

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY:

I think hon. members should wait and hear what I have to say before applauding.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The hon. gentleman over there applaud as a reaction.

MR. L. BARRY:

I appreciate the staunch support and solidarity that we have on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate to the hon. members of the House of Assembly that government has considered the final report from the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities concerning Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's request to increase the rates which it charges for the power and energy supplied to Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited and the Board of Trustees of the Power Distribution District of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The proposed hydro rates were referred to the Board on July 19, 1979 in accordance with Section 7 of the Electrical Power Control Act. As was the case with Hydro's first referral in 1977, the hearings were lengthy because of the concern over the impact of Hydro's proposed rates on the ultimate consumers. Copies of Hydro's referral which contained factual statistical information and the opinions of expert witnesses were immediately made available to all members of the House of Assembly and the press. Hydro's application was then subjected to public hearings and two organizations formally intervened, namely, the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities and Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited.

MR. L. BARRY:

The first phase of the hearings commenced on August 5, 1979 and the second phase began on September 24, 1979 and continued until adjournment on October 3, 1979. During this period, expert advisers of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities conducted an independent investigation into Hydro's financial affairs and the interveners had an opportunity to question Hydro's senior management concerning all aspects of Hydro's present and planned operations. Intervenors had an opportunity to present independent evidence to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities on any points in Hydro's referral with which they disagreed.

In October, the Board made an interim report recommending that Hydro be permitted an interim rate increase. This interim report was considered by Cabinet and its recommendations approved, thereby allowing Hydro to increase its rates effective October 18, 1979. The effect of the October increase was estimated to increase rates at the consumer level by approximately 9 per cent, including the effect of higher fuel costs.

The hearing was continued on December 6, 1979 and December 19, 1979 and the Board submitted its report to the Minister of Mines and Energy on February 28, 1980.

MR. L. BARRY: This final report has been considered by Cabinet and its recommendations approved. Hydro's interim rates will remain in effect until March 31st, 1980 and the recommended rates will be effective from April 1, 1980.

It is not possible to state precisely the impact which Hydro's rate increase would have on homeowners' bills until the Board renders its judgement on applications of Newfoundland Light and Power Company. However, Hydro has calculated that the effect of the April increase will be a further 8 to 9 per cent at the consumer level, including the estimated effects of higher fuel costs which are passed on directly to Hydro's customers. And I have to underline that that includes the effects of the higher fuel costs.

For a customer who does not use electricity for home heating, this is equivalent to a further increase of approximately \$2.50 a month, while the bills of customers who heat their homes electrically will be increased by approximately \$8.02 per month. It should be noted that these are merely indicative calculations and that the actual increase in the bill of any consumer would depend, not only on rate increases, but also on individual customer consumption of energy.

It should be emphasized that even after implementing these increases, electricity rates in Newfoundland are below those in the neighbouring provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I would stress the importance of charging electricity rates which cover the cost of service and which provide a margin of profit sufficient to achieve and maintain a sound financial position as it will mean that Hydro will be able to finance more of its expenditures from internally generated funds, thereby reducing interest costs. The result will be reduced costs to the electrical consumer. In addition, an improved capital structure should, in the longer term, lead to comparatively lower borrowing costs both for the Province and for Hydro.

MR. L. BARRY:

Through development of Labrador's renewable hydro-electric resources, Newfoundland and Labrador has the opportunity to have stably priced energy in the 1980's at a time when much of the rest of the world will be facing horrendous price increases and even shortages of energy supply.

The energy produced will not be cheap, but it should stabilize prices. In the meantime, we must work to keep the inevitable price increases as low as possible.

I believe the decision to allow the present rate increases is correct and reasonable.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the consumers in this Province are so discouraged and disillusioned and are wondering where and when it is all going to end?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that members and the general public realize that these increases are brought about in the main by a policy that was adopted by this government, by this administration when they took over a few years ago.

Mr. S. Neary:

Before the takeover by the Tories in this Province, the Newfoundland Hydro was subsidized from the public treasury. There was a substantial amount every year taken from the public treasury to subsidize Newfoundland Hydro to keep electricity rates down in this Province. I am just trying to point out how hypocritical this whole procedure is, Mr. Speaker. And so the government, in its wisdom, rightly or wrongly, took a decision that Newfoundland Hydro would have to stand on its own two feet, would have to break even or declare a profit. So they issued instructions to Newfoundland Hydro, this government, that the Hydro would have to declare a profit, that they would have to stand on their own two feet economically.

And then they turned around and after issuing that ultimatum to Newfoundland Hydro said, "Okay, we are going to allow hearings!" And then, after going through this charade of a hearing, which is a complete waste of time, before the Public Utilities Board, the decision then for approaching any recommendations of the Public Utilities Board rests with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the culprits who started the thing in the beginning, who said you have to declare a profit. Then you have to come back and ask them to approve any recommendations from Newfoundland Hydro.

The whole procedure, Mr. Speaker, is unreal. The government, apparently, has not been prepared to take a stand itself, it has shrugged off, pawned off its responsibility to the Public Utilities Board, and put the Newfoundland Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and other organizations through this charade, and then the ultimate decision then rests with the Cabinet.

And so today, after going through all this procedure, we find the minister up making a statement that there are going to be further increases as of April 1st, of anywhere between

MR. S. NEARY: 8 to 10 per cent in hydro rates in this Province. It has often been said, Mr. Speaker, in this House that this is a sad day for Newfoundland. Well, this is indeed a sad day for Newfoundland. I only wish I could debate the matter with the government, Sir, and perhaps the time is coming in this House when we should set aside a couple of days to debate the cost of living in this House, and the cost of electricity to the consumers.

The Newfoundland consumer, Sir, as I said in the beginning, is wondering when and where it is all going to end. They cannot cope with the high cost of living in this Province and this is going to be a further blow now to the consumer who is already struggling and the government seems to be so preoccupied with other matters that they just do not care about it and have again today put the boots to the consumers of electricity in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite certain to whom I ought to address this question, but I will address it to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and perhaps he may wish to pass part of it, at least, to his colleague. Could the Minister of Finance indicate what the state of play is with regard to the possibility that Petrocan might be reviving its interest in the Come by Chance oil refinery and have there been what I might describe as formal talks or high level talks in that regard in recent times?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the President of Petrocan visited the Province here some time in February, about the middle of February, on another matter and we took that opportunity of discussing their possible interests in the refinery. We knew that they had looked at the refinery some time before that and had not really expressed a lot of interest, but we wanted to see if they had changed their minds. In discussions at that time, we learned from Mr. Hopper that they had taken a somewhat different view, they had not really come to any decision one way or the other but they were viewing the refinery in a somewhat different light. So we undertook therefore to arrange for the Receiver to follow-up that new interest and since that time there have been ongoing talks between the Receiver and Petrocan and we ourselves have had further discussions with representatives of Petrocan. And, I believe, there have even been some direct discussions within Petrocan and ECGD, the guarantor of the first mortgage.

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

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Could I ask the minister if, and I assume that this is the case from what he has said, the Petrocan interest is going to be pursued through the same kind of mechanism that was established when an offer was made publicly for interested parties? In other words, there is no thought that it would be outside the context of the Receiver or dealt with in any way other than simply Petrocan seeing if it can make a bid that would be acceptable to the Receiver or to whoever must make that ultimate decision? Is that the case or has the government looked at possible alternatives to that? In other words, since the Receiver has not received what I might describe as a normal kind of commercial offer according to all reports, is there a new tack being taken or are you simply letting it follow through and relying upon the Receiver to deal with Petrocan in the way that has been the case in the past, like First Arabian, for instance?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I did indicate that we have actually been a bit more active in this regard because we did initiate, after discussions on a somewhat informal basis with Mr. Hopper, we did initiate the contact then between Petrocan and the Receiver. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will understand of course that we are not in an ownership position in regard to the refinery. We are merely in a second mortgagee position so that any offer for the refinery necessarily has to go to the first mortgagee in the first instance, and the Receiver is the first mortgagee's agent. But we are certainly taking a very active interest in this and we are doing all we can to expedite any hopeful discussions going on there. I think one can certainly say that we are being rather more active over this matter than has been the case with some proposals in the past, which really came to us on a second-hand basis and over which we had very little control.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Part of the reason for my question being phrased as it was is, of course, that I happen to represent some of the local creditors who are among my constituents and so on and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) whether or not, for instance, he envisages, and if a solution to this matter comes about through Petrocan, let us say, through Petro Canada, would the position of the local creditors be any different than if some private corporation or the like had acquired the property?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to indicate at this stage of course that there is any real, shall we say, proposal on the ground that is going to go ahead with Petrocan. If that is going to be the case, there have to be some certainly intermediate steps. I do not

DR. COLLINS: want to give the impression that there is a very imminent thing there. If it should come about, clearly Petrocan will have a lot to say in that matter, how they respond to that question. But I might say that this has been a very important point with this government. In all our discussions over any other proposals we were very firm on this, that we wanted this question of some recompense to the local unsecured creditors to be in any proposal, in any final resolution of the matter. We were very insistent on that and I would expect that we will take the same position with any new proposal, be it Petrocan or anyone else.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: My last supplementary is, I think, probably most appropriately directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy and it is very much seeking information because I am not a technician, but the word is that the finds, or the samples, or whatever one wishes to call them, from the present exploration offshore, and the linkage between a potential use of Come By Chance and the offshore development, that the discoveries there

MR. JAMIESON: are not capable, easily, of being upgraded or processed at the Come By Chance refinery as it presently exists. Can the ministers throw any light on that? In other words, would there have to be a complete revision of the structure at Come By Chance in order to accomodate itself to the particular type of oil? I think the word is sweet oil as opposed to sour or something.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding from the preliminary information that has been given us by experts that this is not the case, that in fact a commercially viable operation at Come By Chance could be possible with very little in the way of modifications to the plant and in fact with less modifications than would be required if it were to refine the sour crude for which the original design was planned. So we are optimistic that the product of Hibernia, which is a low sulphur or sweet oil, of a light to medium, thirty-two API, or American Petroleum Index, which has to do with the viscosity of the oil, that type of oil could be refined at Come By Chance.

MR. NEARY: At what cost a barrel (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: It will be competitive, Mr. Speaker, is our understanding.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, on a point of order before I sit down, as I understand I have answered the question.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: I failed to get your eye for another Ministerial Statement before we went to Question Period. If by

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 386

AH-2

MR. BARRY:

leave of the House -

MR. NEARY:

After the Question Period.

MR. BARRY:

- at the end or wherever.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order. The hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. BARRY:

No. At the end of Question Period is fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order,

it is not a point of order but, by leave, after the Question Period.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

My question is for the Minister of

Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), Sir, and I want to say that although I have to give the CBC an assist, it was high on my list of priorities to ask in the House anyway. I want to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) about telephones, why it is in Newfoundland that Newfoundlanders can not go out and buy their own telephones and use their own telephones in their houses? Is it against the law for Newfoundlanders to do this and if so is the minister giving any consideration to changing this foolish setup?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Consumer

Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the

telephone company does have a type of agreement and this is a form of legislation - I really cannot go into it because I cannot give you the details of it, but our department

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: is looking into it and we are hoping that we can have this reversed so that people will be free to buy their own telephones as they can in parts of the United States.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: If I understand the minister correctly, then we can look forward in this session of the House to legislation being brought in making it legal so that the telephone company will no longer have a monopoly, making it legal for Newfoundlanders to be able to go out to these stores and buy their own phones and use their own phones in their own homes. Is this what the minister is saying, that there will be legislation in this session of the House making this legal?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how quickly we can bring this about, but certainly we will do our best and we will do it as quickly as we can.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Would the minister explain for my own benefit, and probably the benefit of other members, why it cannot be done now? What is in the way that bars people now from owning their phones? What legislation, what laws are there? Or is it an agreement, or does the telephone company just have a monopoly themselves? What is it that stops Newfoundlanders now from owning their own phones?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I do not have the details of this information but I certainly will get the information and bring it into this House no later than -

MR. S. NEARY: That will be fine.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, normally I would direct this question to the appropriate minister, but, because of the seriousness of the ramifications of the situation, I would like to direct it to the hon. the Premier. By way of preamble, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that for the past twenty-five years in the Conception Bay area, which now comprises some 40,000 to 60,000 residents, there has been a serious communications problem, and in part that communications problem has been resolved by a decision of the CRTC recently to allow the Colonial Broadcasting System, better known as WOCM, to construct a radio station on the perimeter of the boundaries of Carbonear.

Just recently, the provincial government, namely, the Department of Transportation and Communications, rejected the Station's request for ownership of Crown land. Would the Premier order an appropriate investigation into this situation in the hope that it would be reversed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Two weeks ago I ordered such an investigation, so I am glad to see that I have been two weeks ahead of the hon. the member for Carbonear on this very important issue for the people of Conception Bay. May I also add that I am aware that there were two licences issued, one to the Colonial Broadcasting System, but also one to the Radio System in order to improve that communications system. We are working on it. The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) started two weeks ago after we had talks with Colonial Broadcasting Corporation to ensure that land will be made available so that that improved communications system indeed can be brought about in the hon. member's area and other hon. members' of this House.

MR. R. MOORES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. MOORES: So as I understand it, for fear of not having it clarified, the Premier is saying that in all likelihood there will be a decision, a positive decision in the favour of Colonial Broadcasting to construct a station in Carbonear, not in Port aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) in Port aux Basques

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, I indicated that the government about two weeks ago began talks with Colonial Broadcasting Corporation in order to ensure that they had sufficient land in order to establish their station so that they could get on the air. Whether that is just within Carbonear or just outside the boundary of Carbonear, whether it is in Harbour Grace or whether it is in Bay Roberts, a suitable site to allow for the station to be built so that communication can be provided to the area and to that end we will strive and I am sure we will find a positive solution to it, if already it has not occurred, I know it is well underway and it started about fourteen or fifteen days ago.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor). I would like to ask the minister if his department has any regulations restricting the installation of wood stoves or wood furnaces in houses owned by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation?

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the situation the hon. gentleman is referring to is the one in Happy Valley - Goose Bay where a number of units owned by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, rented to persons in that area, a number of people there apparently began to install such units without any reference to the fire department, without any reference to the town council, without any reference to normal safety requirements, and the Housing Corporation obviously had to take some action to stop that sort of procedure. We would not be totally adverse to something that was done, and installation that was done in accordance with proper requirements. However, the difficulty here is that these are rentals units and people come and go and we would prefer to see it done by a Housing Corporation, if indeed, there is a need for wood burning stoves or furnaces to be installed in these units. I see as a far more critical problem in that area, Mr. Speaker, the low grade of insulation in these units and I have taken action to approach the federal government to see if a CHIP programme can be applied to these units and we will be moving along with that with all due haste.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and I wonder if at this time the minister is any position to make a statement with respect to the ongoing negotiations between either the government or MCP, or both, and the Newfoundland Medical Association with respect to the fee schedules? The minister, of course, will recognize that the question is prompted by the decision of NMA to go public in a fairly spectacular fashion with their side of the story.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, just after the N.M.A. settled last year, sometime, I think, in October with retro-activity to April for 8 per cent, there was a committee set up by government of the Newfoundland Medical Association, the government departments, Treasury Board and Department of Health and the MCP people, to make recommendations to government regarding doctor remuneration, or the physician, I suppose, or MCP remuneration

MR. ROBERTS: Money.

MR. W. HOUSE: Money, yes. I do not know if that new song that is out "I Want Money" emanated from that or not.

That report, I think, has been completed.

It has not been acted on, we have not made any decision.

The report is to advise government and I think it has been received and it is in the process of being assessed. And, of course, it will be taken into consideration in the budgetary process.

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

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the minister for that information and ask whether the report will be made public or whether he regards it as being an internal government document? - which would surprise me, I may say, because it has been put together apparently with quite wide involvement from a lot of people who are not in any way involved in the employ of the government.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know it is a government document. It is a document done for government to guide government and at this point in time I cannot say whether it will or will not be made public. It is just for the benefit of government to make some decision on.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle, followed by the hon. the member from Lewisporte. :

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Minister of Health; since he is not going to make the document public, apparently, could he tell us when we might expect some decision and some announcement on this given that we now have statements by the NMA and, I may add, statements in the House by a eminently qualified gentleman, the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), which seem to indicate that all is not well with the health services in this Province, particularly on the medical side, the physician's side? Given that and given the fact that that will create widespread concern, as it should and as it is intended to, when may we expect some announcement from the minister and his colleagues with respect to this issue?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, two points first, the fact that the Newfoundland Medical Association

MR. W. HOUSE:

have put on a campaign to express their concern. This was made known to us back in October, I think, of '79; they advised that and, of course, they did this with our blessing. We know that -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) public statements the government

MR. W. HOUSE: Public statements about their own situation, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Dr. Whalen was interviewed in the newspapers.

MR. W. HOUSE: Yes, I knew that was happening. He talked to me about that before.

MR. E. ROBERTS: With your blessing, with the minister's blessing.

MR. W. HOUSE: Well, he stated that he had talked to us, I think he made reference to the fact that he had sympathy with our situation and he recognized the situation that we were in. So they are pointing out the situation of doctors relative to pay in the Province and we knew this was going to happen. When we will be able to make some statement as to what is going to happen is a budgetary consideration and, of course, that will be done in due course.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) I would like to ask the Premier a question relative to the seal hunt. The last two or three years we saw hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money being spent by the government to defend the seal hunt throughout the world and I am wondering now whether the government has dropped that policy? I know they are still defending the seal hunt, we all are, but I am just wondering whether or not any of those steps that were taken those past few years are going to be continued under the present government?

MR. S. NEARY: Not with McConnell they will not.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: The decision right now, Mr. Speaker, is to not get involved in additional public expenditures as it relates to defending the seal hunt. We want to examine just what the consensus is around North America and Europe and it would seem, I think evidence bears me out on this over the last number of weeks, that there does not seem to be the same kind of strength and intensity to the anti-seal movement, both in the United States and in Europe, as it has been in former years. One can speculate as to why that is so. Is it because that the programme that the government put on over the last number of years was so effective? Is it because there are other things which are taking up the time of these interest groups? Is it that they have changed their strategy to a more subtle and oblique way of trying to get it across or whatever. Suffice it to say now, we are just willing at this point in time to sit back, if you will, and watch to see what does happen as it relates to the whole seal fishery and whether in fact any particular special endeavors will have to be made by the government. It does not seem to us, in this present year that, that will be necessary and we will view and look cautiously upon what happens over the next year or so to see whether in fact this particular policy now needs to be changed again and additional public funds spent.

But I think the message has gone out fairly loud and clear, besides which, of course, the United States with their ongoing seal hunt on the West coast has diverted some attention away and a lot of the groups have spent some time on it. So that is the present position, that we will not be spending any money directly upon a pro-sealing campaign because at this point in time we do not think it is necessary.

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

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

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier said they were going to, and I can use his exact words, "examine the consensus," and I was wondering whether or not the structure that was put in place to promote the seal hunt and to defend the seal hunt has been disbanded, you know, the bureaucratic structure, and whether or not there is a committee within government examining what is happening to the seal hunt throughout the world?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No. There is no special committee. It is just being done by the Department of Fisheries and by the other interested people in government. But there is none, there is no special committee. There is no amount of money directed specifically at examining that. We do our ongoing survey of world news of course through the Legislative Library and I get that all the time as do the ministers in the government, so that we have a fair idea just what the world kind of press is saying about it, but there is no special team, special amount of money applied to that right now. We are doing it in the same way, I guess, the hon. member is, listening and reading and seeing what the feeling is. Of course, also in talking to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa, Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Fisheries itself there, with the various connections that they have around the world.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Rochers.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and of course he is aware I am asking the question having access to a Ministerial Statement that he is going to present shortly and I will obviously be responding to the Ministerial Statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. JAMIESON: Ask a question before we get the statement!

MR. BARRY: Well, I mean if this is the practice, we will just have to rise to the occasion.

MR. FLIGHT: Now the minister had better be careful.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! If the hon. member has a question, I would direct him to ask his question.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Ministerial Statement indicates that the company came into -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - we do have a procedure, if my friend will let me -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is a point of order, I guess.

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

MR. ROBERTS: It is a point of better order. The problem has come about because the minister inadvertently neglected to make the statement at the time he ought to have made it. Now we have given him leave to make it at the end of Question Period, in response to his request. Now perhaps what we could do is if we could have leave to have my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) ask the same question after the statement. The minister said yesterday he was going to make a statement today.

MR. BARRY: No problem there.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, that is what we will do then. Then my hon. friend can still have his question and he can ask after the statement and we will go on from there in the right way. How is that?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, before an agreement is made on that point -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: You are going to disagree with me, too, are you? It is a bad week.

MR. FLIGHT: No disagreement, it is a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. A ruling has been made in this House that the member on this side answering a Ministerial Statement gets half the time. Now I will not concede my right in Question Period unless I am given the understanding that after I finish my -

MR. ROBERTS: We have set up for that.

MR. FLIGHT: - reaction or my statement to the minister that I then get the right to ask a question.

MR. ROBERTS: You get the right to ask a question.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right. That is right.

MR. HODDER: And two supplementaries.

MR. FLIGHT: And two supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order. I perhaps should point out first of all that I have not asked if hon. members to my right have granted leave. I said I would do that at the end of Question Period, so then we will have to wait and see whether or not leave will be granted to allow the Ministerial Statement to be presented.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, with about two minutes left in Question Period, if the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) has a question, I would allow him the opportunity to ask a question.

MR. ROBERTS: But not on a Ministerial Statement 'Graham'.

MR. SPEAKER: But when the Ministerial Statement time comes, we will have to adhere to the former rulings that have been given in the past where you have half the time to respond.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 391

NM - 4

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is simply this; after fifty years of operation in Buchans, and having carried out extensive exploration programmes over those years, has it been the practice of ASARCO to come to the minister and have a meeting and advise him on any exploration programmes that they have had in their mind this past fifty years?

MR. FLIGHT: or in the minister's mind is this a precedent in the sense that they have come in now to advise him on their exploration programmes?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I doubt if before 1972 the government ever spoke to the mining companies of this Province. At least if you looked at the mining policy you would conclude that the only time they spoke was when they wanted to give away something, give away a resource in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Since 1972, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that during my tenure earlier, from 1972 to 1975, and during the Premier's tenure as Minister of Mines and Energy there were many meetings with all of the mining companies around this Province. I myself have been having periodic and regular reports from ASARCO. As a matter of fact, I have had a number of meetings with Abitibi Price concerning the Buchans mining operation. I have had a number of meetings just since July of last year.

So there is nothing, Mr. Speaker - I can understand why the hon. member opposite would find it extraordinary or unusual that we are staying on top of what is going on in the mining industry, but for his information I have to say that it is my practice to request the mining companies in this Province to give periodic and regular reports so that we can stay on top of what is happening and what the companies are planning to have happen in the industry in all parts of the Province, not just Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

We have time for about a ten second question.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir. Well, in view of the Premier's speech that we have in front of us that he is going to make today, Sir, and you cannot read your speeches in this House, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what the government is doing on the regulations to compel West German companies that are in here with offshore servicing, ships, boats, that are servicing these offshore rigs, what he is doing to have these boats placed under Canadian registration and Canadian boats used with crews of Newfoundlanders on these boats? What is the hon. gentleman doing about that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are most concerned because there are no boats available in Newfoundland, and not that many in Canada that are involved in the servicing of the oil rigs, but we are more concerned about the Newfoundlanders that are going to get jobs on those boats and, as is our practice, where there is a Newfoundlander who is qualified for the job the companies will be bound to hire the Newfoundlander first. If there is not a Newfoundlander or Labradorian available to do that job and that can be shown, that they are not, then of course they can go outside. But in the first instance Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must be hired and we will continue to enforce the regulations that are in place to ensure that that happens.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for the Oral Question period has expired. I am sure hon. members would like to join with me in welcoming fifty grade nine students from Mary Queen of the World school in Mount Pearl together with their teachers, Mr. Robert Sauve, Sister Theresa Doyle and Mrs. Jean Hall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And as well we have visiting with

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): us a group of students from Bishop Field College in St. John's who are here engaging in a work experience programme. I trust both groups will find their visit to be informative and interesting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to get back to the matter raised by the hon. minister. Is there leave to revert back to Ministerial Statements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

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

MR. BARRY: I would like to thank hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and yourself. At a meeting held yesterday with officials of ASARCO Incorporated we reviewed company plans to further explore and evaluate the Tunks Brook deposits. These plans, which involve underground work, were announced to the staff and the union at Buchans earlier this week. And I might say that I am happy to see the company proceeding in this fashion, rather than have announcements made from St. John's before the people the people in Buchans know what is happening they do make it a practice now to have their discussions with the people at Buchans to let them know what is happening with respect to their livelihood. There are three small deposits at Tunks Brook containing copper, lead, zinc, gold and silver which together total something in excess of 500,000 recoverable tons. The discovery and delineation of these deposits is the result of several years of exploration in the area by the Price Company and ASARCO Incorporated under their co-tenancy agreement. That exploration programme will be continued this year with the driving of an exploration adit into one of the deposits.

MR. L. BARRY:

I want to stress that the underground work is for exploration purposes only. There has been no decision yet to mine the Tulks deposits. Driving the adit will enable the companies to obtain information on mining conditions in that particular ground, and also - and this is very important, Mr. Speaker, - to obtain a 100 to 200 ton bulk sample for metallurgical testing. The sample will be subjected to various tests during the 1980 - 1981 Winter season to determine how much of the metals present can be recovered. And I might say that until these metallurgical tests are carried out, neither the company nor government knows whether the mining of the Tulks deposits can be viable. Under the best of circumstances, mining of the Tulks deposits will probably be only marginally viable. However, it is the company's hope that ore from these deposits will provide the means of maintaining operations at the Buchans mill for a few more years while exploration in the general area continues. However, much will depend on metal prices. Continued high metal prices, especially precious metals, will be necessary, as indeed they have been a crucial factor in continued operations of the MacLean mine. At present it is anticipated the MacLean mine will be able to continue operations during the Winter of 1980 - 1981, and this is because of the high metal prices. Over that period the tests will be carried out on the Tulks deposit and it is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that if these tests go favourable and I have to stress, 'if' they go favourably - then in the Spring of 1981, we should be able to indicate further what the potential for development of these deposits will be. And at best, if it is viable to mine them, you are speaking about a possible four to seven year life extension of the Buchans mining operations. 'If' - and I underline 'if' - and it would be cruel, Mr. Speaker, cruel, cruel, cruel, not to stress the 'if' in this equation for the people at Buchans - 'if' the tests go properly, then there is the hope and the possibility that there will be an extension of the life of the Buchans mining operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his statement and I want to say that I think that what is contained in his statement augurs well for the people of Buchans if all the things that are possible come of this exploration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that two days ago, the people of Buchans were living under the pending shut-down of a mine in August. The union had been told there would be no more negotiations. They had negotiated their last work agreement, sixty-six men had been laid off, all young men who grew up in Buchans who are now anywhere from Lynn Lake to the British Empire - all over the world - sixty-six men.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that even with all the 'ifs' the minister has referred to, I would rather stand here and be accused of raising the expectations of the people of Buchans than stand in Buchans and be accused of carrying on the kind of dog-in-the-manger, close-mouthed attitude that both companies involved in that operation for the past fifty years have carried on. Mr. Speaker, there are times it can be said that it has been carried on with the understanding and the co-operation of the minister. And, Mr. Speaker, if my association, if anything that I have said, has raised expectations, I am prepared to say that the action of the company and sometimes of this government has been totally and completely demoralizing to the people of Buchans.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: And I would rather raise expectations than demoralize people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just another couple of words, if you would, Sir. This statement is more noteworthy for what it does not say than what it does say. The fact is, as I tried to allude to in my question, never before, not for the past seven years - and the minister knows it - have ever ASARCO or Abitibi Price come in to talk specifically about exploration. They have spent billions of dollars in exploration. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, the minister knows -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is getting into debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I was about to call the hon. member to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: On a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of personal privilege.

MR. L. BARRY: On a point of personal privilege, the

hon. member is saying that I have misled this House. I just finished stating that I have had meetings with these companies concerning their

MR. L. BARRY: since July of this year apart from between 1972 and 1975. Now I will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement that he just made.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any statement that the minister finds offensive.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I understand that the hon. member has withdrawn any statements, and that disposes of the matter.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans has about one minute left.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let me say I would like for the minister to have included in his statement exactly what took place in that meeting. I would like for him to tell the House whether or not in his statement that ASARCO had come in and talked about the possibility of actually mining that area and what would be entailed and whether or not there would be assistance from the government of this Province in providing access roads and bridges to the construction sites. Now why did the minister not include that particular thing which is of all importance to the people of Buchans as to whether they are going to get that kind of co-operation for from this government?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. G. FLIGHT: That too; Mr. Speaker, should have been part of this ministerial statement and it was part of the discussion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I think this would be the area where I would inform hon. members I had undertaken yesterday to table a copy of the poll referred to in the Auditor General's report. Apparently, there is only one in existence which has been furnished to the RCMP and we have asked them to make a copy and send us the copy.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)
Well, maybe the hon. gentleman has one he can table it but I do not. I am only aware that there is one and that one has gone.

MR. S. NEARY: How many members are on the Public Accounts Committee?

MR. THOMS: They all have a copy.

MR. S. NEARY: They all have a copy, that is at least five.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they do not have a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I understand they do not have a copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have one copy of the copy.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: They have a copy of the copy.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, get it copied, get it copied!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: That is what we are doing, we are getting it copied.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I undertook to do during Question Period yesterday in reply to questions raised by some hon. members, I wish to provide greater detail about education and training programmes and courses in place now and planned for next year to prepare the Province's people to participate in jobs generated through offshore resource exploration and related activities. The College of Fisheries in St. John's now offers a series of short courses entitled Oil Spill Countermeasures Training, which are paid for by the oil companies themselves. In addition, the Fisheries College has increased its training of crews, deck hands, mates, engineers and captains for supply vessels and offshore rigs. At the present time the college is training 130 such people where normally the number would be fifty or fewer. Special programmes are also offered for cooks to serve on the oil rigs. The college has also designed a special programme called Marine Emergency Duties Training, primarily for people associated with supply ships and oil and gas rigs. These programmes are funded by Canada Employment in the normal way.

Also, the Education Department, including the administration of the vocational schools, sixteen or seventeen throughout the Province and the three colleges - the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, both in St. John's, and the Bay St. George Community College are planning a series of new programmes and some extensions or revisions to its existing ones to meet the needs of offshore oil development. I am listing a number of new or revised programmes in the planning stages for the next school year starting September 1980.

MS. L. VERGE: First, the district vocational school in Gander is gearing up for a Helicopter Maintenance Programme and, secondly, a revision and modification of its electronics programmes to adapt them to the needs of off-shore activities. The Bay St. George Community College is planning an Oil Drilling programme for next September. The College of Trades and Technology is planning for several courses, Hydrographic Surveying Technology, expanded Civil Engineering Technology leading into petroleum industry technology, Electrical Technology, and Computer Data Entry Operator training and Computer Studies and Accounting Technology.

Lastly, the Fisheries College is planning about nine courses, specifically, first Expansion and Modification of Electronics Technology programmes, Helicopter Crash Survivor Training Commercial Diving, revision of the Electronics and Communications.

MS. L. VERGE:

programmes, offshore survivor training, marine firefighting, inflatable life raft training, rig rescue, boat training and oil pollution.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Affairs and Environment.

The hon. Minister of Consumer

MRS. H. NEWHOOK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) raised a matter in the House as to whether or not a company known as Cheque Alert was violating any of the credit information laws of this Province. I wish to inform the House that we have received a legal opinion from the Department of Justice to the effect that this type of operation falls under the jurisdiction of our Credit Reporting Agencies Act. And I wish to further inform this House that Cheque Alert is registered under the Credit Reporting Agencies Act and, of course, consumers will be protected under the provisions of this Act.

For the information of the House, I would further advise that companies registered under the Credit Reporting Agencies Act are only permitted to retain information in their files as it relates to bad debts for a period of six years.

MR. S. NEARY:

breaking the law.

So, in other words, they are

AN HON. MEMBER:

Six years.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK:

Yes. Well, I do not know if they are actually doing that but they did say that this could be done so whether, you know, this particular agency has actually done it we really do not know as yet. And further, that upon receiving information of payment of such debts, they must immediately rectify their records and make further reports given on that person - any reports given on that particular person must be rectified, any information already sent out, they have to send out a rectified statement.

MR. S. NEARY: So they are operating outside of the law.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: No, I would not say that they are operating outside of the law.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, they have information -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. minister.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: I think that was a television programme and I did see part of it but not all and I thought they were showing what they could do but not actually that they had that information already. They were probably reporting on how it works in other parts of Canada because these Cheque Alert agencies are all over Canada and they are registered under -

MR. S. NEARY: That does not make them legal because they are all over Canada.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: No, I am not saying that.

And I would further inform the House that the Credit Reporting Agencies Act will be reviewed in the very near future in favour of a new Consumers Reporting Agencies Act which is much broader in scope and will describe how personal information is to be compiled and will give further protection to the consumer.

The matter of employing Social Insurance Numbers as a means of identifying individuals who have issued NSF cheques has raised concerns respecting the invasion of privacy and I wish to inform the House that the Government of Canada has recently initiated a study with respect to the use of Social Insurance Numbers and the implication of such use for the privacy of individuals. The Privacy Commissioner has been in touch with our government respecting the use of Social Insurance Numbers and we shall await the outcome of this study to determine whether or not changes should be made or restraints imposed upon the existing consumer protection legislation.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 278 residents of St. Brendan's, a substantial petition, Mr. Speaker, from that area, of 278 residents which represents

MR. T. LUSH:

about ninety-seven per cent of the voters in that area which shows the importance to these people of this particular petition. And, Mr. Speaker, it should be no surprise to hon. members to know that it relates to the ferry service that operates between Burnside and St. Brendan's, and let me read the petition first, Mr. Speaker.

It says, "To the hon. House of Assembly, the petition of we, the undersigned, being residents and electors of St. Brendan's in the provincial district of Terra Nova, humbly demonstrate that we protest in the strongest possible terms the complete inadequacy of the present ferry boat to meet the needs of St. Brendan's and that of other people who use the ferry.

"We therefore request the provincial government to allocate in this fiscal year sufficient monies for the purchase and operation of a larger and more adequate ferry boat and that the ferry be requested to make two round trips per day, weather permitting, this arrangement to remain in effect until ice and winter weather conditions prevent same. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray."

That is the petition, Mr. Speaker, asking in essence two things: (1) for a new, larger and improved ferry system, and, secondly, once that is done, that the ferry be required to make two trips every day per week.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the petition may I say that the petition certainly, I think, probably does not do justice almost to the complete inadequacy of this present ferry system. I am not sure that there are words to describe the complete inadequacy of this particular system, and Mr. Speaker, that is to say nothing about the operators. First, when that ferry system was put there it was an improvement over what was already there. It could carry three cars and the one prior to that could not carry any vehicles at all. Put of course it is so outdated, and in view of the fact that the federal government have spent I think upwards to \$500,000 in upgrading the terminals,

MR. T. LUSH: that something should be done about the ferry because the present ferry boat just does not fit in with the new terminals that are there. So unless we get a new ferry boat there, the money spent by the federal government is going to be a complete waste.

The new terminals are designed for stern loading, which will enable the operators to load more effectively. So right now these terminals are just about useless unless we get a new ferry. And I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the operators of the present ferry there, anxious to improve the ferry service, have made a proposal to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), in hopes of getting a new ferry boat there on the service this year. And I understand that he has got an excellent boat in mind that has been looked at by experts in Newfoundland and I have been called by these people, people from the Ship Owners Association, who think it is an excellent ferry. It is also CSI inspected. You would not have to waste money on it in getting it upgraded as was the case in the ferry on Little Bay Islands. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a great opportunity and if that boat is not gotten within the next couple of months then we could lose an excellent service for St. Brendan's. But it is contingent upon the approval, of course, of the proposal that the operators put in, which is an excellent proposal, and Mr. Speaker, I hope that the minister will see fit to review that proposal. It is a very reasonable proposal, and to see to it that the people of St. Brendan's are given a better ferry service. The ferry service now, Sir, is not fit to put cattle on, absolutely ridiculous.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. T. LUSH: If hon. members were to see that, I am sure they would agree that it is not the kind of boat that human beings should have to travel on. Mr. Speaker, it is the only way for these people to get off from the Island and it is a -

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 396

NM-3

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

has expired.

Order, please! The hon. member's time

MR. LUSH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. LUSH:

- ask to have it placed upon the table of the
House and referred to the department to which it relates.

- ask to have it placed upon the table of the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms):

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague on behalf of his constituents in St. Brendan's there who are forced through geography, through no fault of their own, forced into isolation and have to use the services of the ferry to get out of St. Brendan's. Having been born and raised on an island and knowing so much about the problems of transportation, Sir, I can sympathize with the people in St. Brendan's and the hon. member who is pushing for improved ferry service for that community.

The government seems to have made a shambles, Mr. Speaker, along with a good many other things, they seem to have made a shambles out of in recent years of the intra-provincial ferry services in this Province. Somehow or other the government has allowed the government of Canada off the hook, to buy their way out of -

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL:

It is a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the people of St. Brendan's with respect to their own specific ferry service. The hon. gentleman now is getting into the realm of debate when he is obviously introducing matters pertaining to the entire ferry service in the Island, the Canadian Government etc.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order, the hon. the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from LaPoile is certainly speaking of ferry services in general but he is not debating, point one; and point two, it is surely appropriate, in fact nothing could be more appropriate than in speaking in behalf of a petition or in support of a petition for an improvement in ferry

MR. E. ROBERTS: services in one area to speak of ferry services in general. That is the very essence of the way in which - one of the legitimate ways, proper ways in which one can support a petition. The ferry service in St. Brendan's cannot be regarded in isolation. It should not be regarded in isolation. The ferry service in St. Brendan's has to be regarded as being one of a group of intra- as opposed to inter-provincial ferry services being offered in this Province. I suggest that what my hon. friend from LaPoile district is saying is quite in order and he should be allowed to conclude his remarks. He is not debating, Sir. If he were to debate that, of course, would be out of order. But all he is doing is supporting the petition in his own inimitable but effective style.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, I would bring to the attention of hon. members Standing Order No. 92, which is quite clear and says that any member speaking in favor of a petition should confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached and the material allegations it contains. And there shall be no debate on a petition. I suspect that maybe the hon. the Member for LaPoile was beginning to drift into the realm of debate and ask him to confine his remarks to the petition as presented.

MR. S. NEARY: I am sure that the people who signed this petition are aware, Mr. Speaker, are very conscious of the fact that this government let the Government of Canada off the hook, that the government took over the intra-provincial ferry services without any provision for improving ferries such as we see in, such as the one in St. Brendan's. Therein lies the problem, Mr. Speaker. Your Honor knows that up to a year ago the Government of Canada had assumed the responsibility for operating these ferry services here in the Province. Somehow or other, down through the years, the

MR. S. NEARY: previous government that has been so much maligned, managed to persuade the Government of Canada to assume the responsibility for these ferries that were operating within the Province, Although there is some doubt whether or not the government of Canada should have taken them over

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I mean, Your Honor has made a ruling touching on the remarks made by the hon. gentleman before I got up on the first point of order. And it is my understanding that the point of order was sustained. And the hon. gentleman is now continuing, he is not addressing himself to the material allegations of the petition from the people of St. Brendan's.

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

MR. S. NEARY: You wasting the time of the House; it is ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Sir, I must protest. I think the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) is verging unto debate himself when he says what his understanding is as to what a point of order did. You know, a point of order was raised and Your Honor made a ruling on it and the ruling speaks for itself.

MR. E. ROBERTS: hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), I would suggest, is trying to comply with the ruling and I submit he is doing it in his own effective but inimitable way. Your Honour, you know, my learned friend from St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) is attempting to penalize the gentleman from LaPoile for his style, for the very warp and woof of his substance as a speaker. My friend from LaPoile has been in this House - I do not know - longer than anybody else now. Is it not seventeen or eighteen years? He has developed his own style, Sir, it is particular to him, and I submit he ought to be allowed to speak within the rules of the House as he is without being harassed by the gentleman from St. John's East, who is exhibiting his own particular and peculiar style, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I agree that the hon. the member for LaPoile has his own style and I believe that in this particular case, he may be drifting into the realm of debate. So he has about half a minute to conclude his comments.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we were told when the ferry service was taken over by the Province that the Water Transport section of the Department of Transport in Ottawa would move to Newfoundland, and my understanding is they have not yet moved here because of a policy, apparently, that exists whereby the federal Department of Public Works are trying to force them into the basement of a building of one of the buddies of the administration here that they do not want to go into. So this matter of improving the ferry service will never be brought about the way the government is approaching it now unless, Mr. Speaker, the Premier moves to take action like he did in his own district in the case of Little Bay Islands. And that is the only way that the people in St. Barbe will get their improved ferry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL: Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, Address in Reply.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to start off this morning by saying that in the five years that I have been a member of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, I can say without fear of contradiction that it has always been a policy of this Party and a policy of its leadership to encourage and to promote individual opinion, whether those opinions differ with that of the Party or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

Perhaps of all the members on this side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES:

I ask, Mr. Speaker, for no interjections, please.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! The hon. member has requested to be heard without interruption.

MR. R. MOORES:

In my five years, Mr. Speaker, some of the members on the other side will tell you that I have not been one to interject members of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES:

I have never been guilty of that indiscretion.

Mr. Speaker, for five years I have sat in this Party and on many instances I, myself, have disagreed with the leadership of the Party and its policies on various issues facing the people of Newfoundland.

My colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout) yesterday, in a very noble and a very eloquent fashion, stood and submitted to this House his personal belief as to what the policy of this Party should be towards offshore ownership of resources, oil and gas. What I did not know, however, yesterday afternoon, was that the government of this Province had been informed prior to the presentation of that speech that it was to be made.

MR. R. MOORES:

My colleague from Baie Verte -

White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout) in true sincerity, in the belief that what he was saying was right, stood in this House, and in one of the best speeches I have ever heard, put that belief forward for the House to accept.

The government of this Province knew in advance, and like a bunch of clowns in a circus, they stacked their benches and they beat on the desks, and they turned a sincere effort by a colleague of mine to a third-rate, cheap, political trick.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the terminology, "cheap political trick" and "a bunch of clowns". I find them to be unparliamentary and I believe we can do without those expressions.

MR. MOORES: Without reservation, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. That was unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. gentleman.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have heard in this debate, government members stand in their seat and with faces like stone, serious, somber and sober, tell the people of Newfoundland and the members of this House, through the media or whatever, that all of us on this side of the House, every Liberal in this House and in this Province is a traitor to the cause of Newfoundland because we do not readily accept, without reservation, we do not readily accept without question, we do not readily accept without intelligent debate, the selfish, greedy stand of the government that ownership must come at all costs. And in order for the government of this Province to stuff its pockets, to set up its heritage fund, to isolate itself from the federal government and from the people and from the nation of Canada, that we on this side have deliberately orchestrated, orchestrated an anti-Newfoundland and an anti-Newfoundlander policy toward offshore oil and natural resources.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something, that for my part, and I think I speak not only for the Liberal members in this House but for every member in this House and every person in Newfoundland, that we are all Newfoundlanders and we share a common universal theme that we want Newfoundland to own its offshore rights, we want Newfoundland to receive the maximum benefits from anything that is under the water and we feel that there are various methods by which a government or a party can go about best achieving it. And the Government of Newfoundland says that the best way

MR. MOORES: of achieving this is outright almost irrational confrontation with our federal authorities in Ottawa. Well, let me point out to the Premier, who is a university graduate, albeit in an education degree, but nonetheless an university graduate, that of all the books, of all the references that I have studied in my university days on matters of nationalism, there is not one authority in the world who has not rejected as an intellectual disease an irrational method of dealing on diplomatic levels. And the Premier of this Province is now encouraging, in the most blatant of ways, nationalism in its rawest sense, that we must stand for Newfoundland or we must fall as contemptuous and treacherous people. Well, let me point out to the Premier of this Province that if history is an example to him, if he learns at all from history or is guided by the things that have occurred in the past, then I warn him that if he pursues as aggressively and almost as childishly as he is presently pursuing this provincialism, this nationalism or fall -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: that the people of Newfoundland may not accept it. The people of Newfoundland, let me tell you something, proved in 1971 that they had reached the age of maturity that they had become educated enough to assess the policies of a government or the policies of parties that represent them in election. The people of Newfoundland are no longer ignorant, they can see through, sometimes, a deliberate murkiness, a deliberate muddying of the waters by politicians who want to promote their own ends and their own aims. And I say to you now that if the Premier of this Province want to go to the people and whether the people of this Province should be selfish and greedy or if they should stand as Canadians to promote this nation and to share in the good fortunes of this Province, while at the same time for twenty-five years we have been living, we have been existing, we have been subsisting because of the good fortunes of the people of Ontario and British Columbia and the have Provinces of this nation, then if you want to go to the people on that issue, my best advice to you is to be careful; you may not come back with thirty-three seats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: One of the most debilitating things in our Canadian Confederation today is the attitude of certain Premier's in this nation, an attitude of colloquialism, of provincialism, where they want to promote the aims and objectives of their own Province versus those of our nation as a whole. This is a co-operative federalism a nation of ten provinces who have gathered together for the benefit of all of us, all people, rich and poor. And now when the Province of Newfoundland is on the brink of becoming prosperous, of becoming a have province, the Premier of this Province want to say to the Opposition, 'If you share, you are a traitor and if you do not stand with us, you are not a Newfoundlander'. Well, I say to you Mr.

MR. R. MOORES: Premier, be careful how you approach this very serious issue. My final warning to you is perhaps you should move outside the overpass. Perhaps you should go out to the outports and ask the people of this Province just exactly -

MR. S. NEARY: Get away from the St. John's vested interests and the offshore services crowd and the insurance gang.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: But there is a more important issue, Mr. Speaker. I do not have to stand here and defend my position as an independent, free-thinking member of this caucus, or as an independent Newfoundlander as true and as blue as anyone or as true and as red as anyone. I think that my hon. colleague from Bellevue, the Leader of the Opposition, a renowned statesman in every sense of the word, has encouraged and promoted as valiantly as I have seen any leader of our party, free will and free thinking on behalf of our members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: I myself have, on occasion, and I say it here now publicly for the record, have challenged him in caucus meetings, and I have challenged senior members of this caucus as to their position on policies and I am glad to say that some of them have, even after hearing my objections, decided to modify their positions. And I am saying now that I do not have to stand here and defend it with the Premier of this Province who is about to give a speech, by the way, and I do not thank him for the fore-warning of his speech because I believe that the content of it reflects his limited intellect on this issue as it relates to party politics in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 400

EL - 3

MR. R. MOORES:

To accuse the Liberal Opposition
in this Province of an orchestrated, deliberate attempt to
be anti Newfoundland,

MR. R. MOORES: I would like to see you take that to the polls, Mr. Premier. I would like to see you take that to the polls in Carbonear, I grant you that much.

Mr. Speaker, in my final remarks I would like to say that my position on offshore ownership resources, oil and gas. is exactly the same as I believe it to be of my colleagues on this side of the House, that we are clearly, without question, Newfoundlanders who believe that the offshore resources now presently at issue in this Province is ours unequivocally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: The only thing that I find most frustrating about this is how often do I have to say it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. R. MOORES: How often, Mr. Speaker, do I have to get up in this House -

MR. S. NEARY: So long as they want to play cheap political politics (inaudible)

MR. R. MOORES: - and say it -

MR. S. NEARY: They do not want to (inaudible)

MR. R. MOORES: to say that I -

MR. S. NEARY: They are more interested in politics.

MR. R. MOORES: - accept the argument of the Premier of this Province, that it is our resource, we do own it and there is no question about that. How often do I have to say that to make people believe that that is our stand? But we are not going to give the Premier of this Province a blank cheque to tear this country apart, to make fools of us in Confederation, to go up with his boxing gloves on to talk to that little Frenchman, as he calls him -

MR. S. NEARY: No, that is not what he calls him. He calls him worse than that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, worse than that.

MR. R. MOORES: You do not fool -

MR. S. NEARY: It would be unparliamentary for you to say it in the House.

MR. R. MOORES: - you can not mislead and misdirect the Opposition of this Province in the execution of our responsibilities to the people. And we are asking you now to modify your approach, to sit down and talk to these people in Ottawa sensibly and seriously, not as a Newfoundlander versus the rest of Canada but as a Canadian -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: - who wants to share in the prosperity and the progress of this nation, as a Canadian who wants to share the wealth with the rest of Canada who have been feeding and clothing us for the last twenty-five years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: I say to you, Mr. Premier, in all fairness as a politician in this Province who has proven that I can be as astute as others in getting re-elected and increasing my majority by ten times, let me warn you, do not be too hasty in going to the people of the Province on this selfish issue that you have been expounding. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I once again would feel sorry that there is not more co-ordination on the other side of the House on this very vital issue and that it seems clear, regardless of what I have in my prepared speech here, that members of the Opposition, the Opposition generally, are going to try to take the approach, one -which I think you are doing a sad thing for Newfoundland - that we are being selfish; and two, that you are going to try to pit me as one Newfoundlander against the rest of Canada. I would almost sit down again and not give the speech because of what I perceive on the other side of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: House as being a deliberate attempt to try to depict a picture of me personally, and do not say that you are not trying to do it because you are from that speech that was just given, of somehow being selfish and un-Canadian and, more important than that, you are using that politically now that the way out of your dilemma, your delima of principle, which I acknowledge - and everybody has his dilemma of principle - to try then to politically picture that into me being some wide-eyed, wild-eyed, insane, half-crazy individual who is only interested in attack for the sake of attack, that is number one; which I think you are doing a disservice to this House and to yourselves - forget me. And then secondly, to try to paint a selfish, hoarding individual or government.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I will say, Mr. Speaker - and I hope I have the unanimous consent of this House to read this speech; if I do not I do not intend to; I will just table it - I will go around this Province everywhere to refute those principles, because they are too important. And if hon. members want to persist in that approach we will have an election, and we will have it a lot sooner than you think, because this is more important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the platform wants to be - and I will allow the Opposition to present the platform - if the platform wants to be that the Leader of the Government of this Province is a selfish individual, and that the Leader of the Government of this Province is a person who is only out for some wild personal ambition of his, then we will see - they have already spoken once on things almost as important, on planks, not even a year ago, and they will speak again. But more important than that, because it is not one, and I am sorry the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) perceives it as that, it is not one of getting elected or not getting elected. I do not mind about being elected or not being elected. My purpose in being involved in public life, and I hope all members' purposes in being involved in public life is not necessarily to get elected. That is a lever through which one goes to try to serve one's Province, that is what is important, and whether you serve it as an elected member or as a fisherman in Toogood Arm, that is what it is all about. It is not a question of whether you can get elected on this issue, or not get elected on another issue. What a sorry way to present the major issues of the day. If it is convenient and if it is politically convenient, therefore you get elected on it. The question supersedes and overrides those kinds of silly proletariat type of concerns right now. What is at stake here is the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, whether we get elected or we do not get elected we must take stands on principle. It has

PREMIER PECKFORD: nothing to do with that. And let it be clear, Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with being selfish or trying to picture me now.

Let us, as hon. members here for once in our lives, while we are here in this House, I am not interested in picturing parties here. I am interested in an issue which is more important than our political lives, more important than our party lives for the next ten or fifteen years. It supersedes that. It is the most important issue ever to face, as I say in the speech, ever to face this Province and will continue to be for the next two or three years, depending on how it is resolved. And it is not one of a principle of no sharing versus a principle of sharing, it is a principle of sharing. That is what it boils down to. It is a principle of decree here, as far as sharing goes. We all want to see sharing around this Country and nobody has a monopoly on that. But it is also - even more important than that - is a question of who is going to organize and who is going to have some control over a massive, huge - I do not think most hon. members in this House, sometimes I even question whether I do myself, even though I have travelled around and saw it a lot, realize what will happen in this Province over the next three or four years, if in fact this oil and gas thing comes off. I do not think people really understand what is going to happen. It could very well destroy us. And that is why we need some say in it, not exclusively, not to the detriment of other parts of Canada, but we must have some meaningful effective say and up until now we cannot do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Come over, boy. Come over.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the gracious speech mentions, this could very well be an historic debate that we are now having in hon. House. The coming together of events means that major decisions on our resource development activities must be made over the next short while. It

PREMIER PECKFORD: was with this in mind that the government outlined an emphasis on these three major resource development activities: the fishery, offshore oil and gas, and hydro. For Mr. Soaker, if there are to be more jobs for Newfoundlanders, if there are to be more public services for Newfoundlanders, if there is to be an improvement in the Province's financial position, it can only occur through the rational and effective development of these three resource development sectors. It is, in my view, folly to emphasize other areas of society which, for the most part, will be taking money from the economy if, firstly, the money is not being generated. Hence, a suitable and appropriate

PREMIER PECKFORD: foundation on which to build a compassionate society must be from the generation of new dollars which can only come, in Newfoundland's context, from the fishery, in the long term from offshore oil and gas and short and medium term from hydro development. Those who would deny this principle and would somehow try to confuse this principle, have missed the whole point of resource development strategy that this government is in the process of enunciating. Schools, hospitals, water and sewer, improved highways, ongoing transportation facilities all over the Province, and many, many other social services programmes, have their origin in the creation of wealth by the society as a whole. The creation of wealth can only be found in the resources of the jurisdiction and from the creativity of its people. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly disappointed with what seems to me - and I will take out the words, I do not want to be partisan here in this debate on this thing - with the approach that seems to be - and I will concede the point - taken by the Opposition in debating this gracious speech. Because, Mr. Speaker, it seems to show - I will change it - a lack of understanding of the basic and fundamental problems facing this Province over the next year or two and over the next number of generations. Our problems are easily discernible and they relate to the factors that I have just mentioned, a soaring provincial debt, the highest levy of taxation on a people in Canada, continued high unemployment and a standard of living less than any other people in any Province of Canada. The solution to these problems must be found in the next number of years or otherwise, we will be relegating ourselves to a level of services which will be below that of other societies in this Confederation. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this administration has put as a cornerstone to the future prosperity of this Province, to the solution of the problems of this Province so that the level of services can be permanently at a level equal to, and hopefully even greater than the rest of Canada, the fishery of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It will always be, in my view, and, I am sure, in the view of many Newfoundlanders, the major resource

PREMIER PECKFORD: development activity which will allow for the continued existence of the Newfoundland and Labrador as we know it today. That is an important phrase - 'as we know it today'. But, Mr. Speaker, we have been blessed once again by additional resources which in the short term can provide us with the financial flexibility to better develop the ongoing renewable resources like the fishery, like the forestry, like tourism, and the other activities that can be a permanent solution for the long term for our people. With the proper development of these resources to enhance job opportunities in the short and medium term and to give us the financial flexibility spoken about, we can build a society which can equal societies anywhere else in Canada and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and of great importance, contribute to societies in other parts of Canada which have not up to that time reached a point where they can be self-sufficient.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is with this background that this administration has indicated clearly and unmistakably, three phases to its overall strategy for making Newfoundland a better place in which to live over the short, medium and long term. These strategies must first and foremost be the fishery of Newfoundland which must be expanded and must be effectively managed to maximize job opportunities, to maximize, therefore, secondary processing and value added that is needed in our fishery in a way consistent with the present population pattern distribution of this Province. A natural corollary, therefore, to this aim and principle is the acquisition by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians of additional fish to allow for the continued operation of our fish processing facilities beyond their normal four, five or six month period now presently in effect. This, of course, leads to the realistic contention that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must have first call on the Northern cod stock;

PREMIER PECKFORD: that the inshore fishery must be protected at all costs and that even after it has been protected and expanded to a realistic level over the next five to ten years, the so-called surplus that might exist in addition to what would be needed on the inshore should be, in the first instance, relegated to Newfoundland and Labrador so that the processing sectors have access to this additional fish to bring about the fish plants being opened for eight to ten and even twelve months of the year and hence reduce our unemployment and thereby increase our wealth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This kind of contention is not based on any selfish motive but rather on the principle of traditional historic rights which we believe should apply to the extraction of resources throughout all of Canada and if this kind of reasonable, equitable principle is applied, then justice will not only be done as it relates to the Northern cod stock, but it will be done for Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers, Prince Edward Islanders and people throughout the Nation who can make such claims.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we would indeed be remiss as leaders of this Province and legislators of this parliament if, in fact, we accepted the present state of affairs which exists as it relates to the Upper Churchill contract and an overall strategy for Labrador power development, if we did not recognize that in the first instance that Upper Churchill contract must, in fact, be changed in some way to provide us with additional revenues and power for this Province. To do otherwise would, in my view, be totally and absolutely irresponsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is a fact that if a reasonable deal were now struck on the power contract - and let us, when we think about it as good Canadians and Newfoundlander and Labradorians. Here is an indication, sure we are not the most wealthy people in society on this globe, but if that contract were changed reasonably

PREMIER PECKFORD: we would not be, as the member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) indicated, just continuing gratefully receiving the wealth of other parts of Canada. The point must be made and must continue to be reiterated by all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that we have it within our grasp here to be true, positive contributors to Confederation in Canada if we got these deals or if we can now get them changed. So we are not just recipients of somebody else's wealth but can, in our own merit, both contribute to our own better well being and that of other people in this Confederation.

We did not recognize that in the first instance that Upper Churchill contract must, in fact, be changed in some way to provide us with additional revenues and power for this Province, to do otherwise would, in my view, be totally and absolutely irresponsible. It is a fact that if a reasonable deal were now struck on the power contract, on the Upper Churchill with Hydro Quebec and the Province of Quebec, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians could in fact be a part of a province which could claim the same kind of status, that of a have province, as the provinces of Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan now can claim. We intend to see, and there is no threat, that contracts of this sort will never again be allowed to occur and why, therefore, it is with a great deal of caution that we approach and move forward to try to see that the Lower Churchill developments become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the water can flow to the sea until a fair and equitable deal is struck for the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - not only in the short term but in the long term and if, Mr. Speaker, it is possible to extract a better deal on the Upper Churchill, then this will be additional money much needed in this Province to continue to provide expanded services and to relieve the financial situation that we now find

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 404

SD - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: ourselves in. Consistent with
that policy there is also the question of power subsidies that have been
provided at high cost to the taxpayers to various industries in
this Province and reiterate again

PREMIER PECKFORD: our intention to bring to this hon. House enabling legislation which would see to it that the Government of Newfoundland, with the various corporations involved, negotiate towards making these kinds of subsidies less on the taxpayers of Newfoundland so that the benefits to be derived from these industries for Newfoundlanders would be greater than they are today.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a departure from the past when these kinds of issues were the political rhetoric of the day during an election time but which were lost and forgotten as soon as the respective parties won their place in this hon. House.

This administration, in sharp contrast to those that have come before, of whatever political stripe, intends to act and to put into practice the promises, commitments and policies and programs articulated during election campaigns. It is, with this in mind, we intend to move forward on this policy during this session of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am disappointed though, Mr. Speaker, in the way that the opposition has approached this gracious speech and have, to a large degree, some of the members especially rather than the Leader and have not commented upon the fishery, have totally lacked any comment upon the hydro development in Labrador, the whole question of trying to get through legislation making it obligatory for additional processing of raw materials in Newfoundland, and almost completely ignoring the fact that this government intends to bring in legislation to try to bring about a more equitable distribution of power costs between the taxpayers of Newfoundland and private industry.

Given all these disappointments, and they are great individually, but greater, of course, collectively,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and I will take out the words here to show my fairness in trying to present this speech.

But it did seem to me, and it does, I do not know what the position of the Leader of the Opposition is clearly on this whole question of the off-shore. I do not clearly know what the position of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is on the question of mineral ownership on the off-shore. I have heard various statements from one or the other of the members and I am not sure what the Leader of the Opposition's position is and I must obviously take my cue from what his position is, to be what is the position of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland.

But it seemed to me that over the last number of days especially, until today, that there was an attempt by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland to speak for and coordinate with those people in Ottawa who might not be as sympathetic to the cause of mineral ownership by the Province as would otherwise be the case,

MR. STAGG: Right on!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I will leave it for them -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Would the Premier give me the courtesy of just a short intervention?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, absolutely.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I just want to -

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: In the interests of hearing him out fully, I just want to tell, through you, Mr. Speaker, there has been no consultation since the election.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I believe you.

MR. D. JAMIESON: For very obvious reasons that it has only been a matter of ten days or two weeks. I am not saying that there will not be, but I want to assure him that any sort of calculated strategy is not in fact the case and I am sure he will take my word

MR. D. JAMIESON:

for that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will, wholeheartedly.

MR. SPEAKER

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Down on the bottom of page 7, Mr.

Speaker, what we are talking about here relates to the future of Newfoundland. The future viability of Newfoundland and Labrador as a people and as a society, that is the issue, and how we want to, as a people, be, twenty or thirty years from now.

The possibility of becoming a self-sufficient partner within Confederation, that is the issue, and obviously and clearly and unmistakably the Opposition of this legislature, up until just a few minutes ago, had determined that we, in my view, had a very remote chance of ever becoming a have Province of this Confederation,

That they move therefore from the premise that we would always be receiving equalization payments, that there would always be somehow less able to govern our fears and other parts of this Confederation.

It is very incumbent upon the Liberal Party of Newfoundland to take a stand, a clear, unmistakable stand on this, because if we go divided from this day forward or from this week forward or from this month forward, it is going to make the battle all the more difficult to win. It will make the battle all the more difficult for us to win because the Federal Liberal Government of Ottawa will look to its counterpart in the Province for guidance on the politics of this issue and when the rest of Canada, including the Federal government

PREMIER PECKFORD:

see that there is not unanimity on this kind of issue, then of course they can move in quickly and expeditiously to ensure that the present power structure of this Country remains in Central Canada. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is not just a fact or a concern of mine that Mr. Trudeau or Mr. LeLonde or one of the new federal ministers or the Prime Minister adheres to this particular philosophy of Confederation; what really bothers me is that when it gets down into practice, it ensures that the present industrial complex which wants to continue to feed off the extremities of Canada but remain firmly entrenched in Central Canada, will have their way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And what I mean by that in simple terms is that if we do not have the kind of regulations we have applying company A from Gault, Ontario, or Company B, from Hamilton, Ontario, company C, from Charbourgamou, Quebec -

MR. NEARY:

- West Germany.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- or from West Germany. Whatever, can still manipulate the levers from Gault, from Hamilton, from Chabougamou, or whatever the name of the place is, or from Calgary or somewhere else and that therefore we cannot you see then expect to maximize anything in this Province, that it will not be possible for large companies with a substantial Newfoundland component to become effectively and truly involved in the prosecution of our resource development over the long term, that it will not be possible for substantial numbers of Newfoundlanders to become directly and critically involved in the development of our resources in the future, because, Mr. Speaker, if if we do not own the resources, our control over them and their development is nothing.

Mr. Speaker, our arguments are clear on what we believe we own, the mineral resources on our Continental Shelf. Those arguments are legal and they are based on the whole question of international law up to and including 1949 and the Terms of Union with

PREMIER PECKFORD: Canada at 1949 and we will, Mr. Speaker, be pursuing the policy of exercising that jurisdiction through the oil and gas act already in place, through the oil and gas regulations already in place. But more important than all of that, Mr. Speaker, and one could get into all the intricate legalities, I think it has become fairly clear over the last number of days that if the present so-called dispute between the federal government and the Province of Newfoundland over the claim of ownership, if it really wants to be settled, it can be settled very easily in a number of ways:

- (1) It can be done through an act of Parliament of the House of Commons and simultaneously an act through the House of Assmebly.
- (2) It can be done through an agreement between the two governments in the same way as an agreement was reached between the federal government and the Maritime Provinces. And (3) It can be done in the way the British Government did it in relation to Bermuda and other territories in the Carribean years ago when they, by a simple Order in Council, extended the boundaries of these jurisdictions to include the mineral resources on their Continental Shelves.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons, compelling, overriding reasons, for this approach. They are financial. They are economic. They are social. And they are cultural reasons. Everybody recognizes that there is just no more money to be taken out of the Newfoundland and Labrador people through additional taxation. We tried it again today, slaughtering them again today, but there is not any more wealth to be extracted by way of taxation. The only way additional funds can be generated over and above those that are presently in place, through taxation, through federal government payments, through corporate income taxes, and every other conceivable means at our disposal, the only other way is to create more wealth, to create additional dollars and the only way this can be done in a sizeable, substantial way, in the short run is through the proper development of oil and gas, no other way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The mining sector will continue to go up and down and hence we cannot depend on a continual progression upwards of the royalties and mineral resources of this Province or any other jurisdiction. Forestry is presently at a very high level and will continue that way, hopefully, into the long term. The only place where a significant change can be made to the financial situation of this Province, of our Province, to allow us the flexibility to build on our renewable resources like fisheries and like forestry is through a large injection of money from the oil and gas development. So from a sheer financial point of view, to make us not be the bottom rung on the ladder of Confederation when it comes to our credit rating, not to be the bottom rung on the ladder of Confederation when it comes to the amount of taxation upon our people, not to be the bottom rung on the ladder when it comes to our standard of living and the level of our public services, is to be able to get a large share of the revenues to be generated from oil and gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: This money will go to relieve and to enhance our financial situation and thereby give us additional flexibility, both to borrow

PREMIER PECKFORD: and to use some of the oil and gas money to put into those renewable resources like the fishery which long-term can give us a viability as a society, but only if we have the money now to develop that fishery right and properly.

Mr. Speaker, the basic services needed to bring Newfoundland and Labrador to even a par level with the rest of Canada will take hundreds of millions of dollars and many, many years. How in the name of common sense and realism can this be done? Surely this is not an ambitious aim - surely I speak for all in this House and a majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians when I set our sights on this "modest goal ." This goal has a chance of attainment only if we can create "additional wealth". This in the short and medium term (5 - 15 years) can only come from a sudden burst or explosion of additional money. This is only possible if we have commercial quantities of oil and gas - and more importantly if we get a large share of the royalties generated, in other words, if we own that resource.

There is, Mr. Speaker, no other way and I would be remiss as a leader in this Province, and Premier of this Province if I misled any person in this House or in Newfoundland differently, there is no other way. There is no other alternative for reaching this goal. There is no other way under the sun and the stars to achieve this "modest reasonable, sensible." goal of having our public services on a par with other Canadians. There is no other way for us to graduate to first-class status.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Perhaps the factor which most Newfoundlanders and Labradorians understand only too well is the economic one as it relates to jobs and the cultural one relating to our way of life. As I listen to some of my fellow Newfoundlanders, I am at once angry, cynical, humoured and finally left with an emptiness and a sadness.

The hypocrisy of an hon. member in this House, on the one

PREMIER PECKFORD: hand hardly sure whether we should own the oil and gas resources but at the same time asking, almost demanding, the provincial government of this Province to ensure that benefits from these resources are spread around the Province to his district. Where will our authority come from to make this happen if we do not have ownership? How do we truly ensure that qualified Newfoundlanders get jobs if we do not have ownership - how do we ensure that Newfoundland businesses get a fair crack if we do not have ownership?

Does not our economic history, both recent and ancient teach us something here. Does not the fact that our "cod" is being "traded off" in an international chess game today teach us this lesson? Can one help but be cynical when one hears an hon. member of this House speak of somehow "draining off" the oil inside the 200-mile limit from wells that reside outside the 200 mile limit? Is this the level of understanding on which the ultimate solution of this all-important question depends? And yes, to hear others exclaim that there is too much talk of oil and not enough on people. Mr. Speaker, it is to get jobs for people, to earn money from oil to provide more services for people, that is the issue, that is what the issue is all about, people IS the issue, Newfoundlanders IS the issue, the future viability of Canadians who happen to live on a land mass called Newfoundland and Labrador that IS the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And as if this was not enough, how can it be conceived that some effective, meaningful control over the impact of these massive developments can occur without ownership residing in this Province? It

PREMIER PECKFORD: defies logic, it defies common sense. If we are serious and true to our objectives and ideals to lessen the negative efforts and impacts of this "boom", then "we" as Canadians living in Newfoundland must do it. If not, Mr. Speaker, I fear for our future.

To those who doubt our loyalty to our country, I reply "red hegring ". Mr. Speaker, is it disloyal to want to help Canada by helping ourselves? Is it disloyal to desire more jobs for Canadians who live here? Is it disloyal to want less equalization and more self-realization? Is it disloyal to want to retain our uniqueness to enrich the Canadian experience? If so, Mr. Speaker, call me a traitor and label me the greatest traitor of our time.

We are embarked upon a great venture, an experiment in federalism. We

PREMIER PECKFORD: ask and we humbly ask for the opportunity for self-fulfillment and self-realization for an opportunity to realize our own worth and destiny, To the fulfillment of this goal, I will never waiver, Mr. Speaker, because I am convinced that one say soon the sun will shine and "have not" will be no more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - am obviously not entitled to speak at this time but I wonder if the hon. the Premier would permit one very brief question, not here and now because I do not want to delay the House. I would be very interested, however, in knowing whether or not the Premier when he said, "He was not sure what our position is" - it would be very helpful indeed in giving him more clarity on that if he could, in writing perhaps to me, on the points begining on page nine where he talks about the three options. If he could elaborate to me it would be very interesting to see because, for example, if he wishes to answer it now, it seems to me that number two, "through an agreement between the two governments in the same way as an agreement was reached between the Federal Government and the Maritime Provinces." I would be interested in having a elaboration of that as to how he sees that functioning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: On the first one, I think there has been a fair amount of information both given by the Minister of Mines and Energy. (Mr. L. Barry) -

MR. D. JAMIESON: (Inaudible) I understand.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) as it relates to the legislation of simultaneous acts in both parliaments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I beg your pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Incurred acts.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, that is a term that is used in another context, usually by legal people, but if the hon. member wants to use it in this particular context I have no great objection.

But the second one; when one talks about the principle, and up until the Federal Government did sign an agreement, which was a letter of intent, and I think which formalizes the agreement, there was no question about the percentages of revenues to go, in other words, a very major principle was either violated or established from the federal government's point of view, when they entered into and signed the Maritime's agreement. Because up until that time there was no legal foundation for Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island on the ownership of their mineral resources or at least if it is, it is unknown to us, one; and two, it is much different than what our legal case is. Okay? So establishing that, that means that the federal government could have legitimately received from the mineral resource development offshore Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and PEI 100 per cent of the revenues if they had wanted to under the constitution, 100 per cent. They did not have to agree to then the seventy-five/twenty-five split that they did. In so agreeing to change the principles of Confederation, because that is what they really did, to less than and recognizing some legitimacy in reason and morality on behalf of the Maritime Provinces they have therefore moved from their classic dogmatic position of total ownership of the mineral resources. And, therefore, because they could do that we would argue, using that same line of argument, that then they can sign another agreement which is only an agreement of greater degree and not of kind. That is what the basis of our argument relies on.

On the third point, the research is done, I have it and I shall get it to the hon. member, as it relates

PREMIER PECKFORD: to Orders in Council passed by the British Government to Bermuda. In the same way that could be done here and give some legalities to the whole question of being even able to do it that way. We, for our part, are very open on this and for the sake of not inhibiting the ongoing development of the offshore, we are willing to sit down and just sign an agreement - Okay? - confirm the principles, those four principles that were in the letter to Prime Minister Clark, confirm those so there principles are established and signed and perhaps an Order in Council or something is issued, let us get an agreement and then later have legislative sanction on it. There is lots of time to do those other niceties, legal and constitutional and necessary though they may be. But for the sake -

MR. S. NEARY: Well, now, that is quite a change
(Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: No it is not. That is what we said. No, there is no change at all. All we want is the confirmation -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) we have been saying all along.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, we maintain the position that we own the offshore and all we are asking the federal government to do is relinquish

PREMIER PECKFORD: their claim and confirm ours, and then the working out of the rest of it is a matter of mechanics and specifics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, there have been times in this debate when I have cringed in my chair when I have heard the comments coming from the other side, but in view of the speech of the Premier, I am not going to allude to any of these speeches and I am going to try to give a rational, unemotional speech. I have not prepared anything, I am simply reacting to the Premier's prepared speech.

The Premier mentioned in his speech that he wanted to know where we stood on this side and that there seemed to be some confusion. Well, I can say that after the Premier ended up, I thought it was our leader in our caucus telling it, because precisely, that is our position -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. T. LUSH: - the position that the Premier enunciated. And obviously, I am quite delighted to know that the Premier has changed because the very basic -

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order or a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, whatever it happens to be.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I say to the hon. the member for Terra Nova, our position has not changed, that we are asking - we allege ownership of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. There is nothing in what we have said, written or otherwise, to change from the position I have taken today, none whatsoever, that we own the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf and that we want the federal government to stop alleging that they have a claim there as well so that we can get on with the business of developing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To the point of privilege, I will take it under advisement and rule on it later.

MR. T. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly our position, and really, I could have delivered this speech myself excluding a few parts that did hinge upon being a little bit political, but I think the Premier softened up as he went through and even toned it down somewhat. And without these references, there are many parts of the speech that we on this side subscribe to wholeheartedly. But as I go down through I will certainly try to be more specific to develop my own position in this particular area of offshore oil and gas.

Just to take the speech from its beginning where the Premier talks about the strategies for the development of this Province - we agree wholeheartedly, but again, the Premier takes a shot at us by saying that none of us here have talked about the fisheries and hydro and all of these matters. But let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that we agree that the fisheries is the backbone of this Province, and never let anybody say that we have not agreed with any of the fisheries policies, any policies to advance the fisheries in this Province. And we have spoken on them on this side, all hon. members, on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, with Hydro, certainly if there is anything the government can do to make better that deal, we are all for it, Mr. Speaker. Nobody on this side of the House ever objected to the government trying to renegotiate that deal and come up with a better case for Newfoundland - nobody. And we support the Premier and we hope that he can come back with a better deal. We hope that he can renegotiate a better deal, a deal that is going to put more revenues into this Province, that is going to be able to enable the government to increase and enhance the level of services in this Province. Sure, any of the deals that we can make with ERCO and those people to ensure that they are paying a fair share for electrical costs and in so doing, enabling a better price to the consumers of this Province - agreed, Mr. Speaker. We support the government on these issues wholeheartedly, no difference at all.

But, Mr. Speaker, on the offshore oil

MR. LUSH: the difference has been not a philosophical one. It has not been a philosophical difference, **it has been a difference in approach. We have said in this hon. House** that we support the ownership of the offshore oil resources. As a matter of fact, this Party has in the past, I think, passed a resolution in this House to that effect.

MR. F. ROWE: In 1975.

MR. LUSH: 1975.

MR. F. WHITE: March 1975.

MR. LUSH: But the dispute, the difference, has been in the approach, and I could take examples. But in the Premier's speech today we can see a change in approach. We can see a change in approach. Instead of this nationalistic, parochial, emotional point of view, he has now taken the highroad in this thing here. He has now taken the broader scope and that is where we differed. This is where we have differed, this political approach, making political points. That is what we have disagreed with, appearing to make Newfoundlanders like greedy, parochial, narrow-minded people and we are not. We are Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. LUSH: And let it be known that everybody on this side of the House, as I am sure hon. members on the other side of the House, we are all Newfoundlanders. And for people to get down to that low level of debate, to attribute to other members that they are not Newfoundlanders, that they are traitors, that they are making treacherous remarks, ridiculous, and asking people to stand up and be counted. Goodness! All people here, I think they have all stood up. Have they not? On both sides of the House. We have all stood up to be counted. Nobody here is afraid to stand up and be counted. We have all stood up. Some of us on several occasions. A lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, that has been going on, a lot of nonsense. But now this speech represents a change. We are putting up front the things that should be up front. We are giving the reasons why we think we should be getting the maximum benefits from our offshore oil.

MR. LUSH: Sure it is our depressed economy, the state of the economy in Newfoundland, the highest unemployment level in Canada, highest level of taxation. That is the message we want to send to other Canadians instead of going on a confrontation course. We want other Canadians to understand why it is that we want control of our own resources, why it is that we want to control our own destiny. That is the message we want to get across to other Canadians. But what we have been doing, and what the Premier has been doing is taking the bull in the china shop approach. Ferdinand the bull on the local preference issue, an issue that I am sure all Canadians would support us on if we had taken the right approach, if we had taken to them the depressed economy, the state of our economy, the ridiculously high levels of unemployment that would not be tolerated any place else in Canada. That is the message we were taking to Canadians. We want to give preference because we want to improve that level of unemployment. But taking the parochial, nationalistic attitude, just up front the local preference, that is not what should be up front, it is the reason for it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: That is what should be up front, the economic facts.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Take that story to Canadians in other Provinces of Canada and I do not think you would find people on the air-waves bad-mouthing Newfoundland for those regulations. They would not be doing it. They would understand it and they would appreciate it, and would not discriminate against Newfoundlanders who are moving out into Ontario, and For McMurray, Alberta, and other places to get jobs.

MR. LUSH: But that is the approach we have taken. And notice the approach with the cod stock, with our Northern cod stock. Quite a different approach from the first time the Premier brought that out. When the Premier brought that out it looked like he was clearly fighting a war with Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: 'We do not want the Nova Scotians out there, that belongs to Newfoundland'. But today he has put it in the right context again, put it in the right context. So where we differ is not on the philosophy, not on the principle, but on the approach. And the Premier seems to be modifying that so we have been effective. We have been very effective. He has modified his approach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: He is getting more diplomatic. He is getting a little more class. He is getting a little more finesse.

MR. JAMIESON: Experience.

MR. LUSH: It comes with experience I suppose.

MR. MOORES: He is maturing.

MR. LUSH: A little bit blatant, and brash in the beginning.

MR. MARSHALL: By approach the hon. gentleman means which member speaks next, on your side, your difference in approach depends upon which member speaks, is that correct? Is that what you mean by difference in approach?

MR. JAMIESON: We are all being very sweet now, we will get argumentative.

MR. LUSH: Well, thinking about that, that looks like a difference in approach over there too. Because as I recall now when the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) spoke there seemed to be some confusion about ownership. Let me tell you, we talk about confusion, there is some confusion on the other side about ownership. There is some confusion.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. LUSH: There is some confusion. Because I thought over there the story was that we own it. But the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did not think he did. So what did he want to do so that we would own? Put the boundaries out there. If we can extend - so that was an admission on his part that he was not sure whether we own it or not. He wanted to put the boundaries out there. So talking about one speaker, how the policy changes, one after the other, let the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just listen. And that was a clear admission that the member for St. John's East did not know where he stood. He wanted to put the boundaries out there. Extending the boundaries, of course, he thought would give us ownership of those resources, which is a lot of nonsense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again what we have changed, or our differences have been, as I have said, with approach.

MR. T. LUSH: We agree with ownership, we have said that we own those resources. But our saying that we own them, it has been said here so many times, does it mean that other people acknowledge that we own them? There are some people throughout Canada who do not take that position. And certainly rational and intelligent people accept that. I expect all hon. members other there have read the dissertations by constitutional experts throughout Canada. I suppose they have just not allowed themselves to read only the one done by Cabot Martin. I would expect they would want to have gotten a broader view.

MR. D. JAMIESON: It has been (inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: No doubt the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), no doubt he has read them, other opinions, No doubt that the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. McNicholas) he has read other opinions. No doubt the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and these places they have read other opinions. So if we have done that we know that there are some people who do not acknowledge that we own them. How do we go about that? How do we go about that? We can all go about preaching that we own the resources, we own them, just like kids owning toys. We can go about saying that we own them but we can say that until we are blue in the face and it does not mean that we own them.

MR. JAMIESON: It would be just as good to say we own Labrador if we did not have -

MR. T. LUSH: That is right. But there are some - there has to be some methods of coming around to a resolution of this and this is where the hon. Leader of the Opposition questioned the Premier on the three points, the three ways to go. He says, one, it can be done through an Act of Parliament - an Act of Parliament of the House of Commons and simultaneously an Act through the House of Assembly.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, I do not know where the legal advice comes for that, I do not know but I can -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: I do not know where the legal advice comes for that, I am not a lawyer, but in the readings I have done on this I have seen nothing to indicate that it can be done this way and if it could have been done this way. I do not know why Mr. Clark did not do it and get it all over with right quick, do not know why he did not do it! Do not know why he did not do it!

MR. R. MOORES: Just like that.

MR. T. LUSH: A great opportunity to certainly come through, to live up to the commitments that were made during the election but it was not done, it was not done! But yet they say it can be done. Well, there is no precedent that I know of in Canada for that.

Now, the Premier says, number two, that is the one that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) enunciated just a couple of days ago, that is the one he enunciated.

MR. R. MOORES: Trudeau said it.

MR. T. LUSH: That is one, of course, this Province could have been in on. No problems there, no problems there at all. But that is not ownership, what we are talking about here is an agreement, it is not ownership. So we are talking about two - if we bring things down under ownership here, these are the ways that we can go: through an Act of Parliament, through an agreement. Two would be just what it says, an agreement which again sort of - an agreement will not establish that we own it. It cannot do that but it can establish that we can control it and it can establish what returns we are going to get out of it, 100 per cent or 80 or 90 per cent. But

MR. T. LUSH: we, on this side want 100 per cent of the resources or the returns, the revenue. Mr. Speaker, that is our position. Nothing vague about that, nothing unclear about that, it is very precise, it is very exquisite, very clear where we stand on that. We want the maximum returns from the revenues that will be generated from offshore oil and gas.

Now number three, Mr. Speaker, I am - again I cannot comment on that, I only know that you can take it by its common sense as it relates to Canadian history. Here we are talking about Bermuda -

MR. JAMIESON: A British colony.

MR. T. LUSH: - which is a colony and we know the regulations are different, that is Newfoundland's case to the courts. That is our case to the courts-

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) it was.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, not that we were a colony exactly but that we were a country. But this is a little different, talking about a colony, we are now talking about a Province that is under the jurisdiction of Canada, of the federal government, we are talking about something that is a little different. But, again, I do not know, maybe it can be done and hopefully the Premier can provide us enough information, but it is the first time that I have heard of this particular one.

MR. JAMIESON: Even you do not believe the third one.

MR. T. LUSH: The one that should have been in there was the Alberta precedent. That is the one that should have been there, how it was that Alberta gained ownership to its resources.

MR. T. LUSH:

And again, that is a little different; that is not exactly similar to our case, because the federal government clearly owned the resources in the Western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta - that the resources in these provinces were owned by the federal government. In this case, we say it is us. So it is a little different. But the precedent is there, the procedures to be followed. That is the one that I think should have been their model and not Bermuda - it should have been the Alberta case. But again, hon. members, no doubt, will know the procedure of that, certainly an agreement which takes in the first one. It takes in the first one, the Premier says - this was the Alberta one. It can be done through an act of Parliament of the House of Commons and simultaneously an act through the House of Assembly. That is what took place with Alberta. The other thing was an amendment to the constitution. So these were the two steps in Alberta. As a matter of fact, there was one in-between, an agreement, a ratification.

So that is where we are hazy,

Mr. Speaker, that is where the fog is, in that area there. No question about where we stand on the ownership, that it belongs to this Province, but it is making everyone else believe that, it is proving that to the Canadian people, that we own it.

Proving it to the operators (inaudible)

MR. JAMIESON:

MR. T. LUSH: And the companies, right. Because otherwise, they are not going to go in there. We have got to prove it to them who it is that owns it. So, Mr. Speaker, that is where we have been hazy, that is where we have been raising questions. That is where we have not agreed with the approach of the government, just going out and shouting all over the place that we own it and going on a confrontation course with the federal government instead of coming to one of the proposals here, number two, which is likely to be the one with which we are going to resolve this situation. And I was glad to hear the Premier say he was willing to go that route, and he was willing to sit down and work out an agreement and let the thing go ahead. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the position we

MR. T. LUSH: should be in. Let us not delay the thing while we are trying to work out who controls it or who owns it or whatever, let us get an agreement and let us get the thing moving.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no fog, there is no haze, there is no muddying of the waters with our position - our position is clear. and as I said, it seems to fit in with the Premier's, and I am glad that he has come to our side, that he has finally seen the light, that he has finally seen our approach. I am glad he has finally seen that, Mr. Speaker. So we have been effective. We have been very effective in showing the Premier the error of his ways, showing him his arrogance, how immature, how irresponsible his previous approach was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. T. LUSH: Now he has come around to a more sensible, a more rational and a more intelligent approach.

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: And that is where the difference was. That is where the main difference lay, Mr. Speaker. So we are glad to know now that the Premier is going to sit down and talk about this in a rational and sensible way. And I suppose he will be meeting with the Prime Minister soon. Maybe this was the speech that was going to be the forerunner of that particular meeting. We are glad to know that he is not going to be acting like a bull in a china shop, that he is going to be going there with diplomacy and he is going to use rationality and he is going to be putting up front those things that should be up front and taking the right approach, Mr. Speaker. And that has, as I have said, been our approach.

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to carry on debating that particular issue, because there was no misunderstanding on this side what our position was - there never was. We always knew quite clearly where we stood. We knew where we stood on the ownership, we just did not know how to go about establishing that, showing the companies that we own it. Well, the Premier outlined some steps there, and I am glad to know that he is willing

MR. T. LUSH: to work on either one of them, but it looks like two is the more obvious one and that is the one that we have been advocating. Again, as I have said, we do not want to cave in on this. There is no way. We want to make sure that our Province gets the maximum benefits from these resources. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have not been directing our attention to the larger issue and that is preparing this Province for the development. That is what we want to know; what are the policies and what are the programs that the government have in place to ensure that we are ready for that development? That has been sadly neglected. We have not been told a thing. Oh, from time to time a minister will get up as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Education got up and told us what programs were in place for, manpower training and this sort of thing. It was the first I had heard of them.

But, anyway, we hear that sort of thing but, Mr. Speaker, what is really going on in terms of developing policies and programs so that we will be ready for that development? Where are the service facilities going to be, Mr. Speaker, is that determined? Where are they going to be? Are they going to be in St. John's? Where are they going to be? Are they going to be in Corner Brook? Where are they going to be?

MR. MARSHALL: It will probably end up in Halifax if you (inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: Where are the various service facilities going to be?

MR. R. MOORES: There you go. There you go. There it is again.

MR. F. B. ROWE: The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is going berserk again.

MR. T. LUSH: Who is going to benefit from this? Is that determined?

MR. R. MOORES: Traitors.

MR. T. LUSH: What parts of Newfoundland? Will rural Newfoundland benefit from this? How about the dispersal of benefits?

MR. T. LUSH: Is the government going to make sure that all of the requirements in terms of the services, that they are going to spread them around? For example, in the terms of providing, let us say, steel that will obviously be needed, they are going to build a platform there, and concrete, where are they going to get that? Is that all going to be provided from St. John's or are we going to spread those benefits throughout the Province?

Will the Terra Nova District get any of these facilities? Providing concrete or whatever it is, food services, does Terra Nova get anything? Will Trinity - Bay de Verde (F. Rowe) get anything? These are questions we should have been talking about instead of the nonsense that we have been getting on with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: These are the issues we have been talking about. Mr. Speaker, these are very large concerns, very large concerns. But, we have been wasting our time here because in the beginning the government was interested in making political brownie points.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. T. LUSH: But now they have seen the error of their ways, now they have seen the folly of their ways, and now they have come around acting like mature people, like responsible Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: That is right. That is the role we have advocated all along, Mr. Speaker, and that is where we stand. Now, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks I have finished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Member for Placentia.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have just seen the most magnificent flip-flop retreat.

MR. HANCOCK: On that side.

MR. PATTERSON: Not on that side. That was

MR. W. PATTERSON: a magnificent job you did trying to weasel out from under. What is your policy? Would one of you gentleman stand up and introduce as a resolution into this House requesting the Federal Government to transfer their right and title to a Crown Corporation in Newfoundland?

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Would one of you gentlemen introduce that resolution? Then we will see that they are sincere, then we will see that they are genuine.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Why did you not (inaudible)

MR. W. PATTERSON: But there is not one syllable, not one paragraph, not one colon not one coma in the in the Premier's speech today, - he has not deviated one iota from his policy. Now you are using it to weasel out saying, 'That was our policy. Oh my God, we were for that all the time! You were embarrassed, you were driven into the ground yesterday, when the member over there

AN. HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on -

MR. W. PATTERSON: stood up his conscience troubled him.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: I had not intended to go back into the past, and I do not intend to go too far, but for the fact the Member for Windsor-Buchans (G. Flight) attacked my hon. colleague here for being an anti - Confederate. If you want anti - confederates, go to the front benches over there, do not talk to us. I am a Canadian by choice, most of the Canadians over here were by birth. He attacked the hon. member for St. John's East (W. Marshall). I was in the Confederation movement as deep as you could get and I do not ever remember seeing or hearing from the hon. minister.

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 414

RA - 1

MR. W. PATTERSON: I had no intention of bringing that up, but we had them on that side who were not only anti-confederate but anti-British, who advocated economic union with the United States. A comic union, something that we could not achieve. But the same people were glad to go off to Ottawa and accept the big posts. These were the people who voted against the family allowance, the unemployment insurance, the workmen's compensation, pensions for the widows, they voted against that, they wanted Newfoundland under the claws of the Water Street lounge lizards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: They would have them there, indeed they would, they did not want us to break our shackles, they did not want that. The member for La Poile there, he is always talking about the toiling masses and now he is down on the Water Street merchants, but he cuddled up with Sheehan and Doyle when he got the chance, they are bed partners.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us go.

MR. W. PATTERSON: These are the simple facts. But if you gentlemen would make a definite policy; otherwise you are going to annihilate yourselves, you are wiped, you are finished, you are destroyed. If the Premier said today, if he would go to the country, we would have to appoint an opposition, that would be a sad day for this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: It would be a very, very sad day.

MR. WARREN: (inaudible) yourself.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I did not intend to be speaking here today on this, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: - No intention whatsoever, but when I heard the last speech there that kind of set my blood boiling. You are lacking in a policy and you are afraid to come out and say that "We are one hundred percent behind Premier Peckford" If Premier Peckford speaks today there is not a thing I just mentioned, not a thing that has

MR. W. PATTERSON: changed it -

MR. L. THOMS: You said that.

MR. W. PATTERSON: -not one thing, but you people have not said anything, you are all jesters, you are all jesters over there.

And if there is an election called, which I do not doubt that there will be one called, you fellows are finished, gene -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: - down the tube.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON: - down the tube and we will appoint an opposition.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (inaudible) up your cheques.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I was very much interested the other day in the hon. member for - in his remarks insofar as the minister's bill was concerned with regard to the environmental control. They were very critical of it in the opposition over there. But I would ask you people to produce the bill, the environmental control bill that you people had. No such thing ever existed.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Not a thing. The wilderness of Labrador was raped, Placentia Bay was raped and if you are talking about environment control, control the tankers, It is international, it is not national, It is international because ships that are registered under the Panamanian flag over there are just old tubs and they are allowed to come into our waters. And we had the Arrow in Chedabucto Bay and we had the Argo Merchant, these tankers came in here and spilled pollution onto our shores and very little compensation. A few other things I would like to comment -

MR. THOMS: You are only up to 1920's yet.

MR. W. PATTERSON: We can go back a bit beyond that. We can go back beyond that if you want me to go back. Well, I will tell you how far back we will go, we will go back to this power contract. Would you like a copy of that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 414

RA - 3

MR. W. PATTERSON: This is a contract that was signed
a few years ago, 1966, the greatest sell-out ever.

MR. THOMS: That is news (Inaudible).

MR. W. PATTERSON: Just listen, I am not blaming you for
it, but you are a disciple of that type of liberalism -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: -you were the victim and you swallowed
gruel that they passed to you.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) accepting responsibility
for Frank Moores and his (Inaudible).

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well, why do you not stand up now
and denounce this and support us, support us on the Northern cod stock,

MR. W. PATTERSON:

support Premier Peckford in renegotiating this contract, why do you not do that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON:

You are a lawyer, you can see more to it than I can, but yet you will sit there. And your hon. friend there, he will get in there and chirrup and chime and mumble. I do not know what you are saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON:

Do not know one word you said, my son.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON:

The contract under which Quebec Hydro produces power from Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation is for a term of forty years. Now, why in the name of God did he give it away for forty years?

MR. R. MOORES:

Ask him, boy?

MR. W. PATTERSON:

I am asking you, you were representing him, you were a part of that political philosophy, you were one of the Jack in the Beanstalk boys, the giveaway. Everything you had you gave it away.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES:

I was in Grade IV when that contract was signed.

MR. W. PATTERSON:

That is probably where you should have stayed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON:

Forty years from the effective date in 1976, with a further term of twenty-five years when that forty year contract ends. They can go ahead for another twenty-five years. The power contract signed on May 12th, 1969, provides for the sale of a substantially - all of the power from the giant hydro electrical plant at a price just under three mills per kilowatt hour. Can you imagine that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame! Shame!

MR. W. PATTERSON: 'For the first twenty-five years
this rate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Listen! - this rate is maintained
for thereafter and the contract provides for a fixed price of two mils
per kilowatt hour in the final twenty-five years, should Quebec Hydro
decide to renew the contract which, more than likely, they will.
In other words, Quebec Hydro, unlike most Newfoundlanders, does not
have to face a rate hike until the year 2041. You should be ashamed.
You should cut the line that binds you to the Liberal party, come
over here and join with us and go forward with Peckford into the '80s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Trinity - Bay
de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I detected this
morning quite a change in the attitude, at least, of the Premier of
this Province and I am extremely glad I detected that change
because I had just gotten home from my district late last night
and turned on the tube and saw an interview going on with respect
to the referendum in Quebec and three people's names were mentioned
in the same breath - Lougheed, Levesque and Peckford.

MR. R. MOORES: Right on.

AN HON. MEMBER: How come?

MR. W. ROWE: And for the first time in my life,
Sir -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mentioned by Peguiste.

MR. W. ROWE: Right.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mentioned by Peguiste defining salaries.

MR. W. ROWE: But it was mentioned, okay; And
I am glad the hon. member pointed that out because

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order!

MR. W. ROWE:

- this was a nationally televised

programme and as people know, not every word that is said in the House of Assembly or every thesis that has been written or every point that has been made in detail, and particularly if it is a complicated one like this, that is not what the people of a province or the people of a nation pick up, it is the impression that is left. And I, for one, was one of these Newfoundlanders who was looking forward to the day when I could stand up, hopefully my children and grandchildren could stand up, being a have Province and making a contribution towards the whole Confederation system. And I can see us over the last few months, particularly during the election campaign, and the words that have been spoken since, particularly in this House of Assembly, we were kind of drifting away, The impression was being left in this Province that if we had to we would separate from the rest of this Confederation. Hon. members know what I am talking about. The impression was left there and some people have referred to it as a greedy, selfish impression. It is a good political point if you are trying to survive as a party in this Province who, I know are going to face extreme difficulties when they have to bring down their budget this year. And I think this is why the strategy has been developed by members opposite, in particular, to stand up for Newfoundland as if they were the only ones who were standing up for Newfoundland

MR. F. ROWE: and try to make that the issue, because they know very shortly, very shortly that they are going to have to bring down a budget that is not going to meet with the universal approval of Newfoundland and Labrador. And if members opposite can distract from that budget by creating a camouflage or a false issue, if they can distract from that they would do so, and they have tried to do so. And for some reason or another, while the Premier was reading his speech this morning, sentence after sentence was being changed while he was reading his speech, as if all of a sudden there was a conversion on the floor of the House of Assembly this morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe what you heard were the Premier's feelings and not those of his speech makers.

MR. F. ROWE: My hon. friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) reminds me that probably what I heard was the Premier's feeling and not that of his speech makers.

AN HON. MEMBER: One whole page.

MR. ROBERTS: That might well be. Now the member for Placentia (Mr. Wm. Patterson), and I am not going to get into an argument with him, asked us to support members opposite with respect to the Northern cod stocks.

MR. MOORES: Indeed we will.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, what are we supposed to support, Mr. Speaker? Let me read the first resolve in the private member's bill from the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), "wherefore be it resolved that this hon. House supports the position of the Province which recognize the exclusive right of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to fish Northern cod." I hope hon. members are listening to the words, recognizes the exclusive right of Newfoundland and Labradorians to fish Northern cod; which in later speeches in the House of Assembly was extended to the Northeastern cod stocks, right up and down the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. F. ROWE: Now this morning, Mr. Speaker, on page four of the Premier's speech, in reference to the Northern cod, we have this - and I will read it in its entirety. "This, of course," the Premier's own words, "This, of course, leads to the realistic contention that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must have," not exclusive rights, but "first call," first call, whatever that means now.

MR. LUSH: There is a big difference.

MR. F. ROWE: Whatever that means. First call, not exclusive, but first call whatever that means, "on the Northern cod stock; that the inshore fishery must be protected," agreed, "at all costs and that even after it has been protected and expanded to a realistic level over the next five to ten years," and then I will skip a few words. "This kind of contention is not based on any selfish motive but rather on the principle of traditional historic rights which we believe should apply to the extraction of resources throughout all of Canada and if this kind of reasonable equitable principle is applied, then justice will not only be done as it relates to the Northern cod stock but will be done for Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers, Prince Edward Islanders and people throughout the nation who can make such claims."

Now, what are we asking to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ownership.

MR. MOORES: First call.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there is a contradiction in the speech that the Premier made this morning with reference to the Northern cod stocks and the private member's resolution that will be debated in the House this coming Wednesday. There is a complete contradiction. So how can the hon. member opposite get up and ask us to support their stand on anything? And I take issue, Mr. Speaker, with -

MR. ROBERTS: It is unreal.

MR. F. ROWE: the fact that the Premier is expressing great disappointment, "Although my disappointments," again I am quoting the Premier, "my disappointments are great in relation to the way the Opposition members have almost totally lacked any comment upon the fishery and have totally lacked any comment upon hydro development in Labrador and have ignored the whole question of trying to get through legislation making it obligatory for additional processing of raw materials in Newfoundland."

MR. MOORES: Hogwash.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, how can we ignore something that has not been presented to us.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: Or speak for or against it. It defies logic what the Premier said in relation to that particular thing this morning. There is no legislation, to my knowledge, that has been brought before this House for further processing of the raw materials, particularly fish in this Province.

MR. MOORES: True.

MR. F. ROWE: No legislation whatsoever. And the Premier is disappointed that we have not debated it, or supported it?

MR. MOORES: What is wrong 'Bill'?

MR. F. ROWE: I just cannot understand - whoever made this speech up, Mr. Speaker, the Premier obviously had difficulty

MR. F. ROWE: in reading it because I suppose he had difficulty in understanding it and probably did not entirely agree with all that was contained therein.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite are concerned about the fisheries policy in this Province and the fact that we have not spoken up about it - and I disagree with that, by the way - I will ask the hon. members opposite 'Where is their fisheries policy?' I have read out ad nauseam to hon. members opposite some twenty-eight promises - actually I think there are more than twenty-eight -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Twenty-eight unkept, so that is a start.

MR. F. ROWE: I am sorry, thirty-eight promises contained in Throne Speeches, Budget Speeches -

MR. ROBERTS: Do I hear forty?

MR. F. ROWE: More to your -

AN HON. MEMBER: More than that.

MR. F. ROWE: I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the promises are a synopsis of many little promises. So the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is absolutely right.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (inaudible) by election (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: There are in fact, in excess of 100 detailed promises contained in Budget Speeches, Throne Speeches since 1971 and 1972 and in campaign speeches -

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is the unkept list.

MR. F. ROWE: \$60 million.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The kept list is somewhat shorter.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, I am not going to go through it, Mr. Speaker, I have read it out before. But there have been a number of major policy statements made with respect to the fisheries in this Province that simply have not been

March 14, 1980

Tape No. 417

DW - 2

MR. F. ROWE: kept. the latest of which was the great strategies for the fisheries for up to -

MR. E. ROBERTS: In that \$500,000 study.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, what was the name of it?

MR. E. ROBERTS: The Kellogg one was it not?

MR. F. ROWE: Fish is the future, strategy programme for fisheries development to 1985. Sir, that was a \$500 million five year policy commitment made by the now defunct - made by Walter Carter.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Speaking of defunct,

MR. F. ROWE: I am talking about defunct.

MR. JAMIESON: I figure the adjective is a little off but we understand your point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: My hon. friend is trying to be parliamentary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a \$500 million fisheries development for this Province which cost in excess of \$600,000, \$600,000 that cost. Last year we had a miserable \$100,000 token vote for that fisheries strategy in the Fisheries Estimates, \$100,000 out of \$500 million for the first year of a five year Fisheries Development Programme. And what did we have in this year's Throne Speech? What is going into the major step forward in fisheries development in this Province? What is the big step forward? What is the policy of this government, A white paper on the fisheries. Sir, I have never heard - how many years do the members opposite require to develop a fishing strategy? They keep going back and criticising the previous administration -

MR. LUSH: They need a minister first.

MR. F. ROWE: They need a minister, Well, I have some advice for the hon. minister who is leaving Wesleyville at this moment in a helicopter going to St.

MR. F. ROWE: Anthony to go to the seal hunt. I hoped to accompany him but I will not say why I will not accompany him. But I have one bit of advice for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that his colleagues can probably pass along to him, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: that we have in Ottawa now a person who is universally accepted throughout the Atlantic Provinces, anyway, as the greatest Fisheries Minister that Canada has ever seen in the name of Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, bar none, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: - who has a compassionate feeling, particularly for the inshore fishermen of this Province and the other Atlantic Provinces including Quebec and British Columbia, in this country, a compassionate feeling for the development of the fisheries in such a way that it would maximize the benefits for the fishermen of a Province.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Even the Premier agrees with that.

MR. F. ROWE: And the Premier even said, Sir, that in comparison to James McGrath,

MR. F. ROWE: Romeo LeBlanc was the greatest fisheries minister that he has ever heard of or dealt with.

MR. ROBERTS: Now there are a number of fisheries (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Now, universally acclaimed. Now the hon. member, Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) in one of his first major ministerial statements gets up and goes on a head-on confrontation with Ottawa.

MR. JAMIESON: Boxing gloves mentality.

MR. F. ROWE: Boxing gloves mentality.

I would suggest that the Minister of Fisheries for this Province disregard, throw away, forget completely the injurious strategy that was adopted by the former Provincial Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Walter Carter, in getting into head-on confrontations on the public airwaves; without having first sat down with Romeo LeBlanc to try to negotiate things out in the best interests of this Province, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that Romeo LeBlanc, Romeo LeBlanc is sympathetic to the fisheries concepts shared by all members on both sides of this House and the fishermen of Newfoundland. He is extremely sympathetic but he also is something else, he is a federalist.

DR. J. COLLINS: You can say that again.

MR. F. ROWE: And there is nothing wrong with - Now there is the type of thing - Here we go again. Because a person is a federalist it is presumed that he has got to be anti-Newfoundland, is that it?

DR. J. COLLINS: It could be both, it could be both.

MR. F. ROWE: It could be both, right. Well, I am telling you something now, Mr. Speaker, I indicated, and obviously the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was not listening or he cannot understand, that Romeo LeBlanc is universally acclaimed as the greatest federal fisheries minister, even by the hon. the Premier, that Canada has ever seen. He is welcomed by the Fishermen's Union of this Province,

MR. F. ROWE: by the fishing industry of this Province, Trades Association, by the fishermen themselves of this Province,

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible), fish

MR. F. ROWE: And even the fish, as the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would well know, in that great historic fisheries riding.

MR. THOMS: How many people were (inaudible

AN HON. MEMBER: Out at the Battery?

MR. F. ROWE: The Battery, yes, it could, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: And the hon. gentleman is a piscatorial prowess -

MR. ROWE: And I would hope, Mr. Speaker - That reminds me of something, during the Federal Election campaign, Mr. John Crosbie and James McGrath going around in the dying moments of that election campaign promising -

MR. JAMIESON: They were dying literally.

MR. ROWE: Dying, literally dying, - promising millions and millions of dollars for fisheries related facilities for such places as the Battery, St. Mary's - The Capes, and different areas of this Province, and he was the very gentleman, the Minister of Finance, Mr. John Crosbie, who froze every cent that was to go to small craft harbours when he was in office, not one red cent. Usually there is about \$10 million available for small craft harbours. John Crosbie said not one red cent for small craft harbours. Then they come out and announce \$14 million or something extra, extra. Was that extra over zero dollars that Crosbie put on there or was it extra over the \$10 million that is normally there?

MR. MARSHALL: Tell the people (inaudible) cancelled.

MR. ROBERTS: Never approved. It was never approved.

MR. F. ROWE: So if I were the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and he is concerned about the Battery and the development out there, I would be kneeling down thanking the people of Canada and Newfoundland for re-electing Pierre Elliott Trudeau and having Romeo LeBlanc back in as fisheries minister in this particular Province. Now, Sir, I would like the Premier, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or somebody, anyway, on the other side to indicate precisely and accurately what the fisheries policy is of this particular administration.

MR. J. COLLINS: Upward.

MR. F. ROWE: Upward. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), says upward, well, if it is going to be up the -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance is more likely what will happen to it.

MR. F. ROWE: That upwards, Sir, can be interpreted in various ways and the way -

DR. J. COLLINS: Input.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, probably the Minister of Finance could answer this question now. For example, the great super-port for Harbour Grace, is that going ahead? The primary landing and distribution port is that going ahead? How much has been spent on it? We already know that in excess of \$600 million has been spent on two studies.

MR. ROBERTS: No, \$600 thousand.

MR. F. ROWE: What did I say?

MR. ROBERTS: Million

MR. F. ROWE: I will correct myself. In excess of \$600 thousand was spent for the Kellogg Report and a provincial report. \$500 million was supposed to be the cost to develop the new fisheries strategy. Where is that fisheries strategy today, Mr. Speaker? Where is it? I know two roads in my district that were going to be upgraded and paved to have fish going back and forth to that primary landing distribution port, the two roads have been dropped off the list of

March 14, 1980

Tape 418

MB - 4

MR. F. ROWE: the list of priorities for upgrading
and paving. Does that mean that the super port is gone?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is only the beginning.

MR. F. ROWE: So in the beginning. Well, Mr.
Speaker, unfortunately we have been standing around for eight and one
half years with the beginning, when is something going to start?
When is something going to start with respect to the fisheries? We
have nothing but lip service Sir, to the fisheries of this Province.
For members opposite and their attitudes I think are coming around
to our point of view now.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE:

but for members opposite for the last eight and a half years to confront Ottawa on matters pertaining to the fisheries defys my comprehension and imagination. Here we have a \$20 million provincial fisheries budget. I think it went up to \$25 million last year. Three years ago, the latest estimates that I have seen from Ottawa, there was \$225 million of federal money that went into the fisheries of this Province, Ten times as much federal money went into the fisheries of this Province three years ago - I do not have the figures for this year or for last year - but three years ago ten times, \$225 million of federal money, went into the development of the fisheries as the Province put into the development of fisheries. And they continue to slam at Ottawa, Walter Carter and his tribe, slamming Ottawa daily, slamming Romeo LeBlanc daily. And when he was challenged in several instances of whether he had sat down and spoken to Romeo LeBlanc, particularly on the issue of the issuing of the shrimp licenses for the Atlantic Provinces, Walter Carter was claiming that he had sent telegrams, letters, had negotiated and sat down with Romeo LeBlanc about that, claimed it after he had made a public attack on Romeo LeBlanc. When I contacted Romeo LeBlanc there had been absolutely no negotiations or correspondence nor telegrams nor phone calls between the Provincial Minister of Fisheries of the day and the Federal minister.

MR. HOLLETT: Blatant politics.

MR. F. ROWE: Blatant politics.

MR. ROBERTS: And it did not work.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, one of the most eloquent speeches that I heard, and I do not like comparing people on either side of the House, but one of the most eloquent speeches that was made that I have heard in a long, long time was made by my friend from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) this morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: It was an excellent speech because what

MR. F. ROWE:

he was essentially saying was this, is that you are not going to get anywhere on confrontation tactics. Sit down and negotiate and talk with the boys in Ottawa whether they are Liberal or P.C. The magnitude of the provincial nationalistic feeling - I do not know what the motivation for it was - but the magnitude of it was exemplified during the federal campaign when the hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford) was openly challenging one of his own colleagues in Ottawa, the Minister of Fisheries. He cannot even sit down and talk with his counterpart in Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: What about his row with the Prime Minister?

MR. F. ROWE: And then had a row with the Prime Minister.

MR. ROBERTS: As he then was.

MR. F. ROWE: As he then was.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) Confederation Building.

MR. ROBERTS: The Prime Minister had to disavow him publicly.

MR. F. ROWE: If the then Prime Minister said federally -

MR. BARRY: I hope we can expect the same now of gentlemen (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: If the Prime Minister is wrong we will certainly go against him.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: If he is wrong just as when the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is wrong we go against him.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Is that out of order, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member is supposed to be speaking I believe.

MR. ROBERTS: He is speaking very well indeed, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, I hope that I am speaking, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: It is just the Minister of Mines and Energy was not listening, that is the trouble.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is closely approaching one o'clock, I can only say this, that we are as interested in maximizing the benefits of offshore mineral, oil, gas and fish as any other members opposite.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: We are just as interested and just as sincere but we are also very sincere when we realize that we do not owe Canada anything. But we are a part of the Confederate system, the Federation, we are a part and we have benefited greatly. And I, for one Newfoundlander, will be proud one day to stand up and be able to say that we are now in a position to help out other provinces of the Canadian Federation.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: That should be the greatest dream of every single member of this House of Assembly, when we as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can say we are proud to be a part of Confederation and we are proud to be contributing financially, socially and culturally to the great Canadian Federation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising - I might inform the House that on Tuesday when we return we will be taking up the Environmental Assessment Act again - but I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I guess there is no place in the world outside of the old sod where it is more appropriate - so a little ahead of time but nevertheless, the top of the morning to you all for Monday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at three of the clock.