight could be put on these aircrafts and the cost would be reduced and the people up there would enjoy eating a dozen eggs without saying, 'Each egg is costing about forty cents almost'. So, Mr. Speaker, with that I close my few remarks and hope that this government will pay more attention to the problems and the cost of living along the Labrador coast and in other remote areas of this Province of ours. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Humber West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the newly appointed Ministers of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Lands and Forests (Mr. Power), Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe). Each portfolio offers tremendous challenges and potential and I am sure that each minister will carry his responsibility in a commendable and capable manner. Last but not least, I would like to welcome the new PC member from the old Liberal district of Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. BAIRD: I would like to get into our normal subject of oil and gas development at the beginning. I would like to know where the hon. members across the floor stand on the all-important issue of ownership. We have heard one hon. member this afternoon who had the fortitude to stand

MR. R. BAIRD: up and speak his position. We had three or four other members opposite who did get up and state their position, I think theirs was in agreement with the government's, that it does belong to Newfoundland, but I would like to know where the rest of the Opposition members stand on the position of ownership.

MR. E. HISCOCK: What do you think I am over here standing up for (inaudible).

MR. R. BAIRD: I see the hon. member for Eagle River is sitting over here already. I did not think he would be here that fast but he is here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. BAIRD: I would like to state that I am pleased with the government's initiative on the commitment to the national development of the offshore petroleum industry for the full benefit of our Province. We should also continue to enforce the existing regulations concerning hiring practice. Jobs are paramount importance to the Province and it is the government's policy to maximize the benefits of our people while at the same time protecting our social and cultural fabric particularly in rural Newfoundland. I am also hopeful that Corner Brook area will play a significant role in the petroleum industry. Fortunately for the East Coast it is right off the area of the East Coast but I do feel that a lot of the effects and spinoffs will be felt across the Province. And now, I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to an article that was in yesterday's paper and again today on Mr. Beesley. First of all I would like to speak for a minute, that is if I could, on Mr. J. Alan Beesley's handling of our position regarding the offshore exploration and development at the Law of the Sea Conference. According to Mr. Beesley's attitude can you see Mr. Idi Amin or Mr. Castro or somebody else coming in here to pick up his share of our offshore rights?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. BAIRD: I do not think Tom Rideout or the member from Bay d'Espoir would have to stand alone on any of those points. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me and indeed to most people that Mr. Beesley has disqualified himself by his own statements to speak effectively for Canada and particularly Newfoundland, at the international discussions of mineral production. Given the importance of the question of offshore ownership and revenue sharing agreement to the Province, I feel Mr. Beesley's statements at the Law of the Sea Conference are cause for considerable alarm. I find it simply incredible that a man who has been given the responsibility to protect in our interests and rights already established in the 1958 accord should now all of a sudden abandon this position because the accord is not acceptable to some

MR. R. BAIRD:                    countries, including communistic countries. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Beesley has made a serious mistake. He has played his cards very badly indeed and very recklessly. We cannot afford to pay for Mr. Beesley's mistakes, Mr. Speaker. Countries that sit around the International Law of the Sea Conference are desperately looking for a foothold to claim a considerable part of our oil resource. We cannot allow Mr. Beesley to concede to that victory, that we have fought so hard to win. I therefore, call upon this Honourable House to collectively voice our opposition to Canada's Minister of External Affairs by calling for the immediate dismissal of Mr. Alan Beesley as Canada's chief negotiator at the Law of the Sea Conference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. BAIRD:                    Our rights and interest have to be protected Mr. Speaker, to ensure this Mr. Beesley has to go. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district where the general population is very heavily dependent on the forest industry for direct and indirect employment from the spruce budworm infestation. This has been the cause of real concern. I attended a meeting with Bowater's officials in January accompanied by colleagues, the Minister of Education, and the member for the Bay of Islands. The meeting was a very fruitful exchange and everyone was concerned, and there was welcomed information exchanged in dialogue. While government recognizes the paper company's legitimate concern with the decision not to undertake a spray programme this year, I feel the decision will be proven in the long run to be a sound one. Given the long term unknown effects of chemical spray on our vegetation wildlife and people, it is our responsibility to suspend any spray programme until all details have been fully studied. While it was a difficult decision I feel, and indeed the Minister of Lands and Forests has indicated, that paper companies through the Province will accept the measures initiated to date, for the long term benefit of our forest industry. The Royal Commission will address not only the effectiveness and safety of an extended spray programme but always and also it means re-establishing a healthy forest resource,



March 13, 1980

Tape No. 372

RA -3

MR. R. BAIRD: through efficient harvesting, re-  
reforestation and management. This is a vital importance to our West  
Coast, I look forward to meaningful solutions and recommendation for  
our forest industry at the conclusion of the commission's findings. Mr.  
**Speaker,** with the growing cost today of food and shelter and what not  
I am very concerned for the plight of our senior citizens, heat, hydro  
everything seems to be escalating, I am becoming increasingly  
concerned with the plight of our senior citizens who find it more  
difficult

MR. BAIRD: to make ends meet on fixed incomes. I am particularly concerned with the increased cost of health care in terms of the purchase of prescription drugs. I am sure each member of this hon. House is aware of the hardship many of our senior citizens are experiencing with budgeting for prescription drugs and, needless to say, we have to address this growing problem very soon to give our citizens who have contributed so much to this Province some badly needed relief. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a drug card program being implemented during this session of the Legislature, and I would certainly welcome further discussion on this vitally important social concern.

Other important initiatives that we should take a very close and serious look at are subsidized senior citizen accommodations, especially in the field of senior citizens' homes located as much and as close as possible to the home environment and, if possible, tax exemptions in certain areas such as heating oil and clothing. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to effect meaningful measures to assist our senior citizens, and it is my sincere hope that a number of initiatives will be taken during this session of the House, especially the provision of prescription drug cards.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard very much about the all-important offshore oil and gas, and I think it is the answer to our future, but again let us not forget our fishery. This is an exciting period in our long history and I am heartened by the government's continued realization, despite the very encouraging offshore oil and gas discoveries, that the future growth and prosperity of our Province rests chiefly in the expanding fish industry. This basic and fundamental commitment to rural Newfoundland, to the continued stimulants and programs for fishery development, was, I am pleased to say, a major component in the Throne Speech. While it appears promising that a major petroleum industry will become a reality for our Province, it does not mean that other sectors of our economy will fall into a state of decline and neglect. Indeed, this government has ensured that through sound policies and planning, the opposite will be the case. Each resource that is abundant in the Province has an important role to fulfill, and each resource will be maximized to the full extent of our people.

MR. BAIRD: I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the government's position on the Northern cod stocks. That, I think, we will probably be hearing a little more of in the next couple of weeks, but I think it is time that all hon. members on the opposite side of the House make their position known on that. The cod we have always had we will.

MR. FLIGHT: No doubt.

MR. BAIRD: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans agrees with me. I am glad. I hope he also agrees with me on the offshore oil and gas.

MR. WHITE: What have you said? What have you said?

MR. BAIRD: It is owned by Newfoundland. That is the government's position, and the Premier's position and my position, and the hon. member opposite made quite plain his position on it today, as did the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and several other hon. members across the House. I think that probably in a short time, as people are beginning to learn a little more than they did know, I think that some more hon. members will probably come along and make their positions known and clear.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, That is about it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: I would like to first of all, Mr. Speaker, in my general introduction to welcome to the House of Assembly the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews). I do hope however short or long his stay is, that his contributions will be equal to the contribution that he has made thus far in his Throne Speech. I enjoyed the speech, I thought it contained some relatively good remarks with some substance, and I do hope that we hear more from him in the ensuing weeks. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is for me now as one of only two Canadian born

MR. R. MOORES:

Newfoundlanders in this House of Assembly to make my position very clear on offshore oil and resources. About the most deceiving statement that has been most frequently used in this House to date has been that by the government members that this Opposition has no position. The fact that we do not get up and rail on like some person on the verge of a nervous breakdown talking about our position on offshore oil, and because we do not get up and espouse greed and selfishness and egoism, it is not because we have no position. So for the purposes of this House and for the sake of some members who may not have been listening, and for the sake of the media in this Province who may or may not be unsure, our position on offshore oil is exactly that which was submitted by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please;

MR. R. MOORES:

We believe, as all good Newfoundlanders

believe -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shut up boy, you might learn something.

MR. R. MOORES:

- we believe that the offshore oil and the submarine resources lying on the Continental Shelf and the 200 mile economic zone, are those of Newfoundland, unquestionably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES:

But there is no such thing in this Province as a carte blanche agreement with the government of this Province that we will say, "Ownership at all costs, and ownership on your grounds."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES:

We as an Opposition have a fundamental responsibility, a responsibility that because of our democratic traditions is clear, concise and very important to the proper administration of democracy in any province or in any nation, and that is that we are not going

MR. R. MOORES: to sit idly by and allow the government of this Province to espouse ownership and to say that the only way that this Province can gain maximum benefits from offshore oil is if we have ownership, because that is not true. That just simply is not true. The Province of Newfoundland can gain maximum benefits through a negotiated settlement and it can gain maximum benefits for its people through control.

Control, let me give you an analogy, let me give you an analogy: Supposing that I am renting a house from a person in St. John's and that person says to me, 'I will own this house, I will repair it if anything breaks down, if the pipes freeze up I will replace them, but in addition to expecting your rent, for this ownership of my house I will agree to give you back fifty per cent of your rent', and that is essentially the position that has been outlined to the people of Newfoundland, that was accepted by the people of Newfoundland, by Prime Minister Trudeau during the federal election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. R. MOORES: He said, "There is no disagreement on ownership, no disagreement at all, it is just that you have a difference of opinion." And it is the

MR. R. MOORES: same difference of opinion that I express now as compared to my hon. colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout). He has an opinion. It happens to agree with that of the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: My opinion, on the other hand, is not quite as crystal clear as the government would want it to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: What the Government of Newfoundland is saying - and let us make it clear now, boys - what the Government of Newfoundland is saying is, 'We want ownership.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: 'We want ownership although it might be debatable. We feel that we own the resources and we want that to be maintained.' This is the same Province, the same government who say that through ownership we are going to deal with multi-billion dollar corporations, who cannot even run their own snowplowing operation, who have bandied around the Come By Chance oil refinery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: - who have emaciated the Upper Churchill agreement, who have castrated the Linerboard mill in Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: And this is the same government that is going to deal with multi-billion dollar oil companies that have chewed up nations in this world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: I listened just a few days ago to a gentleman on C.B.C. from Norway and another one from Scotland, in the North Sea, and they say that the oil companies are virtually uncontrollable, they just throw money out the door as if it were nothing, water. And this is the same government now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: - that has been effectively - or  
ineffectively - unable to administer a Province for the last seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: I have five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. BARRY: I thought you were going to show some courage.

MR. R. MOORES: The Minister of Mines and Energy -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, courage - lesser men  
than me would not be here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Lesser men than you are here  
today.

MR. R. MOORES: If you want courage.

This principle, Mr. Speaker, me - us -  
versus Canada is one of the most ridiculous calamities that has befallen  
this great nation of ours in recent years.. We have in this nation one of  
the greatest pasts and one of the greatest futures. One of the reasons  
why Canada today is one of the most respected nations in the world is  
because we have forged out of confrontation, negotiation and agreement.  
We have forged a co-operative federalism the likes of which is unknown  
anywhere in the free world and we have done it through negotiation, we  
have done it through sensible, civilized confrontation.

I stand here today, for the want of  
a better analogy, as a Newfoundlander, as an indication of what Canada  
has done for us. I was born in 1949 and the

MR. MOORES:

baby bonus put clothes on my back. I went to school and the federal government paid up to 90 per cent of my education. When I went to university, it again provided the finances for 90 per cent of my education.

The physical facilities, the university itself, the high schools in this Province, and I could go on and on ad infinitum telling you what advantages there have been in Confederation for Newfoundland. And now, the Premier of this Province and the government of this Province want to be like, perhaps, the best anti-confederate in Canada today, they want to be like Lougheed in Alberta, 'Stuff it all in your pockets and set up a Heritage Fund while the rest of this nation suffers industrially and economically'. While the Indians, for example, in Northern Alberta, and Saskatchewan and Labrador still do not enjoy the most menial benefits in our society today, you want to take it all because ownership is everything. It means everything for Newfoundland and you want ownership for Newfoundland even though the Prime Minister of Canada is prepared to give us all we want until we become a have Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh! Shameful!

MR. MOORES:

What is the motivation?

MR. YOUNG:

Maybe we are not ready

(inaudible).

MR. MOORES:

What is the motivation

for wanting ownership?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MOORES:

I adjourn the debate,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to call it

five-thirty then? You adjourned a couple of minutes early.

It being five-thirty

then, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.



MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The matter for debate, raised by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, is barite production in Buchans.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday,

I think, I asked the minister, in what I thought was a non-partisan, uncontroversial way, what the status of the barite production possibilities in Buchans was. I asked him in his capacity as Minister of Mines and Energy and Industrial Development. I asked him in light of the economic situation that exists in Buchans, in light of the fact that up until a day ago, anyway - and this new development over the past couple of days of the possibility of another ore body being developed in Buchans, it was not asked in the light of that, it had not happened. I was not aware of it, I was not aware of the possibility, and it may be only a possibility, that ore body will be developed. But, however, more people have joined the fray today. The minister, if he is listening to the news today, he will hear his Deputy Minister saying that yes, indeed, there are meetings with the minister, yes, indeed one of the issues to be discussed is the Tulk's ore body, yes, indeed, the company has made proposals looking for anything that might exist by way of helping them to put in infrastructure. So obviously there is some thinking along the line and I think that at this point in time it is fair to say that is pretty well all that has been said.

But when I asked that question, even that remote possibility of the economy of Buchans being stabilized was not there.

Mr. Speaker, we have known there has been barite in Buchans for thirty years.

MR. FLIGHT: We have known the potential market for barite in the world, but nobody in Buchans - all that concerns the people in Buchans is what will happen to provide some jobs when that mine closes? Nobody in Buchans got excited about barite, there was no market for it as far as we were concerned. Then in the 1970s, the oil well drilling started on the coast, and we knew and we know that barite is one of the ingredients needed and used in offshore development. We know that it stops wells from caving in and we know that it has lubricating properties and all of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the activity going on out there, people are saying, 'Well, why are we not producing barite? Why are we not bringing that development into production? And why are we not creating the twenty-five jobs?' That is the figure they are using, that will be created. Look at the multiplier fact. That may be forty. And that in itself would help sustain, so I simply asked the minister the question, what is the status? We know that there have been two or three pilot projects. Barite of Canada came in and did a pilot project and the recovery rate

MR. FLIGHT:

was not that great, I understand. ASARCO themselves did a pilot project and their recovery rate was indeed good and would warrant, the results of the pilot project warranted going into production. They could produce barite at a rate that would be profitable. The market is offshore. Now the point is also, Mr. Speaker, that the companies were saying that, you know, we do not have the market offshore and even if we did have the total market it would not take enough to warrant going into full production. Spokesmen for the company, top officials of the company, presidents, chairmen of the board of Abitibi-Price indicated that they do now have market potential for all the barite they can mine and put on the market in Buchans. Presumably a lot of it will be used in offshore or we would believe so. Why would it not be? Why would not a Newfoundland product like barite that would create twenty-five jobs be a condition of any agreements with the offshore? So I mean it is a red herring to throw in the issue of where you stand on the offshore. The fact is they are out there, they are drilling, they need barite, Buchans has barite, Buchans is going to lose 300 jobs. Why is the minister not standing up and defending Buchans' right to have a barite producing industry in the same sense he is standing up? Why is he not talking to American Smelting and Refining Company and Abitibi-Price and insisting that if it is possible they get into production? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the issue. It is as simple as that.

I ask the minister in his capacity of mines and energy and industrial development what is the present status because nobody at this point in time except the companies have watched the status of the mining of the barite potential in Buchans. Will there be an operation? Does he know how many jobs will be created? Will all the

MR. FLIGHT:

jobs stay in Buchans? Is there a possibility that when the barite comes into production that it may be shipped out in bulk or will the minister in his capacity as Industrial Development Minister or Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) insist that all the jobs possible in the marketing of barite will be established there and that there will not be some secondary process or bagging or packaging somewhere else on the continent? Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple question put in, what I thought, was a non-controversial way, very non-partisan way and I would be most pleased if the minister would outline for the House the exact position of the barite possibilities in Buchans, will we have an industry or will we not.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I believe it would be cruel, it would be nothing short of cruel to raise the expectation of the people of Buchans with respect to a development until that development is copper fastened, until we know definitely that the development is going ahead. And I submit that the hon. member is already skating perilously close to playing a cruel game as far as the people of Buchans are concerned with his statements yesterday with respect to the Tulk's deposit. I will be making a statement tomorrow on the Tulk's deposit and it is premature, and the hon. member knows it is premature, to give the people of Buchans the impression that agreement has been reached to develop another mine in the Buchans area. That is cruel, Mr. Speaker, unforgivably cruel.

MR. FLIGHT:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. Order, please!

Order, please! A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

In my limited knowledge of parliamentary procedure, Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is improper and unparliamentary to attach motives to anything said in this House and the minister declared - the record will show -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- the record will show - that I deliberately misled the people of Buchans and that is cruel. I did not at any time. To my point of order, Mr. Speaker, at no time in a public statement or in this House did I indicate that an agreement was close, that there would be a mine in Buchans. I simply said that obviously there are meetings being held between the parties concerned. And I want the minister, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw that statement there that attaches motivations to what I said and misrepresents anything that I might have said in this House or publicly with regards to the Buchans situation. And if I have to wait for Hansard I will get Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, I would rule that there is no point of order at this particular time. The hon. minister has about two minutes left really to respond to the hon. member's question.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the first point, so we have to tell it like it is. The way it is, Mr. Speaker, is that there is as of yet nothing finalized with respect to development of the Tulk's deposit into a mine. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing finalized with respect to the production of barite, but we expect, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that things will continue moving in the direction in which they have been moving for the last several months, which is favourable towards ultimate production. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a long ways to go yet, there is a long ways to go yet. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a considerable number of years that work has been done on trying to design a proper plant that can produce barite. The impression prevails, Mr. Speaker, that somehow it is just a matter of going out and scooping it out of the tailings and shoving it down a drill hole. Well, I have to tell the hon. member that the specifications with respect to drilling mud are very strict and it is such an important part of the drilling operation, not just with respect to the mechanics of drilling but with respect to the environmental control, the avoidance of blow-outs and so forth, that the specifications have to be adhered to very strictly. There is a lot of work that has to be done in order to get - whether you have it in tailings or you have it in a mineral deposit - to get barite into production. And a lot of work has been done, Mr. Speaker, with the encouragement and the promotion of this government, a lot of work has been done in seeing an ultimate production of barite from Buchans. There is just one final point I would like to make. Let nobody, let nobody forget, Mr. Speaker, that drilling mud has been supplied in this Province for more than a decade, that were it not for our offshore local preference regulations, which the hon. member opposite is not giving the support to which is needed to make sure that they continue to apply, that were it not for those regulations, Mr. Speaker, it would be a long day indeed before we saw barite production from Buchans. So, I ask the hon. member to get up like a man, forget partisan principles, look at what -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: The hon. member opposite is not afraid to disagree with - the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) has disagreed with members opposite on matters of principle relating to constitutional law. We have seen the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) today, Mr. Speaker, get up and have the courage to speak on principle. So, I ask the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to do the same thing. Get up and let us hear your principles as a Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - to promote industry in your very own district. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The second matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Lapoile, reference increases in gasoline prices, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, from time to time, both inside and outside of this House, we have heard reference to the power that the oil companies have in this country. Nobody seems to be able to exercise any control at all over the oil companies, and I believe I made a statement a few days ago that the oil companies are the most crude individuals on the face of this earth today. They are ruthless in every respect and nobody yet has been able to control the oil companies. The oil companies, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, have been practising for years and years price fixing and price gouging, and nobody has been able to do anything about it. I know it today. I am raising this matter again of the oil companies increasing the price of gasoline in this Province, getting their piece of flesh before the Government of Canada announces their increase in oil and gas. The oil companies are jumping the gun, getting ahead of the game. While everybody is being distracted in this Province by offshore ownership, by the federal election, the oil companies were successful in nudging up the price of gasoline three and four cents, four cents in my own district out in Port aux Basques. They have upped the price by three to four cents, and not a word and not a peep out of anybody on the government side, not a

MR. NEARY: sound from the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) or the Premier of this Province. We have not heard a single word in this House so far, and we have been here now almost three weeks, about the high cost of living in this Province. The number one problem facing the people of Newfoundland is inflation and the high cost of living. What is that three or four cents going to do, Mr. Speaker, to the cost of living in this Province, where you have a Province where all the freight, especially the food, is moved by tractor trailer and moved by truck? That four cents further increases the



MR. S. NEARY:

cost of living in this Province.

People are beginning to ask where it is all going to end.

It would be worth our while,

Mr. Speaker, in this House, to push aside some of the petty, cheap political trickery and manoeuvring and politics that the government are playing and let us roll up our sleeves and get down to brass tacks and try to do something about the cost of living in this Province. And I am speaking now and I have to confine myself to the price of gasoline.

As far as I am concerned, the oil companies have been violating the federal Combines Act for years. They have been practicing price gouging and price fixing and nobody but nobody has been able to do anything about it. They are the big contributors to the coffers of the federal political parties and the provincial political parties and are so powerful and so influential that it is enough to frighten you. And I do not expect today, even though I am getting up and making a strong plea, an impassioned plea to the government to do something about, to look at the possibility of price fixing, a violation of the federal Combines Act. Somebody pointed out today, What about the gasoline and the heating fuel that is already in the tanks? It is a straight rip-off, Mr. Speaker, and even though I am speaking on it now, I am afraid that my words will merely fall on deaf ears, that nothing will be done. That is why I was so disappointed with the Premier's flippant attitude today over this matter. He just more or less shrugged it off, brushed it off, and I do not expect to see anything done about it, Mr. Speaker, because everybody but everybody in authority is afraid of the big oil companies.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it requires too much reply except to note that, Is not all the good reamed out of him, Mr. Speaker? And I wonder why all the good, all the zip and all the zap have been reamed out of the hon. member today.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I wonder did it have anything to do with the speech of the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout)?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: I do not stand on my feet today, Mr. Speaker, to defend the oil companies. There is no point in defending the oil companies. The hon. gentleman is not going to catch us in that trap.

There has been price fixing, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicates. If there has been price fixing, price fixing in this country is a matter for the federal government. So if the hon. gentleman has a legitimate concern, he should take it up with his friends in Ottawa. He should take it up with the member for Bonavista - Trinity Conception (Mr. D. Rooney), the member for Gander - Twillingate (Mr. G. Baker), the member for Humber - St. George's - St. Barbe (Mr. B. Tobin) and his former friend and colleague, the member for Burin - Burgeo (Mr. R. Simmons).

So price fixing, Mr. Speaker, is not a matter for this Province, it is a matter for the federal government. If the oil companies are putting up the prices beyond that which they ought to put them up and if, in fact, there is anything that the provincial government can do with respect to its own legislative jurisdiction and its own enforcement of same, I can guarantee the hon. member, as the Premier has today, that this government will act, and act speedily with respect to same. And what the hon. member indicated today was that in various areas of the Province the price of gas is different. In one particular area it is a few cents a gallon or maybe five to ten cents a gallon more than in other areas. And the hon. the Premier has indicated that this would be looked at, that this would be taken into account, that we would investigate the situation, and if, in fact, there is anything that can be done within our own legislative competence and our own jurisdiction, it certainly will be done. We are not here to defend, as I say, Mr. Speaker, the oil companies.

But I would suggest to the hon. member in conclusion that the nature of his very weak defence - because today

MR. W. MARSHALL: I think he is rather depressed and I can understand why the hon. member would not have his usual vim and his usual vigor, because, as I say, I think from the hon. gentleman there opposite, the good has been reamed out of him today for some particular reason.

But if the hon. gentleman is really concerned about price fixing, as I say, he should take it up with his friends in Ottawa, that is, after the hon. gentlemen there opposite have come to task with the real issue before this Province with respect to prices,

MR. W. MARSHALL: with respect to the future of this Province and that is the ownership of the offshore. So when he is talking to his buddies, the members for the five districts in St. John's and Mr. Pierre Elliot Trudeau and Mr. Rompkey, our representative in Cabinet when he gets through advocating the position of this Province with respect to its rightful ownership of the offshore, then in that event he might have a word or two about the Combines Act and tell him to get going and redress the inequities that he sees around this Province with respect to price fixing by oil companies.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The motion is that this House do now adjourn. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 14, 1980 at 10:00 A.M.