

VOL. 2

NO. 5

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

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

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Pursuant to Section 23(4) of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act, Special Report No. 2 by the Parliamentary Commissioner was received in my office just a short while ago. This report is now being tabled and all members will receive a copy of it shortly.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the Auditor General in his annual report made certain observations regarding the collection of outstanding loans by the Rural Development Authority.

Of the eighteen accounts cited, nine were excluded from legal recourse to collect upon advice from the Department of Justice. Of the remainder, two accounts were considered to be uncollectable and are awaiting implementation of write-off procedures. This, of course, leaves but seven accounts totalling \$46,869 on which certain lapses in follow-up have occurred. Collection efforts are being actively pursued.

The Auditor General has further stated that deficiency balances, that is to say accounts on which loan security has been seized and sold without realizing the full amount owing, should not be carried as regular accounts receivable. My department has made ongoing attempts to negotiate write-off procedures and positive steps will shortly be taken to implement a standard system for handling the write-off of receivables.

The Auditor's report questions letters requiring payment being sent to loan clients having deficiency balances, when it has been stated that certain of these balances are not collectable through the legal process. Advice received from the Department of Justice

MR. J. GOUDIE: states only that we cannot pursue collection of these balances through the courts. It has been standard procedure that applicable clients be advised by letter, following the sale of repossessed equipment, of the proceeds realized and balance remaining. Collection has not been pursued, however, beyond this step. The letter in question is primarily designed to advise clients details of the sale transactions and to preclude any possible areas of misunderstanding. Clients will not in future be advised that they are responsible for payment of deficiency balances that fall within the category in question.

I wish to inform the hon. House that any existing shortcomings of the Rural Development Authority have been recognized by my department and they are currently being dealt with through appropriate channels. Later on the Order Paper today I am giving notice that an amendment to our act will be proposed to allow for the introduction of formal regulations. Other items will also be proposed that will serve to further streamline the operation of the Rural Development Authority and assist in providing an even more comprehensive and effective programme.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this is ordinary for a minister and the Premier to get up and read ministerial statements after the Auditor General's Report. There a couple of days ago we had the Premier giving reasons why \$78,000 was not collected, they were going to collect it. And here we have the minister making a statement of some \$46,869 of that is not collected accompanying to seven accounts.

MR. S. NEARY: That is the ambulance service in Labrador.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's Report on page 26 he did mention that in the 1977 - 1978 report that he commented on the lack of control of the issuance of loans by the Rural Development Authority. That was in the 1977-78 report. And then he stated that the guidelines established were not followed in all cases. Now, you go on further and then he said that "At the time of the writing of this report (December 3rd, 1979) some twenty-eight months have elapsed since the recommendation, and it appears that the authority is no closer to having regulations then it was at that time."

Mr. Speaker, any department of government if they are issuing loans for whatever reason and the loans are issued on a monthly or yearly basis to be repaid, I am sure if the hon. minister or any other member of this House would go to the bank and get a loan from the bank to buy a car or anything else they will be required to make their monthly payments or if not the car would be taken from them or probably the mortgage be seized or their house and so on. So, Mr. Speaker, regardless of who the companies are, who the people are, if they are getting loans from the Rural Development Authority they are obliged to pay back the government the same as any other ordinary human being through other channels. I think it is a bit disgraceful to know that, as the Auditor General said, twenty-eight months have elapsed since he made a recommendation to government, and his last sentence, that the authority has not come any closer to

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 148

SD - 2

MR. G. WARREN:

agreeing to those regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the hon. minister, next year when the Auditor General brings in his report, will be making similar statements.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works

MR. H. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some

comments concerning the paragraphs in the Report of the Auditor General for the year ending the 31st of March 1979 which pertains to the Department of Public Works. Paragraph 36 in the Auditor General's Report refers to Disputed application of spending authority. As the Auditor General points out, for the last several years he has objected to the transfer of the funds between the subdivisions shown in Appendix LV of the Estimates. The Auditor General very quickly points out that transfers did take place in 1978, 1979 with the prior approval of Treasury Board. It is my opinion that Treasury Board, by virtue of the power vested in it under Section 28 of the Financial Administration Act, has the authority to approve and transfer subdivisions.

And my department feels very strongly that it needs this flexibility in order to effectively carry out its service mandate. As the House is aware, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works and Services has a wide range of responsibilities for the construction, alteration and maintenance in all government buildings in the province. In addition, it has certain responsibilities in the many buildings or portions of buildings which Government leases. The Department must be able to respond, therefore, on virtually a day-to-day basis to the many changing demands for maintenance, alterations and other services from the departments whom we serve.

In paragraph 37, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General refers to a duplicate payment in the amount of \$13,877 to a construction company in connection with work done by that company in the C.A. Pippy Park. I must confirm to the House that I agree that this is a factual and valid criticism, but hasten to add that, as the Auditor General points out, the money has been recovered from the contractor in question. Since 1977, when this incident took place, the Department has made substantial progress in the streamlining and modern-

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 149

EL - 2

MR. H. YOUNG: ization of its project control and
accounting procedures. The Department is presently in the final
stages of implementing a new computerized financial management sys-
tem. My officials have asked the Auditor General to carry out a thor-
ough review of this system, and suggest any modifications that he may
feel are required in order to achieve the degree of financial control
that he considers necessary. The Auditor General has recently consent-
ed to carry out this review.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what in essence we are talking about here is this Assembly approving estimates for a particular department and finding out that indeed they are spent in another department which, as I understand it, we approve estimates for the Department of Public Works and to find out that they are spent in some other department which is really approving for 'a' and finding out that it is spent under 'b', which really means it is in a way misappropriation of funds. And though I agree, as the Auditor General points out, that certainly within the Department of Public Works there must be a fair amount of flexibility with respect to the day to day demands that come to the department, but still I think that if we are going to carry on the tradition of parliament whereby this House approves certain expenditures for particular departments, well then we have to abide by that rule and even though, as I said, there has to be some flexibility, where do we draw the line? The Auditor General specifically points out that he agrees that there should be some flexibility but he says he is firmly opposed to the transferring of capital funds, and by this he refers to monies for building, construction and alterations, either between heads or non-capital uses. Now, the thing is, of course, what I do not know at the moment is whether or not the transfer of these payments were indeed made for the points that the Auditor-General particularly alludes to. If it does, certainly that is very serious and it is a matter that we shall have to look into. It is a matter which we will have to address ourselves to. Again the Auditor General refers us to appendix four of the Estimates, and I have taken a look at these but with such quick notice I can hardly see what kinds of transfers there were. But, again, I think

MR. T. LUSH: it is very important that we, certainly iron out some of the weaknesses here, yet giving the minister and giving his department some kind of flexibility. But lines must be drawn so that we in this hon. House can certainly have a check on how the monies are spent and certainly be re-assured that when we here approve of an expenditure for a particular department that it is indeed spent by that department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

I am sure that all hon. members would like to welcome to the gallery today three community councillors from Long Island, Green Bay; Mr. W. A. Rideout, who is chairman of the council, and councillors Croucher and Colbourne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Before we go on, I wanted to table, as I had indicated I would before the galleries were opened to the public, a letter to me from the Senate of the Legislature of Nebraska commending Canadians on their heroic efforts to have some people removed from Tehran a little while ago and a similar kind of resolution from the Legislature of the state of Washington, the Senate of Washington, and I table this for hon. members' perusal and to indicate that we have some friends below the forty-ninth parallel and welcome the members from Long Island.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to prolong the Statements by Ministers and the like, but I am sure the Premier would not object if I made two observations with regard to these complimentary letters from the various legislatures. One is, of course, that I think that I can take some personal pride, no doubt the man in Nebraska was not aware of the fact that I would be here as the person who appointed the Ambassador who did that splendid job in Iran, but the other point is far more important -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: But far more important than that is the fact that there was at least one Newfoundland lady involved and maybe two in that exercise and I think it is another example of where Newfoundlanders have performed extremely well in very difficult circumstances around the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, no question about it that I think we all appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition in the former

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 151

NM - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: position can claim some responsibility for that in that he did appoint him and we thank the Leader of the Opposition for that and acknowledge it wholeheartedly, no question. Of course, there was also another lady involved that was Flora MacDonald

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a very good lead into my question. Speaking about ladies, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) with regard to the Matrimonial Property Act. I have no doubt that I am not alone in getting an increasing number of representations and enquiries and expressions of concern from various parties throughout the Province as to implementation of the act and the informational programme which, in the period immediately preceding Christmas recess, the hon. minister indicated that he was going to bring forward. Now we have only a matter of less, I suppose, than three months before the actual act itself goes into effect. Although I may have a supplementary question as to the timing, in the meantime could the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) indicate at what point the planning is for the massive or - perhaps that is to exaggerated a word - but the substantial publicity campaign and informational campaign to which the government is committed?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the act is due to come into effect or proclaimed July 1st, or whatever is the next working day thereafter. Actually the first part of it, the newspaper advertisements are due to appear this weekend, I believe, in this weekend in areas where there is a daily newspaper and the next issue in areas where there are weekly newspapers. This will be followed up by radio and television promotion. The department is preparing a pamphlet in a question and answer format which will be generally available to everybody in the Province. They will be made available at certain central locations and also people by writing in or phoning in will be able to get a copy. So the first aspect of it, which will be newspapers advertisements, is due this weekend and the pamphlet will be available within a period of about two weeks, and the newspaper advertisements

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 152

AH-2

MR. OTTENHEIMER: will be followed by radio and television.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I might by way of an observation suggest that a household mailer would not be out of order in a case like this rather than have it at some point because of the failure sometimes for the people to know what is available to them. But another question, is there - I am not a lawyer so I do not know the precise words - but is there a period of grace or anything of that nature provided for, or will there be some kind of allowance made for those who have not totally complied or were not able to by the first of July? I realize that

MR. D. JAMIESON: at some point it has to come into effect, but I assure the hon. minister - and while he may not be aware of it personally, I think many members on both sides are - that particularly in rural areas this has gone by virtually unknown, and what concerns me is that people will, quite without their knowledge or without their awareness, find themselves in some way or other in breach of the law. And I am wondering if there is a mechanism which, out of compassion, if you like, or reasonableness, that could be provided whereby these kinds of persons would not in fact feel the full weight of whatever penalties, or whatever the case might be, for an interim or a reasonable period.

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things I probably should say in response to the question of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. First, it is due to be proclaimed July 1st and, of course, once it is proclaimed it is in fact, then, the law. Now, it is not, of course, the type of situation in which, you know, there are penalties in the usual sense. Now, as hon. members will recall, the provisions are there and they govern the disposition of matrimonial property after the proclamation of July 1st, but there is the option that any couple may contract out and may so arrange their affairs as they wish. But they will in fact have to contract out in order not to be brought under the provisions of the act.

So in summary, once it is proclaimed it is immediately effective, but, as hon. members will recall, there is a provision whereby any couple may contract out of the provisions and make their own arrangements.

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

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am perfectly well aware that the

MR. D. JAMIESON:

hon. minister is sympathetic and consequently there is nothing argumentative in what I am saying. I do point out to him however that in rural areas in particular, and I happen to represent one and many members in this House do, where the legal niceties, if you wish, are not that easily procurable even if the couple or the household concerned is totally familiar. That is item number one.

I would like to ask whether or not, for instance, in a case like that where undoubtedly, I suspect, members of this House will find themselves acting perhaps in a quasi-advisory capacity to many couples, because I have had a number of them myself already, whether the process of, let us say, contracting out, to use that as an example, is underway but it has not been completed. I realize that there is a difficulty but I am just trying to find out how, if an event occurs, let us say the death of a spouse on the 2nd. or 3rd. of July or something of that nature, and the attempt has been underway to correct the situation or to comply with the Act, is there some kind of mechanism that the hon. minister could look at to see that those situations do not cause undue hardship when there is no intent to avoid the legislation. Would he at least look at that to if something can be done?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly do that. As hon. members are aware, and I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) is aware of it with matrimonial property, and indeed with everything, there has to be a date at which it is operative. Now there is, of course, a fair area of judicial discretion there within the Act and one could not prejudge how that

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: would be exercised. But it certainly is a matter which we will give consideration of the hon. gentleman's suggestion of sending a copy through household mail, that would be to every household in the Province. It is certainly a very worthwhile one. In other words, what we will be doing there obviously is instead of saying to everybody, 'If you wish a copy let us know either by writing or phoning toll free,' because we were thinking of, in the first instance, advertisements of that type which would invite people to write in if they wanted a copy and then at a later date a toll free, Zenith number to phone in.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly the other would assure that everybody had it. Obviously receiving one is not going to insult anybody if they do not want it or need it, then they can burn it or do what they wish, but certainly that is worth a try. You know, one's first reflection was that that might be extremely expensive. Of course, it might make unnecessary a lot of the advertising asking people to write in if they want one if everybody automatically got one. So that is certainly something we will give very serious thought to.

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

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am not sure if this exceeds the right of the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) or the Attorney General to give legal advice, but a simple, straightforward question: Can the contracting out procedure be made in the proper form without in fact getting legal assistance or legal advice because if a demonstration could be given to people as to how they could put themselves on the side of the law by agreeing to a particular form, either before an MHA or a Justice of the Peace or something like that, is there a provision for that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as to the first part of the question, yes, people may contract out or set up their own agreement without recourse to a lawyer and without cost. And certainly I have not seen the latest draft of the pamphlet which is being prepared but a sort of simple, let us say, or domestic contract take fictitious circumstances as an example would certainly be very worthwhile, but I would repeat, because it is a very important point, and that is that a couple may devise right out in long hand and sign their own contract dealing with the disposition of their property upon the dissolution of the marriage. By dissolution, I should say, because a lot of

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: people think that means automatically divorce or separation, in ninety - I do not know - four, five, six maybe up to nine per cent of cases that means death of one of the spouses. When the marriage comes to an end, through death or whatever means, the property is disposed of. So a couple may, without recourse to a lawyer or any expense, agree among themselves and put on paper and sign how they wish by agreement the property to be disposed off when one or the other has died or for some other reason the marriage has come to an end.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this may have been answered just a moment ago although sometimes I have great difficulty following the logic of the Minister of Justice -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not know why. The hon. gentleman is the only one.

MR. THOMS: Will the minister undertake to make sure that there is a pro forma contract that will go out to every householder in this Province? Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) a question, I would certainly like his attention.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman has my undivided attention.

MR. THOMS: I obviously did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I think the television coverage on the South Coast of this Province is certainly not going to pay dividends because with all the satellite stations and everything out along the Coast of course they are not getting television and I suggest that at this point in time anyway it is probably going to be a waste of money. So will the minister undertake to make sure that there is a pro forma opting out contract that will go out with the pamphlets, and further, whether or not the minister has considered disseminating this information in these pamphlets through the high schools throughout this Province, who can bring this information then into the home and do a good job of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about kindergarten?

MR. THOMS: If the hon. member were in kindergarten I suggest it did.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think to get universal coverage that the household mail would be preferable. I mean, there are couples without children. So I certainly agree with the objective but I

MR. OTTENHEIMER: think the household mail, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), would be preferable. And we will certainly undertake to put in an example of a domestic contract. Now I know what the hon. gentleman is asking is not exactly the same because I think what he is asking is a pro forma one, sort of like these wills one buys at F.W. Woolworth. That is a possibility but I do not know that it would accomplish much because, you know, what would you put in it apart from the fact of a heading, "domestic contract," and down at the bottom, "sign here." I am not being facetious, but I am not sure that it would accomplish much. But we will certainly consider it. An example certainly of a domestic contract I think is very, very valid and I am not saying a pro forma would not be worthwhile, I will just have to think about it a bit because there might be nothing more to it than a heading.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

I am not sure that you could put much more in a pro forma than a heading saying what it was and a place for the people's signatures, but we will certainly give it consideration.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A new question, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. In view of the fact that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) thinks that one of his responsibilities is leaking out little bits and pieces of information from Ottawa, the latest one in connection with the curtailing of the salmon fishery in this Province - and he thinks his duty ends there - would the hon. the Premier tell the House what the position of the provincial government is in connection with the curtailing or banning of the commercial salmon fishery in this Province? Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman - I am asking the Premier a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A refusal by a minister to answer a question is not subject to debate or questioning.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, is the hon. the Premier going to answer the question?

Well, I will put my question to the Minister of Fisheries, then.

MR. SPEAKER:

A new question, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the official position of the Newfoundland Government is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

Oh, he is sulking again now!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:

- what the official position of the Province is in connecting with the curtailing or banning of the commercial salmon fishery in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to take any position. We do not know any certain position taken by the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN:

The situation today is very complex indeed, because there is no set forward policy coming out of Ottawa in connection with the commercial salmon fishery. We know there is some problem with the salmon stocks in Atlantic Canada; that has been, I think, pointed out quite clearly by all concerned. The recent information received by a salmon association more involved with the sports aspect of the fishery than the commercial aspect, indicates to them that there will be some curtailment or restrictions on the Newfoundland fishery in particular - it specified the Newfoundland commercial fishery.

The Salmon Advisory Board appointed by the federal government is in the process of dealing with the matter, but I am not satisfied with the way they are dealing with it, based on the fact there have been no meetings held of that board and you cannot make decisions without meetings. The next meeting will be held the end of March; however, the commercial salmon fishery starts the middle of May in our Province and it is important to have decisions made as soon as possible to let the fishermen know as to exactly what the situation will be; like, for example, the preparation of their gear, the purchase of new gear, etc.

Our position to date is that if there are any adverse effects whatsoever or any effects on restrictions in the commercial salmon fishery, that minimum adverse effects be on the bona fide commercial fishermen in our Province.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that, in the past few years, salmon fishermen in this Province,

MR. S. NEARY: especially on the Southwest Coast, have had their season reduced and they have had drift netting stopped to let the salmon go to the Saint John and Miramichi Rivers over in New Brunswick, where the number of commercial licences for commercial salmon fishing in the Province has increased, the number of sports fishing salmon licences have increased and our fishermen here have been punished because of this. And I understand the rivers over there are polluted. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to ask the hon. gentleman is: The hon. gentleman must be aware of this and certainly the provincial government - the Government of New Brunswick has a policy; and then the Premier has policies on the Northern cod stock and every other thing in relation to the fishery - surely this government here would not stand by and let the salmon go through the Gulf over to New Brunswick, and our fishermen watching them swim over, and have total banning or drastic curtailment of the salmon fishery in this Province. I am asking the hon. gentleman what the government's position is on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it quite clear that we do not want any adverse effects on the commercial salmon fishery in our province. The question of interception of the salmon that is so-called to be intercepted in our province on the way to rivers in New Brunswick is a complex one. It has not been addressed adequately to date.

We were hoping that the Salmon Board will deal with it adequately over the next number of weeks; however, the senior officials of the federal department who advised the out-going minister or the minister who just left the department, Mr. McGrath, and I assume now going to advise the new minister, Mr. LeBlanc, they drafted what they call a blueprint on Atlantic salmon management. Now that blueprint is now in place in Ottawa, yet for some strange reason, and I say for some strange reason, our provincial Department of Fisheries is unable to obtain a copy of that blueprint to be able to formulate any official final position on that matter. I think it is a very important one and a matter that should be discussed as soon as possible.

So if there is no final confirmation in reply to the telegram sent yesterday to the officials, realizing Mr. LeBlanc is moving back in the department, no official confirmation back from them confirming the information we have now received indirectly, I will be seeking a meeting to discuss a number of matters with the new federal minister, Mr. LeBlanc, and I am hoping to be able to discuss that very topic with him some time in the month of March.

MR. S. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member of LePoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Will the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if the Provincial Government will make a strong protest to the

MR. S. NEARY: Salmon Board or the Department of Fisheries, or whoever is responsible, that Newfoundlanders will not be discriminated against in this matter and that there will not be total banning of the commercial salmon fishery because even though they may compensate the fishermen, which has not been mentioned at all yet, I do not like to see a total ban and compensation paid because you will never get the fishery back. So, will there be a strong protest to the appropriate agency or department of government to see that Newfoundlanders will not be discriminated against in this matter?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, without again going to have to be labeled in the future as a man who picks fights with Ottawa, and is labeled by the Opposition the last two or three years of picking fights over transportation matters in particular, I can assure this hon. House that if Morgan was a fighting man on transportation matters, he will be fighting much greater on the salmon and fishery matters in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. WHITE: My question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) and it deals with the suspending of trading by a number of companies on the stock exchange since the last day or so and also the announcement by Mobil Oil concerning the Ben Nevis well, and I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not the government plans an announcement to coincide with the one made by Mobil yesterday in Alberta?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can determine, the only announcements made by Mobil yesterday was several, actually; there was more than one announcement, were several made to

March 6, 1960

Tape No. 158

EL - 3

MR. L. BARRY: try and point out that there was
nothing unusual that they were aware of that could have led to the very
significant increase in share price, not just theirs but others involved
in the Hibernia field which have taken place over the past several days.

MR. BARRY:

And it appears what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a tremendous amount of interest in what is happening off Newfoundland in the petroleum field and there are rumours which develop and there are - I had heard a week ago, more than a week ago, that on the street, as they say, the people speculating in the stock market had it that there was going to be a big announcement yesterday. I was not aware of any big announcement that was coming out yesterday. As far as I can see no big announcement did come out yesterday, but Mobil was forced to, because of the suspension of trading of its shares, forced to make a comment and I believe the comment that it made was just to point out, as I did, that whatever the rumour on the street about the big announcement, there was no big announcement yesterday. And even though we are optimistic and things are moving in the right direction and there will be further announcements at later dates, how do you react to a rumour, or when somebody asks you to comment on a rumour what do you say?

MR. WHITE:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon.

member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, this supplementary sort of deals with what I was asking the minister yesterday, and it is this: Is the minister in constant contact with those companies concerning announcements that they are going to make and is he aware of the contents beforehand of what the announcements are going to be?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a term and condition of the permits which the oil companies hold that they co-ordinate the release of information with us and I have to

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 159

AH-2

MR. BARRY: say that in I believe all cases we have had preliminary clearance of notices that are issued by the oil companies. They telax the gist of the announcement before it is released and reach agreement with us as to timing. We have not always been happy, however, with the amount of notice that we have been given before an announcement is made. For example, we have known in some cases for a week or ten days that we would have to make an announcement at some point, something had happened with respect to the exploration programme, and we have had just a matter of hours notice, in some cases, from the companies; they say, "We want to make the release this afternoon." The usual argument that they make is that "we have to do it because our shares are suspended, the stock exchange is insisting that we make a statement" and we have to try and understand the difficult positions they find themselves in. But we have made it absolutely clear to the companies that we want to have the fullest possible notice before any announcements are made, and any announcements have to be co-ordinated with us. This one yesterday, now, I understand there were attempts to reach me and I was in the House at the time before the announcement was made.

MR. BARRY: This type of announcement is not really the sort of thing we are too concerned about getting pre-clearance on and that is just a response or a reaction to a rumour in the market place.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have two more supplementaries if I -

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I am afraid you will have to put them quickly because there is only about two minutes remaining.

MR. WHITE: Well, I will tie them all in together, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. WHITE: First of all is the minister saying, I mean maybe he can clarify this point, that the Newfoundland Government only make announcements when they are told to do so by the oil companies, and the second, I wonder if the -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) the Opposition would (inaudible).

MR. WHITE: - I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the government plans to have a representative at the Law of the Sea Conference in New York in view of statements made by former colleagues of the minister, Dr. Patton yesterday in Nova Scotia and some suggestion by Allan Beazley, the Canadian negotiator, that the Newfoundland claim, and indeed the Canadian claim to offshore resources might be challenged by some third world countries at the Law of the Sea Conference.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the first question does not really merit an answer because it is a stupid comment by the hon. member rather than a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I will say, Mr. Speaker, and I explained yesterday that the information which is obtained by the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars is proprietary information of the companies involved which, under our regulations and legislation, we are not at liberty, and no government operates this way, to treat this as their information to be distributed at their whim. We co-ordinate responsibly the release of information with these companies. Now that is the bottom line. We do not ask their permission. We do not follow their orders. We co-ordinate jointly the release of information with respect to oil and gas exploration.

On the second question, the hon. member reveals a misunderstanding of the situation with respect to international law that I am afraid is also prevalent in the media. The existing international law position under the 1958 Geneva Convention is that Canada, and Newfoundland as the responsible party within Canada, has the right to explore and exploit, and this is the actual language of the convention, the Continental Shelf out to a depth of 200 metres, or to the limits of exploitability, which at that time they did not think could be much beyond 200 metres. But the existing international law, in other words, is that we have exclusive rights to explore and exploit to the very edge of the Continental margin which in some cases off Newfoundland is 450 miles or more and there is no obligation to share revenue with anyone on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: What has been happening, and this has been happening over a number of years, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) knows, a former Minister of External Affairs since the Law of the Sea Conference opened there has been discussions on many items under this 1958 Geneva Convention and there has been an attempt made by certain landlocked countries who do not have continental shelves to try and get some form of revenue sharing for continental shelves outside the 200 mile limit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: That is not a rule of international -

MR. NEARY: The Speaker called order. Sit down.

MR. BARRY: By leave, just a minute or half a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) By leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Good stuff. Good stuff.

MR. BARRY: There is no need for a select committee;
I know what the law is and I am just trying to set it out clearly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the constitutional lawyers?

MR. BARRY: No contest! It is a matter of international
law in any event, so if constitutional lawyers disagree, you know, they
have to take second place to international lawyers. But as far as the
Law of the Sea Conference is concerned, the rules have not changed.
International law has not yet changed but there is an attempt to bring
about a change and we have communicated with the Department of External
Affairs, the minister, and we are communicating again with the new
minister within the next day or so to underline

MR. L. BARRY: and stress how important it is to Canada and to Newfoundland that we, our delegation at the Law of the Sea Conference, fight tooth and nail against any such attempt to force revenue sharing outside 200 miles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act".

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have the great honour this afternoon, or certainly I am more than pleased to be able to present a petition signed by 974 - I was going to say residents of my constituency of Bellevue, but I think on perusal of the petition it will be discovered that at least half of them are constituents of the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the member for Trinity North (Mr. C. Brett).

This is a petition and I would like to read the prayer of the petition, "That we, the undersigned, humbly petition Her Majesty's Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to pave the twenty miles of highway No. 204 commonly known as the Southwest Arm Road. This road serves nine communities, is used by six school buses and over 400 local vehicles, and serves as the only outlet for a very important fishing area." And the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), I have no doubt, is perfectly

MR. D. JAMIESON: well aware of this and the deterioration that takes place with the fish being transported over this deplorable highway as it presently exists. "Even though it took the last nine years," the petition says, "to upgrade this road, its present condition is deplorable and an insult to those who are forced to use it. In comparison with roads of adjacent areas, Highway 204," and I am using the words of the petition, "is completely out of focus."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. members opposite would have been all that distressed, but I can confirm the fact that we very nearly lost the Leader of the Opposition two Saturday nights ago on this particular highway. I had occasion to drive on it and I can confirm everything that is in it because on two occasions during the drive I found myself in a very hazardous position because it is so bad. Now there was a commitment made some time ago to both upgrade and pave this road and I emphasize once again that there are a number of residents and business community representatives from Clarendville and area who have signed this because, of course, Clarendville is the centre now, the shopping centre and the retail centre and the business centre for all of that region.

So I commend this petition to the House and I urge the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) and the government to act on it immediately.

MR. T. LUSH: You said Northwest Arm; it should have been Southwest Arm.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Excuse me, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

I made a geographical error and called it Northwest Arm when obviously I should have said Southwest Arm.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson), who represents an adjoining district

MR. F. ROWE: to mine of Trinity - Bay de Verde and
of course he represents the district of Bellevue.

Sir, aside from the fact that this road took some nine years to upgrade and represents twenty miles of road where you have nine communities being serviced by that road and six schools, aside from that, Sir, I would like to point out another reason why this particular road should be paved and upgraded immediately and that is an economical reason. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that we do have a considerable amount of transportation of fish products over this particular road and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), I would hope, or certainly the member representing the district I hope would get up and support the petition on that particular point alone because one of the things that probably deters the sale of fish from this particular Province, relegates against it anyway in some manner is the quality of the fish in this Province that is being marketed outside of the Province and quite often the quality of the fish is downgraded, not because of the plant workers or the methods of getting the fish out of the boat and into the plants and this sort of a thing because a lot of work has been done on that, but the transportation of fish particularly in the hot days of the Summer over bumpy, dusty, gravel roads does considerable damage and reduces the quality of the fish products quite significantly. If for no other reason, Sir, we should have such roads upgraded immediately in this Province.

MR. F.B. ROWE: and I would suggest to the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), in the consideration of a road paving programme for this Province, that some consideration be given to roads as they relate to the transportation of fish products in this particular Province.

For a great many years, Sir, we had fish transported down, for example, the Great Northern Peninsula, some 200 or 300 miles of straight dirt road and by the time it reached Port aux Basques for transportation across the Strait, or some other fish plants on the West coast, the fish was in a considerably bad state. So, Sir, I hope that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and/or the minister representing that particular district will get up and support the petition. I certainly give it all my support.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order 1, the Address in Reply.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate the last sitting. Really, I think I would like to take up partially where I left off in the first debate in this House, after the first Throne Speech.

In the first Throne Speech we talked about the identity of Newfoundlanders and the accountability of the government. In this second Throne Speech we are now back to looking, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) said, at an essay of where we are and where we are going. And the two things tie in. The two things tie in, Mr. Speaker, because there is not very much point in the government

MR. STIRLING: talking about the kind of Newfoundland they hope we will have, and the kind of fisheries development that we are talking about unless the government is going to be accountable for making things happen.

And let us just look at what has happened since this first Throne Speech, and what the government is accountable for since that first Throne Speech. In that first Throne Speech, in my reply to it, I asked the government to do something about the Northern cod stock. It was not a big problem. Well, we have come a long way since, since there was not a big problem. There was a conference in Corner Brook. The government did not make very much of a stand. There was a federal government - and then they took on the federal government on the Northern cod stock and now the government's position on the Northern cod stock is the same as the position that was asked for by many people and at that time the only person who responded from the government side was the Minister of Lands and Forests and he is now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

We should have no more problems with the Northern cod stock.

Look at the other area, an area that the government has control over, and that is the area of the Fisheries Loan Board. What has happened to the Fisheries Loan Board in that period? The fishermen who are on the Fisheries Loan Board still do not know where they stand. The fishermen who are on the Fisheries Loan Board still have not been told -

MR. MORGAN: They are not going back on the Board again, I will tell you that.

MR. NEARY: They got the flick. Everything is blamed on the fishermen.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries would like to elaborate a bit more on that statement -

MR. MORGAN: Ask me a question and I will give you the details tomorrow in the House, if you would like.

MR. STIRLING: - I will gladly yield for you to answer specifically that question, that the fishermen are not going back on the Board. Would you like -

MR. MORGAN: Not the same fishermen, no.

MR. STIRLING: Not the same fishermen? Would you like to be more specific? I would gladly yield for you to be more specific.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: He is asking the hon. minister a question.

MR. STIRLING: No, he interrupted me.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): If the hon. member wishes to yield to the hon. minister for some comments during his time, I suppose that is quite in order.

MR. STIRLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought we had established the precedent last time

MR. STIRLING: that if we yield to somebody, that somebody speaks and we take the time, the full amount of time afterwards. That was the precedent that I thought was established by yourself.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, I would suggest to you that we will have to wait and see if the matter arises and if so I will have to rule on it at that time.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: He was too cowardly to get up and make a statement publicly.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I was quite prepared to yield was because this is the first indication, the first indication from the government of the exact point that the Fisheries minister made, those fishermen are not going back on the board. That is the first indication. I asked last December, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have your indication. The minister has again asked if I will yield and I am not prepared to yield without giving up my time. Can I have a ruling from the Speaker? It is the second intervention by the minister, Mr. Speaker, and if he is going to continue that all the way through—I have no objection to yielding if the Speaker will give an indication that it is not cutting into my time.

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to indicate at this time, seeing the hon. minister is about to stand, that I would have to take a moment just to check the reference. I recall the former instance but I believe it is a little different circumstance. And I believe that normally when a person yields for somebody on the other side to make a comment, I believe it does come out of his time. So it will come out of your

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): allotted twenty minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that was not my interpretation of what happened.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)
like thirty seconds. Clarify before you carry on your speech
(Inaudible)

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am not certain that the hon. member has agreed to yield or not.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have not agreed to yield my time.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, then the hon. member should perhaps continue with his speech because his time is certainly moving along.

MR. STIRLING: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. My interpretation was that the Speaker had agreed on that and I would appreciate if he could do that because this minister, I am sure, will interject from time to time.

The first indication that we have from the government that this Fisheries Loan Board has had anything done with it is two minutes ago when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) indicated in a slurring manner that those fishermen will not go back on the loan board.

MR. MORGAN: Not the same fishermen I said, not the same fishermen.

MR. STIRLING: Those same fishermen will not go back on the loan board. And that is exactly the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) formed yet.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. The same fishermen will not go back on the board. This was something that the House Leader on the other side would not agree to, this was something that I refer you back to the December 19th Hansard, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would not say, would not concede, and that they came out and said, "Well their term has expired and there is an interim board." And I remember the Leader of the Opposition getting up and saying, "Come on now, you cannot have two boards. You either have a board or you do not have a board." And up until two minutes ago they had indicated that there were two boards and that they would not come point blank and say it, and now as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has said, those same fishermen will not be put back on the board. Now what has he done to those same fishermen?

MR. MORGAN: New faces (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: Those same fishermen, Mr. Speaker, have not been given an opportunity, those same fishermen have not been given an opportunity to defend their position on the board. The board has been called a mess, a scandal, and a great deal was going on with the board. And what did the government do? In Marystown when they had a similar problem they had the Board of Directors examine the similar problem. In the case of

MR. L. STIRLING: the Fisheries Loan Board, they did nothing to tell the Fisheries Loan Board that they were fired. They just brought in a new bunch of civil servants, made them the Fisheries Loan Board, and until two minutes ago they did not have the courtesy to tell those fishermen who were on the board they would not be replaced, until the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) in his seat, from a slurring point of view said, 'Those fishermen will not be put back on the board.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Insulting the members of that board -

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, one thing I will never do - I never will in the future or never have done in the past - is slur on a fisherman. My father was a fisherman all his life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: And the point of order is there was no slurring comment made. I did say that the Board will not consist of the same fishermen as in the past. The Board will consist of fishermen, but not the same fishermen as in the past. That is a correction, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the point of order is there was no slurring comment made and if the hon. gentleman is going to refer to my comments, quote me accurately.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE: That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is simply a point of clarification. And there is no such thing as a point of clarification in the House, so there is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is a point of ignorance.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would rule that there is, in fact, not a point of order in this particular case, but the hon. minister has taken the opportunity to explain some comments that were attributed to him.

I would ask the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling) to continue.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is typical of the flip-flop that this government has done on matters of fishery. There is no question in my mind that when you check Hansard you will say, 'And those fishermen will never go back on the board.' And the tone of voice may not appear in Hansard, but there is no doubt to anybody who was listening as to what that Fisheries Minister intended. And that is the very point. This whole matter has been left up as a question, that these people who were on the Loan Board up until now have not been given the courtesy of even being told what the Fisheries Minister (Mr. J. Morgan) just said. They have not even been given the courtesy of a letter that says, 'You are no longer a member of the board. Thank you very much for past services,' - nothing.

MR. J. MORGAN: They knew it six months ago. Come on!

MR. L. STIRLING: They have not been told a thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: One of the ignorantest things ever happened.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is an indication -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member wishes to continue.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. members on both sides, of course, are well aware that part of parliamentary procedure and tradition is to exchange comments back and forth. However, there are occasions when it does

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

get somewhat out of hand and I believe this is one of those occasions. I would ask hon. members to please constrain themselves so that the hon. the member for Bonavista North may continue with his remarks.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have no objections to the give and take across the floor and it was not on my objection.

By the way, I said it in this same period in the Throne Speech the last time that I was here, that I was proud to be in the House of Assembly and I had my family in the gallery to observe what a great, wonderful place it is. They are back here again today to observe what a great, wonderful place it is and I am sure that they will understand that it can be a little bit more lively than maybe the first formal visit.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Do they understand the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the point about the Fisheries Loan Board. Those fishermen who were members of that Loan Board had a job to do. They were asked by the government to go out and say to fishermen all over this Province, 'There is a great future in the fishery. There is a great future for young people in the fishery. Come in and borrow from the Fisheries Loan Board. We are going to finance you, we are going to be your bankers. The new look in Newfoundland is going to be the great prosperity of the fishery.' And that is what those fishermen did. They had meetings all over the Province. They encouraged fishermen to come in and borrow money. They encouraged people to go into debt for hundreds of thousands of dollars to prosecute the fishery. And what has happened to that Fisheries Loan Board? The fishermen were fired off the Loan Board and they have not, even at

MR. L. STIRLING: this stage, to this date, to this moment, until we heard the Fisheries Minister's comment a few minutes ago **been** told. They have not been thanked for their services, they have not had the opportunity to defend themselves. The absolutely basic right in this democratic system that we live in is that everybody has the right to defend themselves and yet this Fisheries Loan Board **was-nothing done with**. They put in a new Board, they were not even told that a new board was being brought in. That is one issue! That is one issue that the government still has to deal with. You cannot treat people like dirt and then make pretty speeches about the way of life in Newfoundland **and the great respect they have about** fishermen. You cannot treat people like dirt, like the way they have been treated. Those fishermen were representatives of fishermen all over this Province and at this point they have not been told that they are off the Board.

MR. S. NEARY: One is in my district on it.

MR. L. STIRLING: Oh, of course, all over the fishing districts. **And** they did a good job. The fishermen did a good job, the job that they were supposed to do. Now they were not responsible for the administration of the Board, they are like every other Board of Directors. They were responsible to get fishermen to have confidence in the Board as a source of money. Now what really happened is the fishermen have been flicked off the Board **and a group of** civil servants have been put in there taking their direction directly from the government. They have left the fishermen in utter chaos, Mr. Speaker, utter chaos.

MR. S. NEARY: No protection.

MR. L. STIRLING: No protection, no concern. Let us just ask any of the hon. members opposite who are either in business or in any of the other walks of life; You go to a banker and you borrow some money -in this case the fisherman is a businessman. He borrows money to get himself into a boat. The only thing that he can pay back that loan from is his continuing income as a fisherman. This year he gets a problem with the motor - I have one fisherman in particular who has been in touch with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the minister pronounced this in the House of Assembly-not on the telephone with the guy when he was talking to him but in the House of Assembly, 'I am not interceding or interfering on behalf of anyone'. That same Fisheries minister, of course, on the telephone says, 'Leave it with me, boy, I will see what I can do'.

AN HON. MEMBER:

True

MR. L. STERLING: The same Fisheries minister! Here is a person who is up to his ears in debt to the Fisheries Loan Board, has got a good business as a fisherman and he needs a new motor, \$17,000. He comes to the Loan Board and he has been tossed around since last Spring. And that is one example of hundreds and hundreds, hundreds in every part of this Province who have been told by the people in the Fisheries Loan Board, in the government and in this Throne Speech - in this Throne Speech we say the number one priority in Newfoundland is Fisheries, that is what we are saying in the Throne Speech, and the Minister of Fisheries gets up and says, 'Oh, yes, but, of course, the only place we have any money for is in hardship cases'. But who is going to decide the hardship cases? ~~Not:~~ the Minister of Fisheries he is not getting involved in that.

MR. S. NEARY:

The Minister of Finance like

up in Ottawa.

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 165

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING: It is going to be the Chairman,
or the Acting Chairman or the civil service. It is going to
be the same situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. STIRLING: The question, when it was asked of the Fisheries minister who is bouncing around-

MR. MORGAN: They laughed at him. The fishermen of Wesleyville laughed at him. They laughed at him. He was a joke.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, I would like for Hansard to record the comments of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), his slur across the House. The fishermen of Wesleyville laugh at him, he is a joke.

MR. MORGAN: They think you are a joke, they do.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, the Fisheries minister, they think you are a joke.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) a cornerboy from St. John's about the fisheries, now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: A tavern owner! A tavern owner!
He runs a tavern!

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, what the minister is really doing when he is trying to make a joke and a slur on anybody who questions the minister is that he is saying, 'Do not bother me with these problems of these fishermen from Wesleyville' because the fishermen from Wesleyville or the fishermen from Badger's Quay are not here today -

MR. MORGAN: I will be in Wesleyville next week.

MR. STIRLING: - and they cannot see today what the Minister of Fisheries is doing because the government has not agreed to allow television into the House.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman has not ever (inaudible)book yet. I will be in the office in Wesleyville next week.

MR. STIRLING: If we could get television in this House, Mr. Speaker, if we could get television in this House the people in Newfoundland would see what the Minister of Fisheries is doing in the middle of the afternoon because he thinks he can get away with it, because he thinks he can avoid the subject that he knows cannot be avoided. And maybe it is his last fling as Fisheries minister for the next few days, maybe he has been told 'That is it, boy, might as well have your fun.'

MR. WARREN: He is doing a good job of nothing.

MR. STIRLING: He is saying that it is a joke that the people in Wesleyville have problems with the Fisheries Loan Board. The last time that they came in and brought up a point on behalf of sixty municipalities in the Province he said, 'Only sixty', and now, only the fishermen of Wesleyville. The member for Bonavista North is a joke because he brings in the concerns of the fishermen from Wesleyville.

MR. WARREN: He has a tavern, does he not?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) just left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. STIRLING: The people in Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, the people in Bonavista North want their fair share. The people in Bonavista North want their fair share. And as long as there are Liberals elected to this House of Assembly they will get their fair share and they will have the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - comments of fishermen, and the comments of fishermen in Greenspond and in Badger's Quay and in Valleyfield, they will have these things brought to this House of Assembly because we represent the fishermen of this Province.

MR. WARREN: Right on, right on!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there are not only fishermen in Bonavista North. There are people who have a concern for housing in Bonavista North. The members of St. John's know what great benefits have come through the Residential Rehabilitation Program, brought in by the federal government, operating here in St. John's, operating in many parts. But nowhere in Bonavista North is there one half unit of housing of that nature. Nowhere in Bonavista North is there one unit of public housing.

Mr. Speaker, not too many months ago, this time last year, a little later when we were into the election, this government could find money to send out to the people who were on welfare - a seven per cent increase to the people on welfare.

MR. WARREN: Big deal.

MR. STIRLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, those same people in the district of Bonavista North have had their oil costs increasing, just going up and up and up.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) higher, higher,
higher.

MR. THOMS: Take the weekend off, will you?

MR. STIRLING: And when they came to the welfare office and said, "Where am I going to get this extra money", there is not extra money. Well, I make a proposal to the government that anybody who receives a provincial government cheque through long-term assistance should have an increase, anybody who is on long-term assistance - not only the people in Bonavista North, but because I have seen the crying problems of the people in Bonavista North who have no other choice. Expenses have gone up twenty, thirty, forty dollars a month for oil; they have no other choice. I propose to the government, Mr. Speaker, that at least these people be given the same increase as they were given in the middle of the election last year.

MR. STIRLING:

at least the same seven per cent increase to be sent out in their cheques so that they can cope with this increase in the cost of oil this year.

MR. STAGG:

That the Liberals put on.

MR. HISCOCK:

What about the eighteen cents a gallon?

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, all of us were elected to this House of Assembly to represent the people in our districts. We did not get elected as members of the government or members of the Opposition, we were elected, all fifty-two of us, to represent our district. It was after we got elected, when the seats were added up, that there happened to be more on that side than this side and that is why we end up in Opposition and they happen to be on the government side. But everybody has a responsibility and, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, in addition to representing our districts as individuals, we take the responsibility of making sure that this government operates properly, that you just cannot make pretty speeches. Now you have made pretty speeches about the identity of the Newfoundland community and where we are going in Newfoundland. We talked yesterday about one of those great disparities, **the ambulance service for Labrador which,** I fully expect will be corrected before the budget is brought in. **I have talked to some of** the members on the other side and they are as much ashamed of that situation as we are on this side. I expect that problem to be **resolved.**

I want to bring to your attention, and to the attention of other people- the Minister of Social Services is **not here at the present time** - but I will give you an example of another thing that needs to be corrected. **Right** now I have an incident of a young man whose family is on welfare in my district, and he is representative of hundreds and hundreds of people throughout Newfoundland, because, in the

MR. STIRLING: midst of all the excitement of this great oil boom, Mr. Speaker, there are still hundreds of people that do not have jobs in this Province, and there are hundreds of people on welfare that are ashamed to be on welfare, do not want to be on welfare but they have no choice. This is a young man, 16 years of age, his family is on welfare, and through the school - a bright, young fellow - they got the opportunity for him to go to Gander, to go into the vocational school. This is a situation that I am not blaming on the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), but as a member of this House I am going to bring to the attention of the government, in my role as an Opposition member and as a member, bring to the attention of the government because I am sure they will want to correct it. The standard procedure is that this young man has been told to get a student loan; 'get a student loan to cover your books and tuition, get a student loan,' Mr. Speaker, **to a young man on welfare.** Everybody in the community is giving him a chance to break out of it. And we wonder why we have so many rural development loans not collected, so many fisheries loans not collected? Here is the department that says to the parents of this young man, "Go get him a student loan. A young man, 16 years of age, has a chance to go to vocational school, has a chance to make something of himself, has the chance to break out of the welfare cycle, and what is he told? "Go get a student loan."

MR. MORGAN: What is wrong with getting a student loan?

MR. STIRLING: **Exactly! Now listen and I will tell you what is wrong** with getting a student loan: How can the young fellow ever pay it back? How can he ever pay it back, **His** family on welfare - 16 years old! - and he starts off life and his first introduction to doing something independent on his own is, 'Get a loan, my son'. Get a loan and start off life knowing that nobody pays back government loans; start him off with the idea to get a loan because that is the way to do it. All you have to do is apply on a piece of paper, it does not mean anything. You get a loan. How can the young man ever pay it back?

MR. STIRLING: It cannot be! Five minutes! That is the five minutes that you used up, Mr. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

But this young man, Mr. Speaker, this young man is an example of what is happening all over this Province, and we are trying to talk about helping people break out of a situation, helping people get out of a situation where they are dependent on the

MR. STIRLING:

government. And here is somebody, a new young person and we are cursing him with a student loan that either he has to be conscientious about to try to pay back and go to the welfare officer and say, 'Please, sir, sign this, but I cannot pay it back'. Absolutely ridiculous! What we should be doing is encouraging that person to make a start, give him a chance, not force him to go automatically into becoming a bad debt and one of the hundreds of people who are going to be hounded. Because, Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the fishermen right now, we have a new Chartered Accountant put in as the head of the Fisheries Loan Board, we have a new Chartered Accountant as the accountant, we have a government that says, 'Of course!'.

When I brought up this example the other day the Fisheries Minister said, "He is in arrears in his loan." We have a situation where people were encouraged to think that you did not have to pay back the loans, and they are not going to be given a chance to adjust, they are coming down hard on them. And, Mr. Speaker, there is condition after condition after condition now where boats are being repossessed, where people are getting the attitude that nobody cares, and the essence of this Throne Speech, 'We are going to develop the fishery, we are going to develop the Newfoundlander, give him a sense of community,' -

MR. MORGAN:

We will. We will.

MR. STIRLING:

- 'give him a sense of where we are going'. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude in whatever few minutes I have left. Do I get a one minute warning as well? I have a five minutes warning, do I get a one minute warning?

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. gentleman has about two minutes remaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. STIRLING: I got so wound up in the problems of the district, Mr. Speaker, that I never got time to deal with one or two of the things that the Leader of the Opposition had brought up. We seem to be getting an attitude from the government - this is on the question of the offshore - it seems like the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has a lot of information that he keeps close to his heart. But people all over Newfoundland need that information.

Mr. Speaker, there was a person visiting here, Justice Berger, who conducted an enquiry into the MacKenzie Valley pipeline, and it has been broadcast as one of the great examples of public participation. Mr. Speaker, that enquiry was set up March 21, 1974, and it was not completed until March of 1977. It took three years to handle that enquiry and the impression that I get from the other side when the Leader of the Opposition says, "Look, at least set up a Committee of the House to examine into all aspects of the offshore", that it is something that they think can be done in a week or two weeks. Even if we set up the terms of reference right away, this takes time to do a job. I get the impression that there is a feeling on the other side that they have all the information and when they feel like giving it out - they went to a meeting of The Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, gave them all the information. They went to another group and gave them all the information. We would like to have the representatives of the people of Newfoundland, the members of this House, participate in that kind of a response so that we can

MR. STIRLING: get it out to the people
of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: I thank you very much for
your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of
the people on the other side to allow me to finish the
remarks. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we are debating the Throne Speech, a document that I think will be a landmark in the history of this Province as it sets out the intent of this government, this administration, for at least the next five years and clearly the effects flowing from that will go on for many years longer than that.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like, before getting into the main body of my remarks, to say a few things about my own district. St. John's South, of course, is interested in all the matters alluded to in the Speech.

The good citizens of St. John's South have elected a PC member to this House for I do not know how many years. There are an extremely sensible type of folk in St. John's South and I am sure they will go on doing so for many years to come. They take their politics, they take their interest in Newfoundland very seriously and they are concerned about all matters including, of course, the new opportunities opening up for this Province, such as the offshore oil matters. But that is just one of their interests. I have mentioned this before and I am not sure that people quite understand this, that the district of St. John's South is a great fishing district. It is the second, I think it is the second producer of processed fish in this Province. I am referring, of course, to the plant on the Southside of the harbour of St. John's and I would just like to give a few figures to make that point more clearly. Now these are statistics for the year just completed, 1979. The total landings at that plant were 25,266 metric tons. So if we are not quite up to the metric thing that comes to 55,686,000 lbs. Fifty-five million pounds of fish were processed on the Southside of the harbour of St. John's. The landed value of that catch was over \$7 million. It was \$7,633,000. The export value was over \$20

DR. COLLINS: million. Now that is in actual fact, I think, surpassed only - and my hon. friend opposite, I think, mentioned this one time recently, that is surpassed only, I think, by the plant at Marystown. The catch there was largely cod or redfish. In actual fact it was just over 10,000 metric tons of cod and just over 12,500 metric tons of redfish. The plant itself is served by six trawlers, six of the most modern trawlers in this Province, six stern trawlers, and the number of trawler men involved there are ninety. There are ninety -

MR. NEARY: Who was responsible for getting the plant?

DR. COLLINS: There were a number of people, certainly not least of all the people of this Province. And certainly the people of this Province are operating that plant over there. So there are ninety trawler men in six stern trawlers feeding that plant. In addition to that - and this may not be appreciated - in addition to that there is a total of over one hundred, there are one hundred and six, as a matter of fact, small boats also supply the plant and the total inshore fishermen are one hundred and eighty four. One hundred and eighty four inshore fishermen in one hundred and six small boats also help to supply fish to the plant on the Southside.

There are at

DR. J. COLLINS: this point in time, 550 workers in the plant over there, gainfully employed workers in the plant on the Southside at this time. Now, the usual work force is just over 400 but the plant is working at top capacity now and is employing 550.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other issues that are very current in my district in addition to the fishery and one of them, of course, is the synchrolift. I had discussions recently with the manager at the CN dock and he is quite pleased with the way things are going. At this moment, unfortunately, there are some lay-offs at the dock and that is not due to lack of work, it is due to lack of facility. If there were more facilities down at the CN dock there is enough work down there to retain the total work force and indeed to take on new individuals. As a matter of fact, some of the ships to be serviced at the dock can not get in for several months; they are lying alongside and can not get on berth there for several months. So when the synchrolift comes along it will be a most welcome and a most needed extra facility. Indeed, if it had not been planned to go into place the dock would not have survived. The synchrolift will guarantee the survival of the dock and will increase the work force by several hundreds.

The Federal Treasury Board and Cabinet have given acceptance for the idea. They are dependent on certain final specifications but essentially the go-ahead has been given and the management at the dockyard are now getting the final details together and hopefully they will be able to start either late this year or possibly early next year.

The Russian repair operation was very successful; that has been ongoing at the dock for approximately a year, That has been very successful, It has

DR. J. COLLINS: accounted for approximately one-fifth of all the work at the dock in the past year and indeed accounted for over 50 per cent of the profit that was accumulated in the operations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was it profitable?

DR. J. COLLINS: It was. The dock in the past year did turn a profit. It turned a good healthy profit in this past year and the Russian operation was a large factor in that.

Another matter that concerns the people in my district, of course, is the condition of the Southside Road. This is a very old part of the city, in recent years fallen on hard times not least because of the new Waterford trunk sewer operation there and hopefully the expectations are that it will be completed later this year or early next year and it is my desire and my intention to press very hard then for a major upgrading to be done along that whole area there. As a matter of fact, CN itself should come along in that effort because in a way it is a disgrace what the CN has done to the Waterford Valley down there. In olden days - I was not around, I do not think, at the time, - but my information is that in olden days that was a scenic spot. Even when I was a boy growing up, it was not in the disgraceful condition it is now and that has every capability of being returned to a beauty spot in this city.

I am reminded that in the city where I went to university, in Edinburgh, Scotland, they have their railway come right down through the City Gardens, and the Edinburgh City Gardens are one of the most beautiful gardens in the whole of Europe, and they have a railway going right down through the middle of it into a railway station at the end of the gardens. It can be done and there is no reason why it can not be done in the city of St. John's also.

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 170

MB - 3

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to get on to another topic and that has to do with the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he spoke on the Throne speech. And I do this because I felt that the Leader of the Opposition was certainly not at one with the way this administration views the prospects offshore.

DR. J. COLLINS: As a matter of fact, I will certainly go a lot stronger than that. Not only was he not as one with this administration, I think his view is dialectically opposed to what this administration is trying to do in terms of the offshore. I therefore studied his speech in considerable detail because I thought it was important to understand his perception of the matter and to make sure that this perception was brought out and commented upon. And I went through his speech very carefully, I have summarized it because it was a long speech; not everyone perhaps will agree with my summary. All I can say is that I took out what I took to be the important points in chronological order - I did not take one thought here and another thought there and change them around - and I put them down in what I think is a manageable form and I think a picture comes out of his remarks.

So I would like to read this summary. He said, 'I believe that the people of this Province along with me and along with members of this side' - he was referring to the hon. members opposite - 'get the feeling that throughout this Speech' - he was referring to the Throne Speech - 'there is a general theme of confrontation. If you look at oil and gas there is clearly, and has been for some time, a confrontational atmosphere not only with the Government of Canada but still greater confrontation with industry, with various labour groups, with people in the fishing industry who have very deep-seated concern. So that is one area in which confrontation seems to be the keynote. Nothing could be more demonstrative of this confrontational approach than when the Premier has to rise and say that a government of his own persuasion in Ottawa has acted against the interests of Newfoundland in the most fundamental way possible.'

DR. J. COLLINS: Then he goes on, 'On Hydro we have already argued with the Province of Quebec on this Lower Churchill and just what implication for confrontation there are there I have no idea'. So I think that is the first theme that comes out in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Jamieson) remarks. He says confrontation is a matter that this administration is concentrating upon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just out of interest I looked up what confrontation means means in Webster's dictionary. And the meaning 'to confront' from which 'confrontation' comes is: 'to face; stand; or meet face to face; to face or oppose boldly; to bring face to face with facts; to sit side by side to compare.' So that is true. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite true, we wish to stand up and state our case boldly, to bring the facts forward for comparison. And the tenor of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks is that this is a bad thing for Newfoundland to do, that this is something that this administration should not be doing. I think that is a very cogent point to remember, that we over here wish to stand boldly and present the facts. And if the hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks of that in some pejorative way, he is welcome to his opinion but I am afraid that that is not the way we look upon it. Now he goes on from there; he says, 'One would be very hard pressed to say we could disagree in principle with any of the goals or objectives that have been outlined'.

DR. J. COLLINS: And he goes on: 'In trying to analyse why there has been so much talk and so little really significant action, you have to come down to the fact that sabre rattling, by itself, is not enough. These nine or ten Speeches from the Throne have had more sabres in them than were carried by the troops in Balaklava. There have been a series of sabre rattlings from beginning to end.' In other words, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition agrees with the objectives but he does it very reluctantly. He says he is hard pressed to agree with this, and then he derogates the putting forward of that point of view that we wish to present the facts boldly and starkly and compare them with other facts, he derogates the articulation of that attempt by calling it sabre rattling, and I think that that is an important point to bear in mind.

Now he goes on to say, 'We want to maximize the benefits for this Province. It is such a big subject it is very hard to know where to start. Let us look at what has come to be called - and I am baffled, quite frankly, by the use of the words - ownership, control, jurisdiction. I am not sure what it is that is being sought. There are two ends to the spectrum if one is talking about offshore. One end is that it is wholly owned by the federal government, that is, wholly developed by the federal government, the whole thing being a federal proposition. The other end, the whole thing will be owned, the jurisdiction, the management, would be in provincial hands. Where do we go from here?' Now, Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of that is that the Leader of the Opposition has suddenly come upon this issue. He wants to start from the beginning and look at this issue of the offshore jurisdiction. He has never heard of it before. I am forced to ask, Where has he been for the last four or five years?

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand here a White Paper dated May, 1977, which was put out by this government, which went into this issue in great detail. The substance of this was debated in this House. The substance of this got into the newspapers locally, federally, internationally.

DR. J. COLLINS: I have in my hand here a document that followed shortly after that, went around to every household in the Province, stating the heritage of the sea, our case of offshore mineral rights. I have difficulty in understanding why the Leader of the Opposition is so baffled, so confused, so 'not knowing where to start' and saying that there was one end of a spectrum and the other - What do we do from here? I wonder if he has been interested in the Province for a considerable number of years.

Then he goes on: 'We have nothing to lose,' and he is referring here to the Supreme Court - 'We have nothing to lose by at the very least finding out.' Then he goes on to say, 'If we lose, even on referred reference, we still have the political solution to fall back on.' Now, Mr. Speaker, he goes on: 'On the local preference, Newfoundlanders might be sent to Nova Scotia or might be sent to other parts of Canada in order to be trained to acquire additional skills. There is a certain incompatibility with the idea of saying that there is no way we are going to have anyone else from anywhere else.' Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition - and it is his prerogative, I do not quarrel with that - but what he is saying here is that we should make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada and then he is also casting great doubt on local preference. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the federal position.

In other words, the Leader of the Opposition is enunciating completely the federal side of this question. That is not the provincial side, that is not the side we take, that is not the view we take. We take a view opposite to the federal government. And I would say that it is not illogical for the Leader of the Opposition to articulate the views of the federal Liberal Party of which he was so recently a member. But I think

DR. COLLINS: that this should be borne in mind that the Leader of the Opposition speaks the Federal case when he speaks on the offshore in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: I am coming to that shortly.

He then goes on to say there is a reference in the regulations with regard to this 40 per cent which Newfoundland gets in a development field. "There is reference to 40 per cent which Newfoundland gets in the development field. Now, there are dangers to that. It is not only 40 per cent equity. At the same time it is 40 per cent responsibility. I am asking whether or not it is envisaged at any point that this company is going to ultimately wind up in the position of a full-scale Crown corporation. Tell me when a government owned Crown corporation ever paid a dividend to its shareholders, namely, the people. I am not at all certain that 40 per cent is much better in any case in a way than 25 per cent if one is talking about exerting influence. What is the optimum place at which ownership ceases to be beneficial and starts to be a drag on the economy in general? I want to say that here we are playing in the big leagues, and a step wrong here can put us in a very serious position and could, in many respects, wipe out a lot of the benefits that come from anything of this sort that happens. There is no question about the fact that when we get into it as a population of 500,000 or so people, that in our anxiety to go for the big dollar we do not, in fact, overlook something which a few years from now we will regret."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole tenor of that rather long section I read out here, which, as I say, is a summary over a number of pages of what the hon. Leader said, the hon. Leader of the Opposition - he is putting a fear, he is putting a sense of uncertainty, he is putting a sense that we cannot manage what we have off there. He is making the Newfoundland people unsure of themselves, unconfident, not reliant upon themselves. Mr. Speaker, that is not the position of this administration. We have confidence in the people of this Province. We look to our history and we see what we have done in the past. We were a country at one time. We dealt in international affairs. We carried

DR. COLLINS: out international trade. We are not a people who are afraid to face up to their destiny. I just want to make the point that the Leader of the Opposition takes that point of view. We on this side do not take that point of view.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this whole comment by the Leader of the Opposition is consistent, is quite consistent with how the Liberal Party has viewed development in this Province, and I do not say that in an argumentative way, I say that in a way that one only has to look at the facts and you have to come out with that thought. Right from the time of the terms of Confederation - which resulted in the loss of control of the fisheries, which resulted in the loss of control of our railway, which resulted in the loss of control of local manufacture - the terms of Confederation were Liberally - and I mean that party wise - motivated and this is what the terms of reference ended up as. Now I would point out that there were some people who did not agree with those terms of Confederation. They felt that there should have been other terms put in place, that we were a sovereign country joining a sovereign country and we should have gone in on terms that left us some respect, and that these terms that were struck by the Liberal outlook left us with no respect and left us with losses of some of the major things that our history tells us are valuable to us.

DR. J. COLLINS: In place of this loss of respect, what did we get? We got term 29 - \$3 million, a pittance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (BAIRD) Order please! The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

DR. J. COLLINS: We got the baby bonus and U.I.C. In other words, we got money instead of the ability and the encouragement and the health to make our own way. And I suggest Mr. Speaker, that, that is how the Opposition is now viewing the offshore. They are saying, "Never mind trying to develop it yourself, never mind the Confederation helping Newfoundland to develop its own resources and make its own way. Just let Newfoundland take some money and let all else go."

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: That is not the way this administration views things. I could go on with the way the Liberal Party has viewed development in this country. The Upper Churchill-a few construction jobs and a small amount of cash and all the other benefits go elsewhere. I could point to ERCO-a few construction jobs and all the benefits from our onshore hydro development go elsewhere. I could look at many of the mineral and mining leases- it is thrown out, given out hand over hand with little regard for the development opportunities that they potentially could give the people of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Settle for welfare.

MR. J. COLLINS: Settle for welfare, as my hon. friend here says. In other words, that is the pattern, and now I am not saying that is not a defensible pattern but I will leave it to the members opposite to defend. The pattern is that we are not capable really of doing very much on our own. The most we can get are a few crumbs here and there. Others have to come in from the outside, take our resources and develop them and we will get a little bit of spinoff, a few jobs here and there, a little bit of money here and there. Mr. Speaker, that is

DR. J. COLLINS: not the way of this administration. Ours is a new way and our way is this? We will stand up firmly and state our case. If you want to call that confrontation, as Webster says you may call it, fine, we have no objection to that. Confrontation is standing up firmly, not being afraid to state your case with the facts behind you, and this is what we will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: We are not afraid, we are not unsure, we are quite confident in our ability to exercise our rights, and we have confidence that we will then partake in the management of our offshore resources and that we will do a good job on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think those are two entirely different ways of looking at the development of this Province. Now, are we right? Is this the right way to go?

MR. BARRETT: Sure it is.

DR. J. COLLINS: Is this administration on the right track in that regard? I do not know, quite honestly; I do not know.

MR. BARRETT: Give it all to John Doyle.

DR. J. COLLINS: If I knew for certain I would have to have a divine intelligence. All I can say is this, that I know the way that we have tried, the Liberal way, and I have to put it in those terms because the Liberals were in power during all this time. I know that that way is wrong. We just have to look at our history and see that that has not satisfied the destiny of this Province. I know that that is wrong. I just have one minute, I think it is, and the other point is that I know that other Provinces have gone the opposite way.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: There are certain things the Province of Quebec does that I cannot agree with and I never will agree with, but I am brothers with them when they stand up for their rights and say that "we will manage our own destiny, we have a heritage, we have a place in this Confederation and we will stand up for it and we will not be afraid to take into our hands what we see as our cultural destiny". Not only Quebec, the western Provinces, as my hon. friend

DR. J. COLLINS: the President of the Council mentioned the other day. Alberta and Saskatchewan waited for thirty years to make their case, but they were persistent; they did not throw it away, they did not go cap in hand, they did not say that, I am incapable, I am unsure, You do it and just give me a few little odds and ends. They stuck at it for thirty years and they prevailed and they now own their own natural resources and this is what this administration will do also.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to face the point that there are two diametrically opposed ways of developing this Province, at least as articulated by the major political parties. One is the Liberal way that has been tried for twenty-five years and at our perspective in time we can now say that that was the wrong way. We did not get what we deserve.. The other way is the way that we in this administration want to go. We do not know if we will be successful. If we knew that we would have to have divine intelligence, but we know this that that is the wrong way and that we know that history tells us that what other provinces have done we also can achieve. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In leading off my few remarks I would like to extend some congratulations, Mr. Speaker, that I think are in order. I want to congratulate, of course, the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) on his re-election and wish him success in representing his district. I want to congratulate the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe) on his appointment and wish him well in the various responsibilities he will have. Also my congratulations to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on assuming new responsibilities.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please;

I would like to call the hon. member to order for a moment, although it is not quite five o'clock, rather than have to interrupt you later as you proceed. I can inform the House now that I have received notice of one matter for debate at 5:30 p.m. when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. Notice given by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the subject matter, reference McConnell Advertising.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to record a

special vote of congratulations to our federal minister, Mr. Rompkey, in Ottawa who has been recently appointed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear;

MR. FLIGHT:

- Newfoundland's minister in the Cabinet.

I would want, Mr. Speaker, at this time to have a very brief comment on our Premier's attitude on that appointment. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a man who has served Newfoundland well and worked hard for Newfoundland this past eight years. We have a man who was elected by a resounding majority in his riding, doubling the votes of both his competitors, who rung up a fair majority in the very provincial district that the Premier represents.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. FLIGHT:

And, Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier the next day putting down, belittling the appointment of Mr. Rompkey to the federal Cabinet. Now this government talks about co-operation, Mr. Speaker, and within a day - and that is the man who the Premier and his committees, I would think, will have to do some dealing with. He is our minister, we have to accept that fact. And we talk about co-operation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was totally disappointed in the Premier's performance. To me enough said about it, Sir. Anyone who would react that way without giving a man a chance has no class.

MR. WHITE:

Right on.

MR. FLIGHT:

Our Premier in that particular instance -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Joe Clark?

MR. FLIGHT:

- lacked class, Mr. Speaker, and he is slowly being perceived in this Province as a man who may indeed lack class.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a few words on offshore. I want to make it explicit / clear that I am not, nor would I pretend to be, a constitutional expert. I have to say, though, having sat in this House and listened to the constitutional

MR. FLIGHT: experts on both sides -and I do not mean that in a derogatory way, I mean that seriously,-I am starting to understand a little more about the constitutional problems with regards to our offshore. I am sure I have a better understanding than the miners, the loggers, and the fishermen who are represented by all the members of this House. I can tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that constitutionality goes over the heads of the people out there. They have no concern at all about the constitutionality of the offshore. They are concerned that we derive the maximum financial benefits from offshore, the maximum financial benefits. They are concerned that we make sure that we control the rate of development. But they are not demanding ownership,whatever that means. They do not care how it is derived as long as the money flowing from the offshore helps to replace the jobs of the 400 miners that are going to lose their jobs in Buchans. They do not care how that money is derived as long as it buoys up the economy, fills up our infrastructure, They are looking forward to the day that Newfoundland, having benefited by being part of Canada this past thirty years by billions of dollars, looking forward to the day when they can say we are a have Province thanks to offshore and now we want to contribute.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You got to have ownership. You see, that is the whole point.

MR. FLIGHT:

And now we have the right. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are not about to be bluffed, they are not about to be fooled. About the only way that we can have these benefits is by ownership. And I am not sure that the Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs, the House leader (Mr. Marshall) knows what he is talking about really when he gets up and talks, the only way we can have the financial benefits. We can have 100 per cent financial benefit and we can control the development without this great unknown ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when the hon. House leader stood up a few days ago and suggested that he would bring in legislation that would extend the boundaries of Newfoundland and give us the same rights over those extended boundaries as we have over the forests and the trees. And I presume he meant that with that, if we did it, then we would be responsible for the offshore surveillance and we would have to create our own Merchant Marine because, you know, we are responsible for the health and welfare and safety of the trees in this Province, so I would presume he would not expect complete and total ownership without assuming the responsibilities that went with it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is right.

MR. FLIGHT:

And I do not know if the minister or the Premier knows at this point in time what exactly that will entail.

Mr. Speaker, what about - you know the Premier alluded to it this morning, I think, in a newscast or an interview - what about, for argument's sake, we all agree that we extend our boundaries and we pass the concurrent legislation he is talking about, we have to define it somewhere. We have to say, Well it is right here, 200 miles out, that is it. But the Continental Shelf goes out 1,000 miles. So what happens two months after if Eastcan or

MR. FLIGHT:

some other company decides it has to put a step out well ten miles outside of the boundaries that we just defined? Does the minister then bring back another piece of legislation and we will eventually end up wanting to own half the North Atlantic?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let us define what we know.

Eventually we will deal with what we do not know.

MR. FLIGHT:

Let us define what we know.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, from what the general public has been subject to in this Province that we do not know what we own at this point in time. We do not know if we would have to go outside the 200 mile limit or the 200 miles he talks about to tap the Hibernia reservoir. We do not know if a step out well can be put twenty miles outside of Hibernia and drain off the very oil that we want to control over the rate of development. We do not know. We do not know. The Premier laughs but we do not know.

MR. F. ROWE:

Well, if he knows why does he not say?

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an analogy here. We can make a comparison here. Some years ago, and everybody will remember, this party, this administration, this government said to the people of Newfoundland on a very nationalistic note, "We have to control our own destiny. We have to nationalize BRINCO. We need to own BRINCO in order to start the immediate development of Churchill Falls, of the Lower Churchill, to have some leverage on changing the contract on the Upper Churchill, to have low electric rates in the Province. We have to do it now. \$160 million it is going to cost us." To date, Mr. Speaker, that BRINCO deal has cost us \$330 million and there is not one Newfoundlander today alive who feels any more secure in his job, who is earning one more cent, not one

MR. FLIGHT:

job created by that expenditure of \$330 million. Are we seeing maybe what might be a replay? Could the government's approach to offshore be a replay of the Churchill situation? Could we indeed have our boundaries extended and end up five years down the road realizing that the enormous profits that were made available to us by that extension is being creamed off by all the responsibilities that go with the administration of that? I do not know. But obviously the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) did not know what was going to happen when we nationalized BRINCO either. So, Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things we do not know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say something here. Before I say this I want to tell the House that I think all the members on the other side of the House are honourable gentlemen, good, decent, honourable Newfoundlanders. But there is one thing becoming very, very obvious to a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are directing traffic on the other side of the House, the people who are manipulating the Premier, because he is not old enough to relate to what I am going to talk about, are anti-Confederates. They are the very people, Mr. Speaker, the hon. House leader, the handmaidens of the financial factions on Water Street who fought against, Mr. Speaker, Confederation, who fought to deprive Newfoundland of the benefits that we have derived from Confederation. They are now sitting in Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, and they are manipulating.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let us have something clear, that thirty years ago they fought and they lost. And what did they do? They went underground. They sulked and they slinked and slinged, but they did not have the guts to come out and question our place in Confederation up to a certain point in time. The benefits that flowed from Confederation - it was too obvious. They could not afford to do it so they sat back -

MR. NEARY: And waited for thirty years.

MR. FLIGHT: - and waited for a chance -

MR. NEARY: Waited for thirty years.

MR. FLIGHT: - waited for a chance and for thirty years they whittled away, Mr. Speaker. This administration has whittled away at Confederation, watching for a chance. Now, Mr. Speaker, they think they have their chance, offshore. They are not interested, Mr. Speaker, in negotiating a deal that would give Newfoundlanders the total financial benefit of offshore and all the money that we derive thereof, or giving Newfoundlanders their right to control the rate of development. They are not interested in that. They want to take a position, Mr. Speaker, they want to take a position that will shake, that will shake our position in Confederation to its very roots. They know that the debate that would stem from demanding total control over offshore, that debate in itself would shake -

MR. PATTERSON: Would you permit a question?

MR. FLIGHT: Certainly I will permit a question.

MR. PATTERSON: Could you explain to us Term 37 of the Terms of Union?

MR. NEARY: 'Graham', would you explain Term 32 of the Terms of Union?

MR. PATTERSON: Never answer a question with a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Take notice of it.

MR. FLIGHT: I will take notice of

the question and answer it the next time I address the House. Now,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Tell us about Section 338 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

MR. PATTERSON: Never answer a question with a question.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, that hon. government is not interested at all. They have shown by their actions this past few months they are not interested at all in arriving at a situation that would guarantee Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders all the benefits, the financial benefits, a 100 per cent financial benefit that would flow from the development of our offshore. They are not interested in making sure that we control the rate of development. They are not interested in sitting down and negotiating that kind of thing with the Federal Government or any other agencies they have to negotiate with. They are interested in setting up the confrontation that we have heard tell of. They are interested in going the nationalistic route, playing on the nationalistic on the need to control our own destiny, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province do not care how they get the benefits. What they want is the financial benefit and they are not the least bit interested - they are proud of being part of the Canadian fabric. They are proud of the fact that they benefitted for thirty years as a result of the benefits that flowed from Confederation, and now they are looking forward to contributing back. But, Mr. Speaker, this government, having sulked and having watched for a chance, whittled away, whittled away at Confederation. Now they see their chance. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), why does he not go all the way? Why fool around with a little piddly piece of legislation that merely extends our boundaries and, you know, gives us an extra 200 miles? Why does he not put his mandarins to work upstairs or downstairs and his bureaucrats and bring in a piece of legislation that would recommend a referendum, a referendum to secede? Why does he not bring in a piece of legislation? Because that is the game plan. That is the game plan, Mr. Speaker, that is the obvious

MR. FLIGHT: game plan. Why does he not bring in a piece of legislation that can pull us out altogether? Then, Mr. Speaker, we will become a sovereign state. Then we will not have to pass concurring legislation. All we will have to do is to act as a sovereign state and extend our boundaries 200 or 300 miles and create a Merchant Marine that would defend those boundaries, and we would do all the things that we want to do. Why does the minister not jump over all the foolishness he is talking about and get right to the end of his game plan, bring in a piece of legislation that would talk about a referendum. That is where the minister wants to go and that is why there are some people sitting on that side of the House who for thirty years, having sat and worried and cringed

MR. FLIGHT:

with a bitter jealousy that they lost in 1949 but they will find a way and they have found ways over the past eight or nine years to whittle away at our position in Confederation. So why does he not bring in that kind of legislation? Why fool around with the foolishness? Come right to the point.

MR. STAGG: You are wrong.

MR. FLIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: They could not even agree with their own government up there.

MR. FLIGHT: If, Mr. Speaker, the government is not prepared to shake our position in Confederation, why do they not negotiate? Why do they not guarantee us all the benefits from offshore by simply sitting down and negotiating and not shaking our position in Confederation?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the route the minister is going, he is prepared to deprive Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders of the financial benefits that will flow, will naturally flow - the federal government, the present federal government have made their position clear; all the revenue to the Province, the right of control, the right to control the rate of development. He is prepared to deny Newfoundland that out of his lust to undo all the things, all the good things, that have happened to Newfoundland in this last thirty years. He is prepared to do it at the expense of untold generations. He is prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, in 1980, he is prepared to start, he has started - and he has got the support of his backbenchers. And there are four or five people, the manipulators in that caucus - prepared to do that. They are prepared to shake up, to talk about -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) next election.

MR. FLIGHT: That would be the day. There is an open invitation, any day at all. So, Mr. Speaker, to

MR. FLIGHT:

satisfy a lust, to accomplish by the back door thirty years later what they could not accomplish by the front door in 1949, he is prepared to jeopardize the position that we have in Confederation. He is prepared to jeopardize the monies that will flow to this Province. He is prepared, Mr. Speaker, to put us in a position where it will cost us more than the billions and billions and billions of dollars that we might make off the revenue off the oil. He is prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, and he is prepared to do it so he can say, Finally after thirty years I am vindicated.

Nothing good has happened in the eyes of certain people on those benches, Mr. Speaker, from Confederation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not one thing.

MR. FLIGHT:

Not one. Nothing good has happened, Mr. Speaker, and now in the guise of trying to tell Newfoundlanders that we have to control, that we have to have ownership even though he does not know what ownership means in that sense we have to have ownership, he is prepared to try to force a break. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell him, try it. If he succeeds he will succeed at the expense of future generations of Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, he will succeed but that will not worry him, Mr. Speaker, because the record of this crowd - BRINCO proves it, other actions of this government prove it - it would not worry him that he will succeed at the expense of hundreds of thousands, of generations of Newfoundlanders yet to come. What will be important is he has satisfied his lust for revenge that we should never have gone into Confederation in 1949. Now that is the message, Mr. Speaker, that is slowly getting out in this Province.

Why does not the minister get up and tell the people of Newfoundland what they are worrying about? Well, tell us, if Hibernia comes into production in a

MR. FLIGHT:

year and a half from now, how is the production going to come about? Is a tanker going to go out and park over Hybernia and fill it up and send it up to Point Tupper or down the Eastern Seaboard? Is that what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker? And then all the jobs he talked about on building the great platforms and that, where will they be then? Are the oil companies going to come to the minister and say, "Look, we have put in billions, untold billions in exploration this past five years. Now we have the right, do we not, to make a few dollars, to try to recoup some of our money? And in the interim, while we are waiting for the onshore facility, will you let us pump out some oil into these great tankers so we can make a few bucks and recoup some of our exploration costs?" Is that what is going to happen,

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker? Good question, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you if that happens, it is not going to - I do not know what will happen to real estate that has escalated by 100 per cent in this city in the past six months - it is not going to help put any jobs in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Tell us, is he prepared? If we are not ready on offshore, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow or the next day the way the announcements are coming. Those oil companies are going to say very shortly, they are going to say, 'We are ready to go into production'. And we need to go into production, we have sunk billions and we have a right to get some of it back and we can get it back - it is very simple. It has been done in other parts of the world, we want to put a tanker there now -

MR. S. NEARY: Bring in Petrocan.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - and we will bring in a tanker and we will pump it in. Tell us, Mr. Minister, is there a possibility of that happening or is the minister prepared to cap it and say to the oil companies, 'We are not going to be ready for ten more years, we are not going to have the offshore facilities or the pipelines, or we have not got the facilities that would allow the tankers to bring it ashore.' There would be an awful lot of disappointed people in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: You hope.

AN HON. MEMBER: ... shall ...

MR. G. FLIGHT: Offshore will have meant no more to us than the Churchill means now. It will mean no more, Mr. Speaker, offshore will mean no more. And let us hear it, Mr. Speaker; tell the people in Grand Falls and in St. John's and in Come by Chance what we are going to do in a few weeks from now, in a month from now when the oil companies says, 'Okay, it is there and we want to produce, we have the market. And we have a right to get some of it'.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And, of course, by that time the Government of Newfoundland, this government, will have us shoved so far in the hole that they will probably jump at the chance to sell some oil that way to recoup some of the money they need to help with that ambulance service we were talking about yesterday, that they are ashamed of their life of. And maybe they will look at it in their little Cabinet and that little inner clique, the representatives of the financial faction of Water Street, the handmaidens. They will look at it, the inner Cabinet and they say, 'Look, let us sell some, we need \$100 million. Quick, let us put a tanker out there and pump out some oil and the people will be happy because we will tell them how much money we are making on the sale of the oil.'

And it will go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear the minister, the next speaker who speaks on this Throne Speech, to tell us how he proceeds. We know now, Mr. Speaker, either we are the subject of a big lie or we know we are getting pretty close to being able to produce oil. Now what is going to happen to that oil, Mr. Speaker, is it is going to come ashore or how long is it going to be before we are in a position to bring it ashore so that the jobs created will benefit Newfoundlanders and we will not only have 500 or 600 or 700 people working on the rigs because we surely will not have any on the tankers? Now that is what we want, Mr. Speaker. We own the oil, we owned the oil twenty years ago. We do not need any of your foolishness about determining offshore, extending the boundaries. You are the laughing stock of the country, Canada; you are the laughing stock of the country! The constitution is we own the oil -

MR. S. NEARY: We have thirty-two constitutional experts over there.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, if we pump that oil - maybe, the Premier one day will stand up and tell us now, 'It appears that we are pretty close to the production stage, pretty close to where we can start selling that great black gold out there. And God knows this Province needs the money, needs the profit.' But the name of the game was not the profit on the sale of oil, the royalties, the name of the game was going to be the impact it would have on unemployment in this Province. And the few dollars that you ship out to the town council in Grand Falls and say, 'Here, pay off your outstanding debentures' that is going to be a poor substitute for the jobs that the people of this Province have been built up to believe would be there when we went into production.

MR. FLIGHT: Let the Premier tell the House of Assembly if there has been any negotiations or any thought at this point in time to produce that way, to park an oil tanker over the well and start selling it off to the refineries on the Eastern Seaboard. Then, if there has been any thought in that direction, tell us how many jobs he sees that creating for the Province, tell us how many platforms.

I remember when he was Minister of Mines and Energy he talked about acquiring land to set up a great construction process where we would manufacture the platforms on shore, and all the work that would be involved in the building of pipelines on shore, Mr. Speaker. The people of Newfoundland are entitled to know just what the Premier is thinking, and what the Cabinet is thinking by way of getting into production. Just how are we going to produce? Are we going to bring it ashore? Is it going to Come By Chance? Will the oil out there get Come By Chance operating and therefore we will have the petrochemical complex we have talked about for so long, that will create 10,000 jobs in the Come By Chance area and that will then have the effect of buoying up and taking care of for all times the economy of that particular area? Will there be offshore facilities for loading and storing in Botwood and in Lewisporte? And will the hundreds of thousands of jobs in the refining end - is that the kind of thing we can expect? Is that the way we are going to go into production, Mr. Speaker? If it is it will be very easy to support the production of this government, but if it is not, Mr. Speaker, the fun that that Premier and his ministers have made these past six years, what they have perceived to be the Churchill deal will be nothing to the laughing stock

MR. FLIGHT: that will be made of them.

The first tanker that parks over one of those offshore wells when they want to go into production, Mr. Speaker, the first tanker that parks with the intention of taking a load of oil down to the seaboard - they might have gotten away with it, Mr. Speaker. Maybe Newfoundland would have said, 'We need the bucks so let us sell a bit of it. Let us sell a little drop. Let us make four or five hundred million dollars in the short-term'. And we have seen, Mr. Speaker, the kind of pressure that oil companies can put on, and we know the kinds of millions and billions of dollars they spend in exploration, and we know the kind of pressure they can put on when they are going to say, 'Now boys look, we want to make a little money back. We have to recoup some of our exploration money so we can continue exploration. We have the markets and we need to take some of that oil out'. And there is no question about the technology being available. The ship can pull up, moor, load, be gone and be back again next week and keep going, millions and billions of gallons and millions of dollars accruing to the Province and we become the greatest bunch of shopkeepers since Britain. All we have to do is sell our oil. But there would not be the thousands of jobs all around this Island that the offshore is supposed to do for us. And in the process of doing that, if we were jeopardizing the welfare of our fishery, or the future of our fishery, but we were creating hundreds of thousands on shore, maybe you could buy it if all the different environmental protection than man could think of would be put in place, but, brother, I will guarantee you our fishermen will not take any chances on having their environment fooled up or the fishery jeopardized for no other purpose than pumping off a tanker load of oil and having it sent down

MR. FLIGHT: South, just for the profit that was made on that oil. They do not see any chances of making jobs.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that is it. The Premier, somebody, Mr. Speaker, or the minister, somebody owes it to this House and the people of Newfoundland to tell us how we intend to proceed in the short-term in production, whether or not he is prepared to cap it and keep it there until the production means the jobs that he has talked about, and whether or not, Mr. Speaker, he is prepared to take us the separation route, whether he is prepared to bust up, whether he is running a monumental bluff, or whether he is really prepared to bust of this federation and take us out just to satisfy a vindicative need to get back at another party, to get back at a government of another day.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are my comments on the offshore and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be a subamendment and if there is I intend to get back into the debate. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Crosbie's spokesman.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made a remark, that he has made from time to time from his seat, that I heard, presumably referring to the hon. gentleman as being a spokesman for some other person. Any member of this House speaks for his own district, he speaks in this House on his own right and he is not a spokesman for anybody. It is unparliamentary, it is insulting and it is certainly out of order to insinuate that a member, any member of this Legislature speaks for anyone else other than himself and his constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we must have a double standard in this House and in this province. If Your Honour wishes to go and research Hansard, Your Honour will see that the hon. gentleman who just got up on that specious point of order has accused me on numerous occasions of speaking for people in this House and was never ruled out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And I ask Your Honour not to recognize that as a point of order. It is a point of revenge and ignorance, that is all it is.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): To the point of order. I regret that I did not hear the hon. gentleman's remarks so I cannot rule on it at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure on behalf of the residents of St. John's West -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: Could Your Honour tell the House what time the hon. gentleman's time starts? Does it start as of now or did it start when he first got up?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time started approximately one minute ago that was about 5.21 p.m.

The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: A point of order is taken out of your time (inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: Maybe the hon.gentleman would like to bring up the rest of his points of order before I start.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: I did not raise the point of order.

MR. BARRETT: It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of the residents of St. John's West, contrary to the feelings of the gentleman opposite, and to have this opportunity to speak in support of and to fully endorse the Speech from the Throne delivered at the opening of this Session of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Let me first of all compliment those hon. members from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), and from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) who moved and seconded this memorable outline of the government's stand on the very important issues facing us the next short while.

The people of my district, I feel, recognize the present and future opportunities that are being made available to them by the progressive and aggressive approach this government is taking towards offshore development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: This foresight and appreciation of the need to ensure the right of Newfoundlanders to benefit from their resource is of great significance to the people of my district. Many of these people are already receiving direct benefits in the form of employment on supply boats, employment on drill ships and from business that has developed and expanded to respond to this activity. This has all been the result of the protective regulations that obligate the drilling companies to purchase goods and services from Newfoundland business and to employ Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: All this activity is just a beginning, a beginning that I feel confident will

MR. BARRETT: improve the lifestyle of our people in the future. I feel that the direction of this government in this important resource will be of benefit to every single Newfoundlander.

There was one observation, made by the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) the other day - I am sorry he is not in his seat now - regarding, and I should like to give him some information for his enlightenment, and this is the matter relating to the advantages that St. John's presently enjoys in receiving benefits as a result of the oil and gas offshore exploration activity.

At this point in time St. John's happens to be identified as the location where the activity is closest related. This has been dictated because of the most promising finds which are some 200 miles due East of here. However, may I remind the hon. gentleman that during last year's drilling programme, through the encouragement of this government, a major supply base was established at Botwood to service exploration off the Funk Islands,

MR. BARRETT: and that was because they happened to be closer to Botwood as a port rather than St. John's.

I make no apologies because St. John's benefits now, because the activity is closer to it than to Lewisporte or to any other suitable port. I suggest that the whole purpose of the member opposite in raising this point at all is to try and obscure the basic issue, to try and avoid taking a stand, avoid standing up and being counted on this basic fundamental and most important issue of ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: We must have ownership of this great resource confirmed, confirmed as being the right and proper domain of this Province. It is not and should not be a matter of negotiation between this government and the Government in Ottawa. Each and every one of us should laud the efforts of this government in securing this position.

I might ask the members opposite to reflect for a few moments on the drilling programmes that were carried out over a seven or eight year period some years ago under the Liberal scheme of offshore development. Quite a number of holes were drilled. Unfortunately, they did not produce any gas or oil. However, no jobs were created for Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: There was no business accrued to Newfoundland companies. This was the Liberal way of doing it. Where did all these jobs, where did all this resource go? It went offshore. Each of these drillships came in here fully crewed and fully supplied. These supply boats came in here fully manned. Not even

MR. BARRETT: Canadians were employed for the most case. That is the Liberal proposal for offshore development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: If I may digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few references with respect to my own district. I have noted with a great deal of concern the recent announcement of layoffs at the CN Dockyard which have been attributed mostly to the fact that the dockyard cannot adequately respond to demands for services made upon it. I hope that all members will follow with interest the progress in construction of this new synchrolift facility, now that we have a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

We know that the Conservative Government responded decisively in getting this much needed facility started after several years of procrastination by the former Liberal Government. Let us now see if the project continues to proceed with development. I sincerely hope that it does. As is applicable to in many communities in this Province, St. John's is also dependent, to a great extent, on the CN Rail facilities, dependent on CN Rail as an employer of hundreds of people in St. John's and in my district of St. John's West, in particular, dependent on CN Rail as a purchaser of goods and services from our business community thereby also providing employment. We are dependent on CN Rail as a major transportation mode and to fulfill its mandate as a vital and vibrant part of the Newfoundland transportation system. It is because of this obligation, Mr. Speaker, and the apparent lack of fulfillment of it by the federal government that CN Rail has allowed

MR. BARRETT: its facilities to become downgraded.

I doubt if any of us are naïve enough not to realize that this downgrading of service was anything but a very carefully planned operation, planned and implemented by CN with the full knowledge and endorsement of the government in Ottawa.

Continuous appeals by this government and by previous provincial administrations have done nothing to prevent this downgrading of our rail system. There is probably no way that we can ever accurately determine the cost to this Province, the cost to each and every one of us because of this deliberate and planned attempt to eventually totally eliminate the rail service in this Province. The cost to us from lost wages, and the cost to us from increased prices because the transportation costs of alternative methods are substantially higher. I feel quite strongly about this issue, and I am sure all hon. members are as well, and I therefore took much pleasure in placing on the Order Paper of this House a resolution concerning this very important issue, an issue which I trust can reach the House for debate and resolution.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have some other comments, but to keep them in context, if you wish, I could adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. member would like to adjourn the debate? Fine. Call it five-thirty?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

A matter for debate, raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile, is McConnell Advertising. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this matter of spending public money for political purposes, for political polls and for the Tory convention in Gander is a very, very serious matter indeed, probably one of the most serious matters ever to come before this House.

What happened here, Sir, is that the President of Treasury Board of that day, Mr. Ed Maynard, asked in a memorandum to Cabinet, back in July, 1978, asked his Cabinet colleagues, including the present Premier of this Province, for some \$56,000 to spend on specific items. One of the items was that the company - this is the contract they entered into with Devine Advertising - that the company shall organize a format of youth involvement on a province-wide basis so that they can become more familiar with the policies and practices of the government's legislative programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no more resemblance between that and what the money was spent on than the other side of the moon. The money was fraudulently spent. There was a straight fraud on the Treasury of this Province. There was a breach of

MR. NEARY: trust by the people in high positions, and I am referring mainly to the former Premier of this Province. And the government, I would submit in this instance, Sir, are afraid to have an investigation done by the Commercial Crime Section of the RCMP because they know that other people would be dragged into it and dragged down. And that is why they are afraid to have a full-fledged police investigation.

The Premier comes into this House and tells us that his government is going to be open and honest, but then the Premier himself decides the degree of honesty.

Mr. Speaker, in this Province we have had numerous convictions in the courts for far less than the crimes committed in this particular instance.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) told us yesterday there was no need to get the police involved, that there was merely a violation of the Financial Administration Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me read section 338 of the Criminal Code, for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Justice. Section 338 of the Criminal Code, 1972, by the way, I do not have the amended one.

"Everyone who by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is false pretense within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for ten years".

Now, how can the Minister of Justice sit in his seat and avoid enforcing that section

MR. NEARY: of the Criminal Code and having a police investigation into this whole affair? How can the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who professes to be so lily white and Simon Pure, who professes to be so honest, how can he sit there and not have a police investigation into this when the hon. gentleman sat in Cabinet and instructed other police investigations into this Province for far less crimes than was committed here? It is a violation of the Criminal Code of Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is fraudulent, it is a breach of trust, and there could probably be a dozen other charges laid against the individuals involved, and all the Premier tells us that he is going to try to do with his open, honest policy is to try to recover the money. Mr. Speaker, how about John Q citizen out there in Never-Never Land who forges cheques, who defrauds his company or defrauds the public treasury? What happens to him? Is he allowed to pay back the money and have no charges laid against him? We have two standards in this Province, Mr. Speaker, under this administration—we have a law for the ordinary Newfoundlander and we have a law for the politicians on that side of the House - and over the years they have turned the administration of justice in this Province into a shambles. And if the Premier wants to be honest and open, let him do the courageous thing. Or is he afraid? What is the hon. gentleman in fear of? Is he afraid that some of his Cabinet colleagues may be involved? I say let us have a police investigation and let the chips fall where they may and not come into this House and say, 'Oh, yes, we are going to be an honest and open government,' and then decide the degree of honesty that we are going to have in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, first I want to state in a sentence what essentially I said yesterday so that we know exactly what we are speaking about and what we are debating, and that was that on the information available there were not, in the professional opinion of the Department of Justice, grounds to order a police inquiry. That is what was said, so it is clear what was said.

Decisions whether to have a police investigation are made in a certain way. They are made on the basis of a professional assessment by the prosecutorial staff under the direction of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Attorney General is then responsible for the implementation of that policy and indeed for articulating the overall policy and for making up his mind whether he

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: intends to act consistent with that professional advice or not.

The two principles upon which any decision of this kind must be based are - and they are both the adverse side of the same coin - 1) Department must not refuse to order a police investigation because of any pressure to the contrary; and 2) Department must not agree to order a police investigation because of pressure in that area. It must be based upon the assessment of facts as the facts then are, based upon the information which is then at hand. The information which was then, and for all practical purposes is still on hand is within the Auditor General's report. And the two summarizing sentences of the two areas of criticism make no reference to fraud or to crime. They make reference to quite improper procedures and expenditures, but no reference to fraud, no reference to crime. Not that the Attorney General's department is governed exclusively by the Auditor General - obviously, it has a responsibility quite additional - but we are aware too that if there had been a suspicion on his part, or indeed, more than a suspicion, that the words 'fraud' or 'crime' are known to him. What are the two sentences? These are the two finalizing sentences of the two paragraphs. The first one, in my opinion, 'Payments made for such services do not represent proper charges against the subhead of expenditure used and, indeed, are a questionable charge against public funds at all,' - no mention of crime or fraud. And the next one, 'I hold a differing opinion from those who claim that funds are appropriated by the House for such a purpose.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly, there is an improper use of funds -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the hon. member had his opportunity for debate and I suspect that the hon. minister would like to have the same opportunity to reply.

March 6, 1980

Tape 184

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

So on the basis of the information there - and we always have to act on the basis of the information - we now have - it arrived late this afternoon, we requested it from the Auditor General - a copy of any and all relevant documentation with respect to those two paragraphs, which I think arrived about fifteen or twenty minutes ago, because, presumably, he had to have all of that photostated.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We all know that the hon. Premier wrote the hon. Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee with the request, which the hon. gentleman no doubt would have done anyway, but certainly went on the record with the request that this be given a matter of priority of the Public Accounts Committee. I understand that the Premier has received a reply from the hon. member of Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the member of the Opposition who is Chairman of that Public Accounts Committee, to the effect, I believe, that they will in fact so consider it and that a meeting will be scheduled for next week. So we will also be obviously looking closely at the testimony and any evidence or facts which come out in that Public Accounts Committee -

MR. NEARY: What about all the charges (inaudible)?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - but we do not, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - but we do not intend to have police investigations because of pressure from any individual. I do not mean only the hon. gentleman opposite, I mean anybody.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the hon. gentleman must learn that when he speaks without interruption, he has to extend the same to others, especially when we are both working under a five minute constraint, which we are. So I will say there are two principles on which we will operate: one, there will be no refusal to have a police investigation because of any pressure to that effect; and number two, there will be no agreement to have a police investigation -

MR. NEARY: What about (inaudible)?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - because of pressure in that respect, either, The decision will be made according to the information which is available and based upon professional advice and opinion within the department and not for or against because of any pressure in either direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 6, 1980

Tape No. 185

GH-2

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned
until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.