

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1980

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Hon. members will recall a day or two ago we had in the gallery a young lady who was interested in pursuing a career in politics during Career Day and I have a thank-you card which she has asked me to read to all members of the House." I would like to extend my thanks and appreciation to all for making the 24th of November a very successful Career Day for me. Through your words I have learned much about the lifestyle and work of a political figure. My day was a complete success and helped me to see a little better into my prospective job field." And it is signed, "With best wishes and thanks, Michelle Clemen."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) candidate for Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Who is the candidate for Bellevue?

MR. HOLLETT: She is going to be a nurse now.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Yesterday when the minister was quoting from some court documents, as I understood the quotation he was quoting on the reasons why the last offer was turned down by the trustee, it has since been brought to my attention that the minister was quoting from the first offer. Was that intentional? Did you decide to ignore the question that I had asked? Was it intentional that you were quoting from the first offer or did you not know there was a second offer?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from an affidavit that was put into the hands of the court by the receiver, Mr. Gary Coulter, Vice President of Peat Marwick whose office is in Toronto and has been the receiver and manager of the refinery every since the bankruptcy, or at least ever since Peat Marwick was involved with the bankruptcy. This was a document that was put in evidence there. It was the affidavit and it referred to the offer that had been received by the receiver, if I recall the date, on the 30th of September.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, I am glad that in this case the minister was not attempting to mislead us.

DR. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order. The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would think that that was totally out of order. I think there was an imputation there that I was - there was some suggestion I might be misleading the House, that I

DR. COLLINS: have in the past misled the House. As a matter of fact, I believe a few days ago there was a similar remark made by the Leader of the Opposition who said 'almost misled the House'. I think that imputation is totally out of order.

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

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

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the words were, 'I am glad that the minister is not misleading us.' There can be no imputation there or any character assassination or anything else. That was certainly placed in the negative and I believe the Rules of Order state that if the hon. member had said that the hon. minister was misleading the House, then he would have been out of order, but not in this particular phraseology.

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it helps to quote authorities, I think, in these matters. Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 108, unparliamentary words, list it as being to mislead. I also refer Your Honour to page 130 of that same publication, paragraph (h) it is out of order to ask questions which 'contain inferences' or 'imputations'. I would submit that it is quite obvious that what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did, whether inadvertently or not, as the words were presented, was to contain an imputation that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was misleading the House, and as such I am quite sure he would be quite prepared to withdraw it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Page 108, Beauchesne, just says that the word 'mislead', there cannot be an imputation that a member is misleading.

MR. HODDER: the House. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not say that the minister was misleading the House and I do not think it can be construed that there was any imputation that he might mislead the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I thank hon. members for their submissions to the point of order. Perhaps to settle the situation the hon. the Leader of the Opposition might be prepared to simply indicate that he had no intentions of inferences or to use the word 'mislead' in any other connotation and that will solve the situation and we can get on with Question Period.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I can clarify it any more than I did. I said, 'I am glad that the minister is not misleading us.' I do not know how much clearer I can be than that. I said outside the House the other day that the minister came as close as he could to misrepresentation. What I am now saying is that I am glad it is not a question of misleading, it is a question of the minister answering the question and ignoring the question that I asked. I do not know if that clarifies it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure either, but perhaps the hon. the Leader of the Opposition might be prepared to simply say that he did not

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): intend any inferences and that will certainly eliminate the problem that we are now facing, and then he can ask a supplementary.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I stated something that I would ask the Speaker to check the wording. I cannot say something that I did not already say. What I said is, 'I am glad he is not misleading us.' And if somebody is so sensitive that he feels that he needs to take that up, I do not know what other words I can use.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, if it is the request of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I take the matter under advisement, I will so do and therefore have to make a ruling. I was hoping not to have to make any particular by simply asking that the hon. Leader would simply say that he did not intend any inference, but if he requests that I take it under advisement I certainly will and make a ruling at a later time.

MR. L. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Oppositon.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will not come back to the main cause of the concern. I asked yesterday if the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland had looked at the offer made before the court of \$71 million in cash. And the Minister of Finance quoted affidivits which referred to a previous offer, another offer. Now, so that there is no misunderstand, would the Minister of Finance now answer very specifically the question has the Government of Newfoundland looked at the \$71 million cash offer?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland has not received a \$71 million offer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said yesterday that the government had no legal concern. Why was it that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador were written a letter by Petro-Canada that said Petro-Canada would only live up to the terms of the agreement with another party if they had the unqualified support of the Government of Newfoundland? Would the Minister of Finance indicate to us whether, in the discussions with Petro-Canada, that Petro-Canada had said that unless they had the unqualified support of the Government of Newfoundland to do whatever they wanted afterwards, that they would exercise their option to get out of the contract?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in our letter of agreement with Petro-Canada dated, I think, March 25, 1980, we indicated we would support Petro-Canada's effort in regards to the refinery.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You can see why it is very difficult to get the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in a situation where you can say something very clear cut. In the last letter, it had nothing to do with the March letter, in the last letter which was tabled here by the Minister of Finance, the letter indicated, and it was tabled two days ago, the letter indicated that on the understanding, on the complete understanding and it referred to a section, specifically section 7(2) on the understanding they had the unqualified support of the government they would not exercise their option to get out of the contract. Were there any discussions and did Petro-Canada indicate to the government that unless they had that unqualified support, again restated in their most current letter, that they would in fact get out of the contract?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I tabled yesterday a letter from Petro-Canada to the Government of Newfoundland.

DR. COLLINS: At the same time I tabled a reply signed by myself on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and the hon. Leader of the Opposition has that letter and that letter indicates our attitude towards the remarks made in the original letter from Petro-Canada.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - for the hon. the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister indicate to the House if the Province has any jurisdiction over situations like developed the day before yesterday with the Indian ship that sailed into Conception Bay and anchored not too far from Bell Island, I think the ship's name was Jala Krishna, with a shipload of high explosives on board. Does the Province have any jurisdiction over that type of situation? And if so, would the minister indicate - I do not know if it is too late now, I do not know if the ship has sailed or not. I checked with Bell Island at lunchtime and she was still anchored between Kelly's Island and Lance Cover over on Bell Island - what authority, what jurisdiction does the Province have over that kind of situation?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, with reference to this particular incident, the Province and the Federal authorities, the Coast Guard, have both acted and have acted co-operatively so in a sense the, if you wish, technical point of jurisdiction, you know, has not been operative. Mr. Vivian, who is acting director of EMO, has been involved, the RCMP

November 27, 1980

Tape No. 2460

EL - 3

MR. OTTENHEIMER: have been involved and the Coast
Guard has been involved. I understand that a neutralizing
agent has been brought and arrived yesterday to neutral-
ize the nitroglycerin and that some of the

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: explosives have been removed and are in the custody of or under the guard of the RCMP, and that shipping in that area has been advised to stay away. And to the best of our knowledge there is no danger to people on land. Apparently within one mile would be potentially hazardous and the ship is beyond that approximately two miles. So both provincial and federal people have been involved, the RCMP, the coast guard and the Emergency Measures Organization and co-operatively. There has not been any difficulty in terms of jurisdiction.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: In view of the controversy, Mr. Speaker, over whether or not the Crosbie was carrying firearms to Northern Ireland, I would be interested in finding out from the minister if he has any idea what cargo this ship was carrying to Egypt, which the hon. member knows is one of the hot spots of the world, and the ship, I understand, sailed from Québec to Egypt. Did anybody check to see what actually comprised the cargo? Was she carrying firearms? Was this explosives she was carrying destined to one of the hot spots of the world to be used in any conflict of any kind? Did anybody search to find that out in view of the fact that they spent a lot of time down aboard the Crosbie? And I believe the Queen E. II was accused one time of carrying firearms and so forth, and here we have a ship now right inside the three mile limit. Has the ship been seized? Will she be allowed to sail? Will there be an inspection of the cargo to see what she is carrying from Canada to Egypt in the way of high explosives and so forth?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the RCMP have been aboard the vessel. My understanding is that it is carrying dynamite and explosives, but not firearms - not firearms, not war materiel, but explosives used for whatever else they are used for; I suppose, construction and building dams and that kind of thing. It is my understanding that there are no firearms as such being shipped. I can get or will ask for a fuller report but that is my understanding, that the RCMP have been aboard and it is not firearms but dynamite.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what steps will be taken in future to safeguard fishing boats and people who live near areas where these ships anchor, and so forth, like Bell Island? I would question that two mile limit, by the way; I would say that that ship was dangerously close to a mile from Lance Cove over on Bell Island.

And also, Mr. Speaker, to find out in future when such things are brought to the attention of the authorities that a very thorough search is made to see that explosives are not destined

MR. NEARY:

from Canada to be used in a war that is taking place in the Middle East. And I would like to get the minister's opinion on that, Mr. Speaker. And I would also like to ask the minister one final part of that question in connection with the explosives that the RCMP have taken off the ship, what kind of explosives did they take off the ship? Was it dynamite? Was it nitroglycerin? And what will be done? Are they just safeguarding it or are they going to bury it somewhere? What will be done with these explosives?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that - on the first part of the question - that the ship is two miles from any habitation. I have not been to check it myself. I have to take the word of people who -

MR. NEARY: It is only three miles across there so if she was in between she would be a mile and a half.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - give it to me. But I am told that it is two miles from any habitation, that there was no danger to anybody on land.

With respect to matters being shipped from somewhere in Canada to a foreign country, Newfoundland would have no jurisdiction. It is a matter of international trade and, you know, foreign commerce; it would be exclusively a federal government responsibility. We have absolutely no authority to tell - I think it is a company in Quebec which is sending these explosives to Egypt. We certainly would not have any authority to tell them not to do so.

I will have to find out what the RCMP are going to do with the explosives they took off. I do not know what they are going to do with them, but no doubt they will know what to do with them and I will find out what they are going to do with them.

MR. NEARY: If they were restoring the cargo, why did they take them off, take the explosives off?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think they took them off for a safety factor. The problem was apparently that the cargo broke loose -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - the cargo broke loose, and a neutralizing agent was put in to presumably neutralize some of it and for safety reasons aboard the ship some of the explosives were removed. I suppose because they were -

MR. NEARY: Damaged.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - they were damaged or it was impossible to neutralize them, or perhaps it was impossible to get around the rest of the cargo to neutralize it so they had to remove some of the cargo. But I will find out what they are going to do with it.

MR. NEARY: Who paid for the (inaudible) the ship?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think the ship.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice as well. Could the Minister of Justice confirm the fact that the Newfoundland constabulary have overspent their budget in the vicinity of \$800,000 and consequently as a result there are only ten to twelve policemen on duty now on the twelve to eight o'clock shift, the midnight shift, and there are only two to three cars on patrol on that particular shift instead of twenty-two or so men or eight or ten cars?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the hon. member asked the question based on this morning's

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Daily News editorial.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE:

I have not read the editorial
as a matter of fact.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

And I would also point out that
there are two factual errors - I am not talking about errors
of opinion, everybody is entitled obviously to their own
opinion - but two errors of fact in The Daily News editorial
on which the hon. member bases his question.

MR. F. ROWE:

No. You are wrong.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The first one is a statement that
somebody from The Daily News yesterday tried to get hold of
the Minister or the Deputy Minister, could not get hold of
anybody in the Department of Justice. Around ten o'clock
somebody from The Daily News phoned my office, my secretary
said I was out of the Province. The person at The Daily News
said, "Can I speak to the Deputy Minister?" She said, "Yes,
Mr. Penney is now on the phone. He will get back to you."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Within an hour the Deputy Minister of Justice was back talking to The Daily News; he was asked some questions by The Daily News and the Deputy Minister's answer in general was, 'On matters of policy we do have an internal policy that it is the minister who answers. He will be back in St. John's tomorrow and I will ask him to phone you then'. I got back around two o'clock. So the first error of fact was in that respect, but the second error of fact is that The Daily News editorial on which the hon. member bases his question -

MR. F. ROWE: No. no.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - says that less than a dozen people were policing the city last night.

Now, the hon. member knows, and I have stated before, that we do not give the numbers of officers policing the city at any specific time or day. And the reason is obvious, because we are telling people who either get their full-time income or their part-time income from breaking the law and they will then know what preventive measures are being taken. But I can say this, without saying how many of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary were on duty last night, I will not give the number, it was more than double the alleged statement of fact in the editorial from which the hon. member -

MR. F.B. ROWE: How many was that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Just one second now.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Daily News says less than a dozen. Of course, that is a bit unspecific, less than a dozen, because that could be one or eleven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But -

MR. F.B. ROWE: No, there were at least two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There were at least two, exactly. But if we will even take that editorial, less than a dozen, and take off the less and say a dozen, their inaccuracy of a matter of fact is blatant because it is more than double that, and I am not going to say how much more than double that, more than double the number stated in The Daily News.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: No wonder he did not run for the leadership.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, the other part of the gentleman's question was had the department overspent its budget with respect to overtime. I will answer it this way, that during the present fiscal year, since the 1st. of April, approximately \$800,000 has been spent on overtime in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, approximately \$800,000.

MR. NEARY: You should take on extra staff and save yourselves money.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, there are two comments I want to make on that: One, it is obviously government policy that where public funds are spent in terms of overtime with the police, when it is necessary for adequate protection of the city, overtime is authorized. When it is not necessary for adequate protection of the city, it is not authorized. And the implementation of that policy is the decision of the Chief of Police.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is one area of public policy and its implementation is the decision of the Chief of Police. Now perhaps I will just mention that within a couple of weeks, during December, I will be, because matters are being finalized now, I will be making

MR. OTTENHEIMER: a statement if the House
is open it will be in the House and if not, obviously
it cannot be on a number of matters pertaining to the
Royal Newfoundland Constabulary with a special
reference to our projected date

MR. OTTENHEIMER: to relieve the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary of municipal by-law enforcement in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Meter Maids.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The city will take over the responsibility. Number two, the projected date for policing of Mount Pearl by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. Third, the announcement of a number of new recruits including men and women. And number four, a new training programme which has been worked out for new recruits.

MR. NEARY: Additional forces -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, and for the new recruits, a new training programme.

MR. NEARY: An increase in the force.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. The new recruits will constitute an increase in the force. So within a couple of weeks I will be making a statement, I hope to be able to do it in the House, covering those four matters. But I thank the hon. gentleman for asking the question because it did give me the opportunity to give the public the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. F. ROWE: I would like for the hon. minister to know that the question was not based on the editorial in The Daily News; it was based on a source outside of The Daily News and within the police department itself. The minister has confirmed the fact that \$800,000 has been overspent in overtime. And consequently I would ask the minister to indicate to the House whether he is satisfied that the safety - indeed the lives of the police, are not in danger, because I understand that they are in fact understaffed now for this twelve to eight o'clock time period, they are understaffed with respect

MR. F. ROWE: to personnel and the number of patrol cars on duty during that particular period, 12:00 to 8:00. And with the oncoming of Christmas and increasing number of transients and this sort of thing, is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) satisfied with the situation with respect to the safety of the public in St. John's and the safety of the policemen themselves? And do they have to wait until a new budget is brought in before this matter is rectified financially or can there be some other source of funds in order to take care of any extra necessary funds to bring the staff up to normal which I understand it is not at the moment?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, just a correction: \$800,000 has been spent on overtime. Now, you know, I would not agree that that is overspent. It has been spent on overtime and, as I say, the policy with respect to overtime, number one, there is a government policy and that is where it is necessary for the adequate policing of the city then public funds obviously will be spent for overtime. Where it is not necessary—naturally overtime is not a way of life—and where it is not necessary for the protection of the city, then it will not be. And the implementation of that decision, of that policy, the judgement is exercised by the Chief of Police and his deputies. And obviously it has to be, it is not exercised within the Department of Justice or elsewhere, it is exercised by the Chief of Police and I have full confidence that he exercises that judgement with full

MR. OTTENHEIMER: knowledge of the facts and that with respect to adequate policing of the city that the city is adequately policed and that the Chief, in his implementation of that policy, does so with certainly major consideration, vital consideration given to the safety of people and the safety of the Force as well.

MR. F. ROWE: Just one final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Is the minister saying, Mr. Speaker, that he is, you know, quite satisfied that this over-expenditure of \$800,000 does not present a problem with respect to the policing of the city at the present time?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct this. It is not an overexpenditure; you know, because there has been \$800,000 spent on overtime -

MR. F. ROWE: Right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - it is not necessarily an over-expenditure.

MR. ROWE: Then what is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not recall how much, you know, we allocated, but where overtime is necessary for the safety of the city and for the safety of its citizens, no matter how much it is in excess of any amount estimated - because you can only estimate - that is not a factor. The first concern, naturally, is the safety of the people in the area policed. That is the first concern. So that is not - you know, the budgetary matter there, whether they have gone over or under the amount actually estimated is not a factor. What is a factor obviously is the policy that in all areas where public funds are spent, we want to be sure, because we are accountable for the expenditure of public funds, that

MR. OTTENHEIMER: they are spent appropriately. And that means that where overtime is necessary in policing, it will be paid. Obviously, it means where overtime is not necessary, it would be quite improper to authorize it.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And it is the Chief of Police who implements that policy by the use of his own professional judgement, and I have confidence in his exercise of that judgement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, My question is directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Does the minister now have his transportation priorities established and a package presented to Ottawa for their approval and their blessing, of course, for the upcoming financial year?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, our priorities have been established for a long, long time and forwarded to Ottawa for quite some time. Some of the priorities have been known to Ottawa probably for more than a year, because I am sure Ottawa is aware, as we are, that the Trans-Canada Highway agreement would terminate this year and that most of the DREE agreements terminated this year. So we have informed them months and months and months ago what our priorities are and they are aware of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Uniting.

MR. BRETT: Yes, it is uniting. Now, whether or not the writing, the paper itself, the letter is in Ottawa or sitting in the DREE office in St. John's because they

MR. BRETT: refused to accept it in Ottawa,
I do not know. All I know is that it certainly has left
Confederation Building months and months and months ago.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, could the -

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL: Motion 2.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion 2.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Ships (Bounties) Act (No. 2)". (No. 86).

On motion, Bill No. 86 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1.

When the House last adjourned we were debating the amendment as proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. L. Stirling) and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) adjourned the debate and has about twelve minutes remaining.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear; hear.

MR. L. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take the first minute just to state that we are, today, releasing a further report on the Hibernia B08 well. Timing of the release was for 3:30 p.m. so this is a very convenient time for me on my feet to say that we have, in the fourth test of the Hibernia B08 structure a flow of some 4,347 barrels a day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: - which is coming along.

This is separate and apart from the earlier flow of 2,430 barrels a day that we announced in the second test. There are a number of other tests still to come in the Hibernia B08 testing, but we have to conclude that things are looking very good and the testing is proceeding and the delineation drilling of the Hibernia field is proceeding in a very positive manner. This flow rate was with double chokes both with a forty-eight over sixty-four inch opening. As you reduce the choke - they did a number of tests - from a reduced

November 27, 1980

Tape No. 2466

SD - 2

MR. L. BARRY: choke of sixteen over sixty-fourth inch opening, they had a flow rate of 1,273 barrels, at a thirty-two sixty-fourth inch opening they had 3,631 barrels and then they let her go at forty-eight over sixty-fourth and put in a double choke and they got it up to 4,347 barrels.

MR. BARRY: This is quite a light oil, 40.5 degree API gravity and, as I say, further testing will be proceeding. So things are going in a positive fashion offshore, Mr. Speaker, and we can only hope that Newfoundland's right to ownership and jurisdiction will eventually be confirmed once and for all and I felt at liberty to make these comments today in the course of my address, Mr. Speaker, because the constitutional amendments that are being proposed on the part of the Federal Government could threaten these very fundamental interests of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - could threaten them, put them in jeopardy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And as I said, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, or Tuesday, even if there were a successful court action that confirmed Newfoundland's ownership here, that could be overridden by a national referendum.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the people of this Province want to see their rights put in jeopardy by the type of constitutional amendment being proposed by the Federal Government.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, do I think the people of this Province want to see the United Kingdom Parliament doing the dirty work for this present Liberal Government in Ottawa. And Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is being terribly embarrassed by being asked to wash Canada's dirty linen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: - in the United Kingdom Parliament, Mr. Speaker. It is a shameful, shameful course of action. The Prime Minister said that it is terrible that we still have this link with the United Kingdom, traces of our colonial past. As was said, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons by our worthy Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister himself is the greatest colonial here, going back to the mother of parliaments to have his dirty work done for him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does not reflect at all well upon the government of our nation to be engaging in such despicable tactics. Now, Mr. Speaker, neither does the substance of what they are proposing, apart from what we can say critically about the process engaged in, let us look at the process - let us look at the substance that that process is going to bring about. If the constitution is amended as proposed by this present Liberal Government in Ottawa, we will end up with not ten equal provinces, we will end up with unequal provinces, Mr. Speaker. We will end up with a situation where Ontario and Quebec and the larger provinces have a special status, and Newfoundland and the smaller provinces will be holding the dirty end of the stick. As has often been the case, we have held the dirty end of the stick, Mr. Speaker, from an economic point of view.

MR. BARRY: It is now going to be enshrined in the constitution that we are going to be unequal forever and, Mr. Speaker, what frightens me is that I believe the people of Canada and the people of this Province have a tendency to say, through impatience with the whole process, "Look, this has dragged on long enough, Let the Prime Minister do what he wants to do, get it over with, finalize it once and for all. Let us have a new constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that people, when they say that, realize what is being proposed here: It is not just the patriation of the constitution, it is not just the bringing back of the constitution to Canada from the United Kingdom, it is fundamental change that is being proposed here, change that will make a fundamental difference in the balance of power between the provinces and the Federal Government. When provincial governments now, when Premiers go to a First Ministers' Conference, the Prime Minister right at the beginning of the Conference will be able to say to them, "Now, shape up, shape up or I will whip it to the country." A sword of Damocles will be hanging over their heads, Mr. Speaker, and the excuse that is being given for taking this action is that the provinces have been frustrating constitutional change and it is time to get rid of this so that we can get on with the job of constitutional amendment.

Look at the new constitution we are going to end up with. Ask yourself from where has the greatest opposition to constitutional change been coming,

MR. BARRY: which province? I am sure that all members know. Which was the one province that, after having agreed at Victoria, came back to the government of the day having changed its mind? That was in the Province of Quebec.

And, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak critically about our neighbours in Quebec, they might have had very good reasons for so doing; however, will the new constitution change this? Will the new constitution make it any easier to get over opposition from the Province of Quebec? No, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. The new constitution will give a veto power to the Province of Quebec, to the Province of Ontario, but it will not give a veto power to the smaller provinces, Mr. Speaker. And that is why, that is why if the people of this country, if the members of this House accept the constitutional amendments as proposed, we will be accepting an entrenchment of inequality. And if we thought that we in this Province because of our small population, our small representation in the House of Commons, if we thought in the past that we had a hard job making our views known federally, on the federal scene or on the national scene, Mr. Speaker, I stand here and I predict if these constitutional amendments go through, the difficulties we have had in the past with making our views known will be nothing to the utter impossibility of making our views known in the future. We will be ignored, Mr. Speaker, we will be ignored because the federal government will be able to pass us by at any time it wished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have given some of the reasons why I cannot support the amendment as proposed by the party opposite. That amendment, Mr. Speaker, is very shortsighted. It excepts two examples given by our Premier and seizes upon those as being the

MR. L. BARRY: only defects in the constitutional amendments as proposed. I think I have pointed out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of this House why the very inequality that is obvious in the treatment of provinces would be another reason for us to vote against, for us to fight against these constitutional amendments proposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Premier is in the United Kingdom today and he has been for a number of days making Newfoundland's opposition to the constitutional proposals known to the British people. I think it would be very appropriate, Mr. Speaker, before he returned for him to receive the unanimous support of this House of Assembly for our opposition as a House - every man and woman in this House should be prepared to support the Premier's message.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that members vote against this amendment and vote very quickly for the resolution as proposed so that we can get an immediate telex over to the Premier that he can report to the British people that the House of Assembly is solidly behind him in this message. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) should send off a telex to the Premier right away and tell him to hang on for a week or two and see what happens because indeed the resolution and the amendment might both get unanimous support of this House. Who knows what might happen in a period of time?

MR. F. WHITE: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I have ever heard as many reasons given for someone refusing to support something when all the reasons given were those for which a member should support something. I thought all the reasons that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) gave today and in his speech on Tuesday were the reasons why he should support this amendment that has been brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). For the Premier to have taken the time of this Province on such two important major issues that he felt were the two single most important issues that Newfoundland could stand to lose out on, and we in the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition brings in this amendment and then the Minister of Mines and Energy stands up, gives all reasons why he should support the amendment and then says he will not. The resolution is very clear - or the amendment to the resolution is very clear, Mr. Speaker, and I am

MR. WHITE: proud that I am able to support this amendment and I am delighted that the Opposition has brought it in.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian who was proud when the Prime Minister of this country came on television and announced what I thought he should have done years ago, and that is finally say that the Canadian Government was going to move to patriate the Canadian Constitution.

I always felt as a Canadian that there was something lacking in our nationhood, something lacking as a nation that we should have our own constitution still in the hands of a foreign country, a foreign body, and I was delighted and proud as a Canadian when the Prime Minister announced that the Government of Canada was going to move to patriate the constitution, because I had seen on television and read time and time again how the premiers and the Government of Canada could not agree on an amending formula and could not agree to come up with the proper amending formulas so that they could bring the constitution home to Canada. So I was delighted and proud to see the Prime Minister move in that direction and delighted and proud that he is going to push forward with it.

I am not so sure that I can say that I agree with everything that is in the resolution, and in the constitutional proposals, the proposed changes, but I do agree with the way that the Prime Minister has gone about starting the process of patriating the Canadian Constitution. And I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and I will say that if there are any objections from the British Parliament, if the British Parliament should belabour this issue, and the Prime Minister of our country were to decide to take unilateral action as did Rhodesia many years ago, and decide to declare

MR. WHITE: unilateral independence in Canada,
and decide to -

MR. ROBERTS: As the United States, too.

MR. WHITE: - as the United States did as well,
and decide to get out of the Commonwealth, then I would support
him on that as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: I think the time has come to move
now, well over a hundred years in Canada, a hundred twelve or
thirteen years, it is time to bring our own constitution home
and woe betied to the British Parliament if they try to object
and try to stop the government of this country from bringing
home the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was proud as a
Newfoundlander and as a Canadian to see our Prime Minister move
in the direction that he moved in on television and I was
very proud to sit there and watch him do it.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that
I was less proud to see our own Premier on television with the
kinds of statements that he was making, and the kinds of issues
that he was bringing in to the political ballgame in this
Province. And I had an inkling of what he was going to say
when he came on television that night, because I was sort of
forewarned. I had an occasion to run into him one day in
the lobby of Confederation Building and we were chatting about
various things and he asked me how I felt about the Canadian
Constitution and the proposals that were being made to bring
it home, and I said I did not find anything that objectionable
about them. I thought it was the right approach and the
right idea and he said to me, "How do you think your constituents
are going to feel when they find out that our denominational
education system is going to be threatened or could be threatened
because of the proposals that are before the Federal Parliament
at the present time?" So I was sort of forewarned. But I could

MR. WHITE: not believe that a Premier in 1980 could use this kind of shock treatment on the people of this Province to get them stirred up over religious issues at a time when that kind of politics should have disappeared from our shores forever more. I could not believe it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: I know, Mr. Speaker, that religion plays a factor in some elections, an unseen factor and I was the victim of one of those particular cases in the last provincial election and I do not want to go into it any further but I saw it at work. I saw its dirty head rise up and come out as an issue in an election campaign and I never thought that it would spread to the Premier's Office of this country and to the government of this country where it would be used in that kind of fashion. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it may have gotten some people upset

MR. WHITE: from the denominational education point of view but maybe not upset from the way the Premier wanted them to get upset. I know a lot of people who resent being drawn into this debate, resent it greatly, and they have told me as much. They have told me they are concerned about the denominational education, about any changes that might come about, but they have told me as well that they resent this issue being used as a way of getting people on side, this kind of shock treatment that we are using. When all other psychiatric trickery has failed, then the shock treatment approach is used by the Premier to try and beat Newfoundlanders into shape in the sense of getting them on side with respect to this issue.

So I resent that, I resent it greatly. I do not think it should have been brought into this debate and I think that the Premier will find out that it was a mistake in the long run to have started this process. I have a great deal of respect, Mr. Speaker, for our denominational education system and I have a great deal of respect for what it can do. I think that in many ways in the past number of years the denominational system of education has revolutionized many rural communities in this Province, many small, remote areas. The denominational education system is not just a school system as you would find it in St. John's or in some of the larger towns, but it is part of the community. It is tied into social activities in a community, it is tied into church activities in a community, and the whole community revolves around the denominational activities that are going on within many communities, particularly my district and along the Northeast coast of Newfoundland. So I am proud of that system of education. A lot of people are not and a lot of people would like to see it done away with, but I am not one of those. I think it should

MR. WHITE: remain. I think there is a lot of good to be said for it and I think it provides a quality of education that we did not have in Newfoundland for many, many years. Not that we did not have the denominational education system for many, many years, but I think in recent years with the kind of trained personnel that has been developed, we have seen this denominational education system come into its own in the last ten or twenty years and it has really provided a breakthrough in the rural and remote parts of this Province, a breakthrough that was long overdue and one that I am very happy about.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why our resolution is the right approach. It is the right approach because the Premier has raised this matter and we are trying to put it to rest with our amendment in this regard.

I do not like the approach that the government has taken, Mr. Speaker, on this matter. I do not like the hysterical way that the Premier has gone about trying to force Newfoundlanders to take sides on this matter, calling people into his office, calling people into the eight floor Cabinet room almost in a panic kind of situation, almost in a paranoiac kind of situation. I have talked to people who have been in those sessions and they have come out of there and they have told me that, while they sat there listening to the Premier they were wondering whether or not deep down inside the political issue of how he was going to fare in the next election might have been more important to him than exactly what he was talking about in terms of the possible changes in the long run to our system of education or to our border. And I am scared, Mr. Speaker, about the damage, I am scared, Mr. Speaker, about the damage that that kind of approach this government is doing, the damage that might be caused to

MR. WHITE:

Newfoundland, not just now but in future. I am afraid that a great deal of damage might be caused because of the actions of this government towards the federal government. I support the government, Mr. Speaker, on many of the issues of the day. I do support the government. I support them on trying to get the offshore oil and gas rights to this Province and to make sure the Province is sure that we own the offshore oil and gas rights - I support them on that, I support them on many of the constitutional changes that they are trying to get brought about, but I do not support the way they are going about doing it, particularly the way the Premier is setting about to do this. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to do Newfoundland any good in future years to have this kind of rhetoric and to paint Newfoundland in this kind of villain format that is being displayed right across this country. Take, for example,

MR. WHITE: the Premier's statement in Ottawa the very night of the Quebec referendum when he said that the federal government should be an agency of the Provinces. What a silly remark to make the very night that we were trying to bring this country together in unison -

MR. NEARY: In a prepared statement.

MR. WHITE: - from sea to sea! In a prepared speech as well - and then had to go and withdraw that remark later on and say that he really did not mean that at all. So, you know, I just wonder if the Premier really thinks things through in that regard or if he goes off sometimes in a half cocked fashion making statements that later on he has to retract and is sorry for.

Everything with respect to Ottawa is negative, Mr. Speaker, everything, and that is what concerns a great many of my constituents, the negativity that is being thrown out towards Ottawa, and I hear it all the time. Goodness knows, if the federal government and the federal monies coming in here has not uplifted Newfoundland in the last numbers of years. And I am not saying that everything Ottawa does is right, because I know it is not, and I know that we have to stand up and be counted down here in this Province and fight for our rights and not just sit back and depend on old Uncle Ottawa, as the talk used to be, to throw down the goodies to us. It is not like that anymore, we have to fight for our rights, but I do not think we have to take Ottawa on on every single issue that comes up, and that is the way it seems to be. It scares me, Mr. Speaker, and it scares many people in this Province to think that for one moment there might be a possibility of the financial taps being turned off in Ottawa towards this Province. I think the Premier has turned the bureaucratic mind in Ottawa off towards Newfoundland

MR. WHITE: and I think that is a dangerous situation. It is something that could take years to restore, years in the future when we will need help with many programmes and many projects and I think that is a dangerous thing. Take, for example, the Economic Council of Canada report just a little while ago, a two year major study on Newfoundland, and the Premier goes up to the university and in a flippant manner says, 'What is the good of it? - you know, another federalist point of view.' Do you mean to tell me that a two year study done by the Economic Council of Canada with follow-up studies to come at the request of the government, at the request of the Premier, contains nothing good? Not one single iota of anything that is any good to this Province? Nonsense, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: He implied that and he gave the people of this Province that impression, that this Economic Council of Canada report was no good. Why did he not pick out one single item that was positive instead of classing it immediately, right off the bat, as federalist, you know, giving Newfoundlanders the impression that two years of a major study on Newfoundland, 'Oh, there is nothing to it, another federalist point of view.' It is the same old kind of thing, kick out against Ottawa. I am getting sick and tired of it and I know a lot of Newfoundlanders are getting sick and tired of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: The politics being played! Talk about politics being played! The Premier of Quebec, René Levesque, Mr. Speaker, decides not to call an election because he thinks the constitutional issues are so important that he should not call an election at this time and disturb the political fabric in his province when these constitutional talks are going on. What did we hear from the Newfoundland

MR. WHITE: Premier? - threatening to call a provincial election on this matter. Only last week when I was in Lewisporte watching television - I was ill - I saw him on television saying, 'Well, we will probably call an election on this matter. You know, one of these days we might have to call an election to get the support of the people.' Well, who cares? Maybe he will win every seat. He might win every seat in Newfoundland, fifty-two seats, but who cares if he wins fifty-two seats in Newfoundland? If he won every seat in the Province or won ten more than he has now or one less than he has now, what does it matter? He could go up to Ottawa and say, 'Mr. Trudeau, now I have fifty-two seats in Newfoundland,' and Mr. Trudeau will say, 'What good is that to you?'

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is what he would say.

MR. WHITE: Sure, and so he should say, too. So he should say, 'What is the good of that to you? Go back home and sulk some more,' because that is the way it is, playing politics with this issue! I do not care if he should call an election on this matter and I am sure most of my colleagues do not care. Who cares? Our concern is that the Province be protected -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: - that our constitutional proposals be made clear to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to see the Premier of this Province take the kind of sound, logical, sensible, diplomatic approach that was taken a few days ago by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: - when he spoke in this Legislature. If we had him representing us on the national stage out front, we would be further ahead than we are today, Mr. Speaker, much further ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: So, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the reasons why I feel that all members of this Legislature should support this amendment that we have brought in.

MR. WARREN: Right.

MR. WHITE: It is what the Premier asked for, it is what we are offering him, it is an amendment that would guarantee that everyone in this House would

MR. F. WHITE:

be united on an approach to Ottawa; an approach on the educational system, an approach on the Labrador boundary which were the two issues that the Premier said were the most important issues as far as he was concerned and those are the ones that we are offering unanimity on, Mr. Speaker, in that regard. If this amendment fails then we will have to talk about the overall resolution and I have some concerns about some of the things in that resolution. I would not rule out completely, Mr. Speaker, that no one on our side of the House could support that resolution and I am not saying that. I would not rule out completely that I could not support that resolution. I want to hear debate on that resolution, but there are some things in it that I simply do not agree with. I do not agree with shared jurisdiction in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, I just do not agree with it, period. And I cannot find anybody in my district who agrees with it, no one.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. F. WHITE: So those are just some of the things that I feel, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this amendment, I hope to get a few minutes to speak when the main resolution comes up to talk about some of the items in that that concern me and I imagine that will come up in the next few days and then I might get a chance to speak again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. POWER: Now you are going to hear some common sense for a change, some logic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is little wonder that the recent poll throughout the Province showed the Liberal Party would pick up four out of seven seats -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: - because it is obvious to the people of Newfoundland they do not know what they want -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. J. MORGAN:

want.

- they just do not know what they

MR. C. POWER:

Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN:

To listen to this debate in the last few days it is obvious that they are totally confused, The last speaker, for example, leaves the impression that the major concerns of the constitutional change in the amending formula, in the patriation of the constitution, are two issues - two.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He just quoted the Premier.

MR. J. MORGAN:

And that leaves me, Mr. Speaker, first of all, to say I will support the first 'Be it therefore resolved' of the Opposition's amendment. I will support that part of it. But here is the key part of the resolution, 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED subject to such amendment being made that this House supports and endorses the proposal of the federal government to patriate the Constitution'. In other words, give us an assurance that there is no change to be made to our boundary in Labrador, give us the sacred right that there will be no changes to our denominational educational system and the rest is all fine.

MR. POWER:

That is right give it away.

MR. J. MORGAN:

That is what the amendment is saying, They are asking the House of Assembly to vote for an amendment that just give us those two assurances and the rest is all fine with regards to any amending formula and a constitution.

Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition party with its new leader is now fully behind the federal government's proposal? They are asking us to support the proposal in their 'Be it therefore resolved' - the second one. Are they supporting Mr. Rompkey, the federal MP, who stands up in British Columbia and says, 'Newfoundland is greedy.

MR. J. MORGAN: It is time to give back to Confederation what we have taken from it'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Confrontation! Confrontation!

MR. POWER: Come on boys, come on.

MR. J. MORGAN: And he comes back here a few days after and does what? What does he do? He starts on one of our most important resources and starts extracting money from the fishermen around the Province, left and right. Right now, today, I had a case in my office this morning, a fisherman, where Mr. Rompkey refused to be lenient. I took the case to Mr. Rompkey's office; he refused to be lenient with a fisherman in his own riding which saw a man today being forced to go on welfare, forced to accept social assistance because the Revenue and Taxation Department has taken his total earnings for this season because he is in dispute -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. J. MORGAN: - with the federal government over taxation policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. J. MORGAN: That is the kind of policy put forward by the present government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. J. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: - I want to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Every hon. member has a right to be heard in silence in the House.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no way that we can support and, in fact, I would say the majority of the people of this Province can support the present proposal which they are asking us to support in this amendment. The federal

MR. J. MORGAN: government's present proposal on the amending formula of the Constitution. Why? Because it is not ensuring us any provincial ownership over our resources, as my colleague mentioned earlier, of the

MR. MORGAN: offshore resources. There is still no assurance of a free transmission of power across a neighbouring province to export it, there are no assurances of that. There is no assurance that our local preference policy, which is so important to offset our high unemployment, is going to be protected. No way, it will be lost and gone. And if a fellow from Bonavista, or a fellow from Bay de Verde, is fighting against a fellow from Alberta or Ontario for a job in the offshore, who is going to get it? The fellow from Bonavista will stay in Bonavista, and the fellow from Bay de Verde will stay there, unemployed. That is what the Opposition wants. That is what the Opposition party wants. These are the kinds of things that are being talked about in this kind of proposal by the federal government.

And the Opposition is caught in the middle of a bind because yesterday I was quite pleased to - I was sitting here listening very closely, the day before yesterday, and I heard one member stand up, in the Opposition party, and that man, in my estimation, went up twenty feet, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe), who had the courage to stand up and say in his seat that he was not going to agree with things being said by his own party, he felt that things being done by Mr. Trudeau in Ottawa were obnoxious, Obnoxious! arbitrary actions being taken by the Prime Minister in the Government of Canada on the amending formula. Now that man, I think, was speaking for more than one in his party. And that is the reason why they are confused, they do not know what they want.

The last speaker said he was not in favour of having any kind of shared jurisdiction over the fisheries. Well, let me ask that same gentleman a few questions, and ask the House a few questions. Does that mean that that same gentleman and the fishermen in his

MR. MORGAN: riding are going to agree with the following? Listen to this: Does it mean that he agrees with Ottawa, first of all, controlling and managing in a total way our most important industry? Our most important industry being managed by the technocrats and the autocrats miles away from the scene, miles away from Notre Dame Bay and Lewisporte and Bay de Verde and other places, does he mean that? Does he mean our most important industry will be controlled and managed by Ottawa forever? That is only the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

Does he mean that he supports the idea of a man setting out today in Springdale with a thirty-five foot longliner, built it himself - I was aboard the boat a few days ago.

MR. NEARY: Probably (inaudible)

MR. POWER: Be quiet. Be quiet!

MR. MORGAN: He built it himself, Mr. Speaker, with hard work and determination. He travelled the Labrador in schooners for years fishing, him and his father before him. I walked aboard his boat a few days ago and I talked to him. He said, 'I have a problem and I cannot get it resolved'. He was begging me to help him. He said, 'I went into the woods and cut my material and built my boat'. He had a fine boat. He had an engine in his boat, his own expense. He did not want no government assistance. An independent-minded fellow, he grew up the hard way. That boat, Mr. Speaker, has been tied up to the wharf in Springdale since last May because Mr. LeBlanc refuses to give the man a licence to go fishing. Why? Not because he was not a fisherman, because of the stupid regulations that were brought in. He used to go to Labrador with his father in a schooner. He fished for years, Mr. Speaker, in Labrador in the fishery. But now he has a boat of his own, on his own

MR. MORGAN: effort. Those are the kinds of policies, Mr. Speaker, that are now being brought forward that we do not like. There are some good decisions, but there are many, many bad ones and they are made by people in Ottawa, far removed from the scene and we do not like that.

Why could not someone walk down on that wharf from Ottawa? You will never see them from Ottawa on a wharf in Springdale, or Bonavista or Plate Cove or anywhere else in this Province, you will never see them there. They are not going to be there. Well, why could not someone walk in to him and listen to his story? Then they could recognize the human factor involved, of a man who could be employing at least four men all last Summer, fishing, and taking a few pounds of fish and supplying a livelihood to the families concerned. But he could not do it because the federal government's licencing policy said, 'You do not get a licence for your boat because we will not give you a licence for your boat'.

That is one of the reasons why the last speaker is supporting federal control over the fisheries. Again a good reason why. Sure it is a good reason why.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another good reason why that member is probably not going to support shared jurisdiction over the fisheries: He wants it totally controlled by Ottawa. There was a recent decision made by Ottawa, and announced at a meeting here in St. John's recently, for us to have the Western part of our Province, taking in 110 communities along the Western part of Newfoundland, around to Port aux Basques, up to the Northern Peninsula, managed - from where?

MR. MORGAN:

Not from Corner Brook, not from Port aux Basques, not from St. John's but guess where?

MR. POWER:

Not from Port au Port.

MR. MORGAN:

From Moncton, New Brunswick,

A new office to be located in Moncton, New Brunswick to manage our fisheries, to manage our people and our affairs.

MR. WINDSOR:

(Inaudible) That is right!

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, but they are getting a little closer, they are getting a little closer; they are in Ottawa most of the time, now they are moving to Moncton. They are getting a little closer.

MR. POWER:

And how good of them, how good of them, eh? Why have they got to do that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

And is it, again, the reason why they do not want any shared jurisdiction and people in our Province to have a say, is it because this year our fishermen only could catch themselves 13,000 metric tons of squid because of low prices, five cents a pound compared to eleven last year? They only caught 13,000 tons because they could not sell any more than 13,000 tons of fish because the reason why, because the Federal Government in this so-called management decisions of our fishery decided not to negotiate an import quota for squid in the Japanese market, which is our main market for squid, but instead to trade away 17,000 metric tons of squid from our own Canadian waters this year.

MR. POWER:

That is right.

MR. MORGAN: That is what has happened.

MR. POWER: That is the kind of management they have.

MR. MORGAN: Everybody knows what has happened, it is fact. That is one of the reasons I guess the Opposition is supporting total federal control over the fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Or is it because of the fact that recent licenses went up by 300 percent increase for fishermen.

MR. WARREN: Right on! So have car licenses.

MR. MORGAN: All the licenses have gone up. Fishermen are making thousands of dollars. Mr. Rompkey thinks they are making a fortune. He is going out drawing it out of their bank accounts. He is doing it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR: Be quiet, boy.

MR. MORGAN: I thought Mr. Rompkey, and I know Mr. Rompkey for years, would buck-

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) decision on you.

MR. MORGAN: I thought he would, Mr. Speaker, would have enough gumption as a Newfoundlander to stand up to some of his technicrats and autocrats in his department, and say, 'Look, fellows, slow down. Those fishermen do not have the kind of techniques or the expertise available to them to help them with the kind of complicated forms that we use in our taxation policy. They have never had course in how to complete these forms. They are taking courses now at the Trades College, Fisheries College, travelling

MR. MORGAN: around the Province, people training these fishermen. 'Give them a little break, slow down on them.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: I am not saying that he should not be paying taxes. The minister could be saying to his officials, 'Sure, they should pay their taxes but give it to them in a bit more lenient way.' Do not go in and seize their bank accounts as took place the last three weeks, seizing a bank account.

MR. POWER: Do you agree with that?

MR. MORGAN: Do not go in and take all their earnings and force them on welfare.

MR. POWER: Do you agree with that?

MR. MORGAN: Do not do these kind of things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: You agree? Are you doing -

MR. MORGAN: Be a bit more lenient. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rompkey is caught in the same position -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Could I have some order, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! I have difficulty understanding the hon. the Minister.

MR. NEARY: We all do.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that are affecting and directly affecting - maybe it is the reason why that the Opposition party is so in tune

MR. MORGAN: with things in Ottawa and caught in a bind, in a political bind of having to support Mr. Trudeau in the kind of things he is doing to Newfoundland right now, and the kind of way he is treating Newfoundland because we have an MP up there who is a Minister and Mr. Rompkey meets with the caucus, he tells the caucus, 'Now, boys, get behind me because I am behind Mr. Trudeau. We cannot show any dissension here'. Maybe they are caught.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes!

MR. MORGAN: The member for Twillingate (W. Rowe) showed his colours. He does not care what Mr. Rompkey says, he has his own mind to use and he is going to use it, he told the House two days ago. And where is the rest of the fellows. Where is the member for St. Barbe (T. Bennett)? Surely he does not want the fishermen in his area managed through an office in Moncton, New Brunswick. And I can go on and on in these kind of examples. Why did we lose 25,000 metric tons of cod last year?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: Why did we lose it? And at the same time when Mr. Etchegary a few days ago, Fishery Products, Nickersons are saying the same thing: 'We may have to close our offshore plants.' Why? Because of lack of raw material from the offshore. Not because the raw material was taken by the inshore and midshore fishery, but because there is no material left offshore and the harvesting plans for 1981 shows there is no substantial increase, a few thousand metric tons for the offshore quota in 1981. But at the same time, at the same time, those so-called experts in managing our fisheries are saying, Yes, we will give away 25,000 metric tons again this coming year to Spain and Portugal and other places. We will give it away, we do not want it. But the people in the South Coast want it and they are worried now about keeping their plants open next year. And the hon. gentleman, who is spokesman on fisheries knows what I am talking about. The industry is concerned

MR. MORGAN: for the coming year and lack of raw material for their plants, lack of raw material. And surely they are not going to make a decision this year again and say, 'We will give away to the foreign nations 25,000 metric tons' at a time when our own fish plants are going to be lying idle which would normally be operating year-round. These are the kinds of things, I am guessing, the Opposition are supporting in saying they do not want any shared jurisdiction, they do not want Newfoundland - who knows? I mean, this party could be here for another twenty years. The way things are going, I think it could be. But the colour of a party in power can change. And I am sure if the hon. member for the Burin Peninsula (Mr. Hollett) were Minister of Fisheries in a Liberal administration, that his attitude right now, if he is going to support the Opposition in this change and say we do not want any control over the fisheries - and we are not saying, Mr. Speaker, in any way or form that we want total control over the fisheries; all we are saying is, 'Mr. Ottawa up there, look, do not come down here with all the answers. We have people in the fishery like Gus Etchegary, and Denis Monroe and the Lakes and the fishermen themselves and the committees, take a listen to what they have to say. If you do not want to listen to the Minister of Fisheries because you might not like him, because he is too political for you maybe, maybe, you do not have to listen to him, but listen to Newfoundlanders. Listen to us. Consult with us'. That is not taking place. You talk to anybody in today in the fishing industry in our Province and they are not being listened to by anybody in Ottawa. There is only person who may have the ear of Mr. LeBlanc in Newfoundland, Richard Cashin, because they are buddy/buddy

MR. MORGAN: politically.

MR. FLIGHT: Ah, ha!

MR. MORGAN: That is all. The rest in the important industry are not being listened to in Ottawa, are not being listened to.

And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the kind of a reason that I can hear from the Opposition, that they want us to vote for an amendment asking us to go to Ottawa and fully support and endorse Mr. Trudeau's proposal in amending the constitution, and if they think Newfoundlanders are not concerned, they had better stop and think.

The last speaker said that the Premier was creating - and yesterday I heard the same comment, the day before yesterday - some kind of hysterical - using hysterical tactics, I think was the term used by the hon. gentleman. If the Opposition is of the opinion that they have to defend the party in power in Ottawa because it is of the same stripe, and if they are going to try to create an illusion in their own minds that the people of Newfoundland are not behind this administration and behind the Premier and his admirable efforts over the last month or so on the constitutional change, why not travel around the Province a bit and ask a few questions? Why not talk to some of the town councils around the Province? Why not look at the file that is coming up in the Premier's office of support - unending, day after day support for the Premier and what he is doing, because he is standing up for Newfoundland and the Newfoundland people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: He is not standing up for the P.C. Party, no way! He is not standing up to keep the party in power, he is standing up to defend the Province and this Province's rights. And what he is doing he is

MR. MORGAN: I am dead serious because down the road we are going to see things happen to this Province that are going to be damaging and hurting to generations to come and all because we did not get a resolution passed unanimously, Not for the sake of partisan lines. Surely we can cast them aside and forget them. Let us stand together, let us stand together on behalf of the people of our Province and go to Mr. Trudeau and say, "Look, Mr. Trudeau, bring back the Constitution. Sure we agree with that. But bring it back and have it amended here in our Province, upon agreement with all the provinces across Canada. And do that and that only."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was quite interesting hearing the Minister of Fisheries comments, Mr. Speaker, and before I go down through some of the notes I have made here I would like to remind the minister in all of his Ottawa bashing as he goes along in condemning the Ottawa ministers, the Ottawa departments, he will come down to Newfoundland and fail to go around to the provinces, I would like to remind the minister that last evening I was called by the President of the St. Barbe District Rural Development Association. They are having their annual meeting Saturday and Sunday. They have sent the hon. minister three invitations -

MR. FLIGHT:

What? What?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT:

- and he is not able to go.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: You know, so with all the interest that the hon. gentleman - I know he takes a lot of interest in the fishery of the Province, and St. Barbe being such a fishing area -

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

MR. BENNETT: - Mr. Speaker, as it is, and it is a real good fishing area -

MR. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman must have his facts all wrong because I was invited no later than yesterday and I confirmed today that I will be making every effort to be at that conference on the St. Barbe Coast this weekend with all my officials with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

It is obviously no point of order but the minister took the opportunity to clarify remarks attributed to him.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, thanks.

Well, I assume then, Mr. Minister, it is okay for me to call my colleagues up in the St. Barbe area and tell them that you are coming.

MR. MORGAN: That is what is happening.

MR. BENNETT: If it gets fogged in, let us hope you can travel over the road and then you come back and talk to your Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

He is gone to make reservations now.

MR. BENNETT: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, our roads are reasonably good up there, so let us not be too hard on our

MR. BENNETT: minister. We will have lots of questions for him as the House proceeds along this session.

I would like certainly, Mr. Speaker, to support the amendment to the resolution that has been put forward by my colleague, most certainly support it, and in doing so I thought, and I still feel, that we are supporting the resolution that was put forward by the Premier himself. There are some things in that resolution that was put forward by the Premier that I am reluctant to come right out and say, "Yes, I shall support wholeheartedly the Premier's resolution," because I know that the people in my district are not very happy with some of the wording of that resolution, especially when it comes to the fisheries and the fisheries jurisdictions.

The district that I represent is very heavily fishery. It is the main source of cash flow and revenue for that district. So I want for that district, as their representative in the House, I most certainly want for them what is best and they are indicating to me that they have so little trust in the present government, the present administration, they have so little trust in the present administration that they are reluctant to have the present Tory Government have any more jurisdiction over the fisheries than they presently have.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. BENNETT: Unless they could prove to the people of this Province that they can

MR. T. BENNETT: do a good job in the departments they now control, when they can prove that then the people of the Province and the House of Assembly on both sides, I suspect both sides of the House will talk again about fisheries shared jurisdiction. But not until that time when the people are sure that they can trust their valuable resource in the hands of their local administrators. They feel more secure, Mr. Speaker, in the hands of Ottawa. That is the feedback that I get, and I can only speak on what I am hearing in my district.

In supporting the amendment as put forward by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) I feel that I am supporting a half of the Premier's resolution. It is half of what the Premier puts forward. And if we do not get unanimous support for that amendment, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is purely blatant politics and nothing more than pure blatant politics.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on.

MR. T. BENNETT: We could support this portion of that resolution of the Premier's. I am not telling secrets out of school, I think, out of our meeting when we are asked - around our table we were suggesting what can we support in this. Our leader, he is not narrow-minded, he is able to look up and say, 'Gentlemen, what can you support, what can we support unanimously of the Premier's resolution? Can this, gentlemen? Can this, gentlemen? Can this, gentlemen?' And you can go around our table and when we decide whole-heartedly and I am sure that I can support the amendment to the resolution. I feel very sure that I can support that so I would like to vote in favour of it, and I suspect most of the House of Assembly would like to vote for that amendment.

MR. T. BENNETT: Take the other three parts of the resolution as it was presented and have some discussion, some debate on that. Probably we could decide on another one of the three remaining issues that is built into that resolution. There might be only one that we would be hung up on, and in a day we could debate that one and we would speed up the Premier's resolution or the material that the Premier wants to get across.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, there has been a committee formed in Ottawa to accept proposals from individuals, from committees, interested persons of any sort that would submit briefs concerning the constitution. And I wonder why the Premier chooses to rush off in a panic to Britain. Why not have a chat or do up a resolution or a proposal and take it to the committee that has been formed? Take it to the committee that has been formed in Ottawa and save our tax dollars from the all the travel. He could telex to that committee in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: How could he take it to the First Ministers' Conference - the committee was not established at that particular and place, so I understand. It was not ready to receive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: Like some of the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the Opposition side of the House, I too am very sick and very tired of all the Ottawa bashing that I am hearing around the Province and coming from the government side of the Province. People in the Province are becoming very disillusioned. They know the Premier is gone off to England. They also know that the various departments in government cannot find money to do mediocre jobs in the communities.

MR. S. NEARY: Did you see him last night sipping his glass of wine on T.V.?

MR. HOLLETT: The taxpayer in Newfoundland is paying for it.

MR. BENNETT: That is a million dollar glass of wine enjoyed by the Premier of this Province in England.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: Well, it is about time, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier paid more attention to home affairs.

MR. WARREN: Right on! The bread and butter issues.

MR. BENNETT: Pay more attention to bread and butter issues, pay more attention to getting his marbles and his various departments of government in order so they can get their homework done and so they know the next move that they are to make in the administration of this Province.

Every time that I ask or the news media might ask some department in government when is money available for forestry, when is money available for the fishery, when is money available for transportation, all of this goes back to Ottawa. They come along, Mr. Speaker, with a Five Year Plan and everything hinges on Ottawa, and, still, there is never a kind word, there is never a compatible word, there is never a thank-you note. I doubt if there is even a Christmas card ever sent back to Ottawa saying, 'Thank you, Mr. Ottawa, for the years of co-operation that you have displayed to Newfoundland, and we now would like to return in kind.'

We had a good many years of practically full employment and I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that at this time in Newfoundland's history, it is surely

- MR. BENNETT: the highest unemployment we have ever known.
- AN HON. MEMBER: The highest since Confederation.
- MR. BENNETT: It is certainly the highest that I have ever experienced since the 1930s. And if Ottawa plucked away from us the unemployment insurance cheques, the old age pension cheques, the family allowance cheques, the equalization payments -
- AN HON. MEMBER: Canada Pension.
- MR. BENNETT: - the Canada Pension -
- MR. HODDER: Medicare.
- MR. BENNETT: - the Medicare -
- MR. S. NEARY: Fifty per cent of the welfare payments.
- MR. BENNETT: - and fifty per cent of the welfare payments, and you could go on with reams and reams of the benefits that come down from Ottawa and that have come from Ottawa to this Province over the last ten years, not to mention over the last thirty years, the benefits that have come down and this Province shows no appreciation. All they show is arrogance and lack of appreciation.
- MR. NEARY: You are looking for a forestry programme of \$47 million -
- AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).
- MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!
- MR. BENNETT: The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) suggested that we are on the dirty end of the stick all the time. Well, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we invite the dirty end of the stick -
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. BENNETT: - in our attitude towards the clean end of the stick.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: And it is about time that we shake up our approach to Ottawa and see if this government cannot get back on track as a governing body of the Province. They have been given a mandate by the people of the Province, Mr. Speaker, they were not given a mandate to go go globe-trotting all over God's creation on issues that could be resolved possibly at home with debate.

Now, I am suggesting that the Premier of the Province, being in England at this time, must have felt very sure, very certain, that his Party would support unanimously his Resolution. He did not stay back for debate on this Resolution, he went tearing off to England hoping that he is going to get a telex in support. Why could the Premier not wait and help with the - probably the Premier may have been able to persuade in this House of Assembly more support from this side before he went off to Britain. England would still be there. It has been there a long time and it is going to be there a long time after we are all gone. So I think that the Premier again is jumping the gun, he is again seeking the limelight.

MR. T. BENNETT: When the Premier was on half hour television displaying his -

MR. WARREN: Charisma.

MR. T. BENNETT: - charisma, my colleague says, it was described in my district as something different than charisma. However, when the Premier was on that half an hour television show we broke up a meeting which I was attending of a community council at which a very good supporter of the Premier was in attendance. We left that meeting to go and watch the Premier. And when the Premier's half an hour was all over we compared notes and the most frustrated and most disillusioned person among the seven people who broke the meeting was the greatest supporter of the Tory Party in the district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name names.

MR. G. WARREN: No, he is not any more. He is a Liberal now.

MR. T. BENNETT: Well, I do not need to name names, but I can, Mr. Speaker, surely tell you who it is and you can, by process of elimination - he is President of your party up in that district. So that is clear enough for you. And he was disillusioned and he was scratching his head and said, 'The Premier - look, it is really hypothetical and it is premature'. And he said to me, 'The Premier, I cannot get over it the way he is getting on with this stuff'.

MR. G. WARREN: What is that? From a PC?

MR. T. BENNETT: Well, he is the President of the Tory Party in that district.

MR. G. WARREN: Wow.

MR. T. BENNETT: So I do not need to name names, you can sort it out for yourself.

MR. HOLLETT: He has not said which district yet.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I feel that everybody in this House of Assembly here would like to be considered as loyal Newfoundlanders. I suspect most of the people in the

MR. T. BENNETT: House of Assembly would like to be recognized and as Canadians. I think most of us would like

to be considered as good Canadians; I would. I would like to be considered as a Newfoundlander and most certainly as a Canadian as well. When we talk about the border -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: When we talk about the border between Quebec and Newfoundland, for the life of me I cannot see British Columbia, Ontario, Nova Scotia, any of the other provinces allowing any provincial government to encroach upon Newfoundland borders. I just could not see it. If there is any danger of any encroachment, I certainly cannot see it. I cannot see where Quebec would want to encroach upon our borders. I cannot see the rest of the provinces going along with that kind of an approach. And I do not believe for one minute that this government are ready to believe that Ottawa would accept an encroachment on our borders even if Quebec would want to encroach upon our borders.

MR. WARREN: There shall be light and there was light.

MR. T. BENNETT: In the Premier's resolution there, and I am speaking on the amendment, but when it comes to the Premier's resolution he talks about free transmission across other provinces. Well, that is fine and dandy too, but I never saw free transportation of hydro lines over my land. I have had to-

MR. HOLLETT: Sign easements.

MR. T. BENNETT: - sign easements. So I think that that should be debated and discussed and clarified when you say free. They may want a dollar a pole for the land it is taking up. There are so many things, Mr. Speaker, that I could not

MR. T. BENNETT: support, without debate, in the resolution but this here, the amendment to the resolution, I can support and I am very anxious to do so. I said a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, that this government in power today was given a mandate to rule. They were given a mandate by the people of the Province and I feel right now they are abusing it. I feel, Mr. Speaker, the governing body of this Province is playing too much politics with people's lives.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on, buddy!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. BENNETT: There are too many bread and butter issues that should be discussed in every district, not only St. John's and offshore oil.

MR. WARREN: Roads, hospitals.

MR. T. BENNETT: There are too many issues that should be discussed by this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like the hospital in Port-aux-Basques.

MR. WARREN: Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or the one you announced for Salt Pond.

MR. WARREN: Clareville.

MR. T. BENNETT: Or like the elimination of those that might come about if Come By Chance and Bonavista North might be cut off in favour of Clareville possibly.

MR. HOUSE: What?

MR. WARREN: Clarendville, yes.

MR. BENNETT: I am just wondering out loud -
I am just thinking out loud, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: - some kind of playing
politics with people's lives.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I am asking questions. Well,
I do not know if that is playing politics with people's
lives when you start juggling their medical services around
but that is the question -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! There is a motion
on the floor

MR. WARREN: Oh, oh, the Minister of Health,
you had better be careful. Better be careful, Minister of
Health.

MR. BENNETT: However, I did say, Mr. Speaker,
that this government was given a mandate by the people and I wish
they would -

MR. WARREN: Use it.

MR. BENNETT: - use that mandate -

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. WARREN: - instead of juggling people's
lives politically. And there are so many things that we
would like to speak about. I would like to talk more about
district work myself. When the hon. Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) is talking, and Ottawa bashing again, as usual,
and he is talking about not being able to get licences and
not being able to get money in place from Ottawa, and I have seen
boats in my district tied up because they could not get
\$2,000 or \$3,000 from the Fisheries Loan Board to put
their \$50,000 or their \$20,000 boat afloat, just because
they already owed a few dollars. Consequently there are
about half a dozen fellows unemployed. And if they do not

MR. WARREN: get back in the fisheries - I have one case in point over in my district where a gentleman lost the engine in his boat; he was in the good graces of his bank, consequently he could borrow \$3,000 to get him a down payment to qualify for the Fisheries Loan Board financing. He was only afloat for three weeks or so and he lost the engine in his boat, he had to haul it up, he had a family to feed, he had bank payments to make, he had Fishery Loan Board payments to make and he had no income. He approached the Fisheries Loan Board -

MR. WARREN: What happened I wonder?

MR. BENNETT: He was turned down.

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. BENNETT: Turned down by the Fisheries Loan Board. They would not advance a nickel to him until he brought his account up to date.

MR. WARREN: Now. Now.

MR. BENNETT: And by this time the season was behind him.

MR. WARREN: That is what you would call shared jurisdiction.

MR. BENNETT: That is what you call shared jurisdiction. By this time his boat is hauled up on the bank. The family by this time has got to go to the welfare officer, so the government will not advance a loan of \$2,000 or \$3,000 but they will feed that family and the other three or four families from the other pot, social welfare, for the next ten years, unless that gentleman can get back on the water again, because he knows nothing but fishing, and in that district jobs are so limited other than fishing.

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of aches and pains in this Province that could be adhered to and talked about and resolved, a lot of them, and I

MR. BENNETT: sympathize with the gentlemen on the other side of the House, I sympathize with them when they are sort of caught off track. They did not expect us to support them. We are, in essence, supporting them, but not on their resolution in total. We are supporting it to simplify it. We are supporting it - we are supporting a couple of areas of that immediately, get that swept aside and taken care of, in place, and hopefully they will see the light and support our amendment. If they so desire they came come forward with another resolution and they can reframe it, hopefully, and we might support it in total. Who knows? I do not know. It depends on how it is worded and what is involved. I might need to see some things changed, especially related to the fishery. Like I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the fishery is of magnificent importance to my district. It is of magnitude importance over in my district. It is the one area. - it is the greatest cash flow. I continually say at this time there are few places in the Province where there is a decent cash flow, and one of them is in Port au Choix where there is a good fish plant operation and one is in St. John's, those are the two that I am most exposed to at the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: Where is the cash flow in St. John's?

MR. BENNETT: Well, there is a cash flow in St. John's because people are rushing in because of the excitement displayed with offshore oil and industry and because government seems to be attracting industry to the -

MR. NEARY: That is only a lot of boutiques down on Gower Street and Duckworth Street (inaudible)

MR. BENNETT:

Well, I am very much aware that this, of course, is much wants more and so dollars are being attracted by dollars. Dollars are in St. John's, they have always been in St. John's, I guess they shall always be in St. John's. And I doubt very much if we will ever see very many benefits from the spin-off from offshore in rural Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BENNETT:

And when I speak - the thing about it is we will not see the benefits

MR. BENNETT: but we will see a lot of the disadvantages. I do not want to sound negative, Mr. Speaker, but the cost of living will go up and the cost of living is very high in rural Newfoundland now and it is being aggravated and inflated by a bill that came through this House last year. And when we talk about resettlement, this government, the government of today, have put forward and had a bill go through this House that established another form of resettlement, resettlement in disguise. They are not going out and saying to the people in small communities, 'Look, you have to move from Bellburns, River of Ponds, Trout River, Eddies Cove, Green Island Cove,' they are not saying that, but they are saying, 'Unless you can show that you can get a substantial tax off the properties of your residence, your services are not going to be provided by this government; and when you get your tax structure in place, you come back and we will talk to you.'

Now, a lot of these communities that I am familiar with, Mr. Speaker, have not got appraisals done in the communities to establish a tax. Once a tax is established on their properties, we do not have the financial tax base that people can support such a tax. So what I am saying is, in reality this government is introducing, or inflicting on the Province of Newfoundland resettlement in disguise, because people have, under previous administrations, become accustomed to the services that were about to be very well provided for by the Liberal Government when it was in power, with its roads programme, its hospitals and nurses and the schools, water systems and everything else. And all of a sudden the bottom seems to have dropped out of all of this. None of it seems to be coming forth anymore, and unless the communities can provide this for themselves, they are just not going to have it.

MR. BENNETT: People have become accustomed to this; they have travelled abroad and they have gone back into these communities and they do not have it in these communities anymore, so, Mr. Speaker, I am betting that in a very few years ahead you are going to see more communities disappear out of rural Newfoundland in favour of the urban areas.

MR. NEARY: Right on! That is a good point.

MR. HOLLETT: That is John Carter's plan, centralization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Have everybody living in the urban centres.

MR. WARREN: Less expensive savoury.

MR. BENNETT: It is beginning to become very evident, Mr. Speaker, not only to the people in the House of Assembly, not only to the Opposition in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming very, very obvious and evident to the people around the Province, the bungling of the present government, the atrocious bungling.

When you travel over the Province and you talk to people - and I am accustomed to talking to people; I have been in the public service most of my life and it is just my second nature to speak with people - they question the wisdom of the government they have in place. They question, Mr. Speaker, the wisdom. And how can we accept and put up with it? How can we wait for another few years to see if we cannot have something better to carry on the affairs of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting - I do not have much time left, I am sorry about that - however, the next election in Quebec undoubtedly will see

MR. BENNETT: a Liberal Government in place.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And a Liberal in Newfoundland.

MR. BENNETT: Hopefully, the next election in Newfoundland will see a Liberal Government in place.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: All the fighting, all the Ottawa bashing, all the hypocrites, all of this can be swept away, the hypocrisy that we presently have to listen to and live with and endure. You will have a uniform political - we will not be Ottawa bashing. We will have a Liberal Government in place in Quebec -

MR. WARREN: Right.

MR. BENNETT: - we will have a Liberal Government in place in Newfoundland, we will have a Liberal Government in place in Ottawa, and the cash again will flow, employment will flow and everything will be reasonably compatible again and Newfoundland again, Mr. Speaker, might very well be able to smile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: In closing, I most certainly want to support the amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the motion and I just want to make a few comments with regard to the last speaker. First of all, he started commenting on the Premier, where the Premier is and what the Premier is doing and, of course, I am amazed at the number of people on that side who can give comments as to what premiers should be doing when they could not get anybody to run for Leader of the Opposition -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: - Only a couple of fellows who have scarcely been in the party for more than a couple of years or elected to the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: They have all

the answers. The other comment there is that we have got to be prostrating ourselves and bowing before Ottawa every day and what does it get us? He said we cannot be in confrontation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been for thirty years going to Ottawa and coming back with the little bit they are willing to give us and we have been good boys and so on and what did we get? Trudeau, I think, a few days ago said he did not like Newfoundlanders because they were saucy and I thought all these years we had been the epitome of timidity, you know, here in this Province, docile people, nice people. A minister, from the Province, in Ottawa, goes out to British Columbia, and British Columbia is - I do not know - around five thousand miles from here.

AN HON. MEMBER: At least.

MR. BENNETT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: The minister is suggesting that the Prime Minister of Canada suggested that Newfoundlanders are saucy.

MR. BAIRD: Well, that is what he said.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I probably could support his views because he is apparently dealing with the higher echelon like our Premier and our ministers, you know, but the rest of the Newfoundland people, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, are not nasty people, they are compatible, very nice people, humble people, decent.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. It is a point by the hon. gentleman to inject some type of humour into the debate as he perceives it, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it is an abuse of the rules of this House to arise on a point of order for the purpose of interrupting the speech of somebody when you have no real point of order. The hon. member is entitled to be heard in silence. He is is entitled to speak for allotted time unless he is in infringement of the rules of this House, and the hon. member is out of order himself arising on a spurious point of order of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER: It is very obvious that that was not a point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Barbe.

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was making a comment from a book by Richard Gwyn. A little while ago

MR. HOUSE: I read that comment, and that book was written before the present Premier of this Province was in power, so the fact is this was Trudeau's reaction to the people of Newfoundland. Then I went on further to say, talking about our minister in the provincial Cabinet being in British Columbia saying to the effect that we are greedy, giving the impression out there to people -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) provincial (inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: No, the federal Cabinet - that we are wealthy. These people may think we are wealthy, I do not know. We are five thousand miles away; this is a big country, and what he forgot to say to these people was that in British Columbia they have double the per capita income that we have in Newfoundland. So we are greedy and should be giving back now. In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, that minister is not doing Newfoundland any favours whatsoever in Canada.

Now, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) also made reference to a certain PC Party president who talks about our reaction being hypothetical and premature, our reaction to this constitution. Obviously you have to presuppose what can happen and that is all we have been saying. Nobody has been saying this is bound to happen. What we have said is these guarantees that we had are taken away and there is a possibility that what we had ironclad before is no longer there. The potential is there now to abuse our rights.

With regard to playing politics, this government playing politics, Mr. Speaker, I sit in this House day after day. Yesterday's Question Period was

MR. HOUSE: the most beautiful example of politicking that I have seen for some time. And, of course, you lost all kinds of Brownie points on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to just say a few words on the amendment. And as a lot of my colleagues have said, we are against the constitution package on a number of counts; we are against the process that we are going through now, the process, the unilateral action, and we are against the content that is in the total package. We have given five or six reasons. We have talked about the Charter of Rights, there are two or three items in that, and that is covered a little bit of this particular amendment, but we also talk about the bread and butter issues.

The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was up the other day talking and waxing eloquently on: he was ashamed to be up talking about this now when there are so many bread and butter issues to be talked about. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has taken the bread and butter issues right out of our Resolution and taken it off the floor and now we have to discuss things other than the bread and butter. Because the three points that we talked about, the three major points about crossing other territories with our electricity, offshore oil and gas and shared jurisdiction, are aimed right at the major industries in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Prime Minister settled that.

MR. HOUSE: The Prime Minister has not settled it. There is nothing there except the Prime Minister's very loose words.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have said that we want these things in the constitution. These are the bread and butter issues. And when you talk about health delivery, when you talk about education delivery in this

MR. HOUSE: Province, you have to think about a wherewithal to do it, and that is why we want entrenched in that constitution a means whereby we can give the people the service that they want, give the service that the Opposition is asking for as well as some of the other people.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reason now that I am not going to support this amendment - I will say it now quite clearly - the reason I am not supporting this amendment is - you know, there are a number of reasons. The two items there are not bad in themselves, but what you are saying and what you are asking us to do is to go to Ottawa and say, 'We approve everything else you have there but these two.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. HOUSE: What a foolish way, Mr. Speaker, to go about trying to negotiate! Imagine if you had a union so inept as to say, 'We will only go for 5 per cent first and then we will go for 10 per cent after, or 20 per cent.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: You go for what you want. And this is what we are going for in our resolution, and, therefore, we cannot accept this particular one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, also, I do not know the motivation for this resolution, I do not know whatsoever.

MR. STIRLING: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. HOUSE: No, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition keeps trying to interrupt. I do not know the motivation. I think it could be to try to embarrass the government, but that would be impossible because this government is flying so high now there is nothing over there that can embarrass it anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: The other one might be to help the feds get off the hook, and I think that may be their motivation, because Mr. Rompkey certainly needs a lot of help now and I think probably that is the best thing -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) Mr. Stirling put them on the hook well, though, with that indirect tax.

MR. HOUSE: Well, yes, of course.

MR. BARRY: When he went back to Ottawa, Mr. Chretien and Mr. LaLonde slapped his wrist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Anyway, that may be the motivation. Because surely, Mr. Speaker, nobody over there would agree with the constitution should come back amended like Trudeau wants it or the federal government wants it. Nobody wants to have us a second-class Province. Certainly, we cannot have that. And surely, goodness, they want us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It would be third-class here.

MR. HOUSE: It would be third-class here, yes. Surely, goodness, they want us to have rights to our offshore oil and gas.

MR. BARRY: No, no.

MR. AYLWARD: No, they do not want that.

MR. HOUSE: Do they not? Well, my goodness, they must, Mr. Speaker, they must!

MR. BARRY: That would embarrass the federal government, too, see.

MR. HOUSE: So the Leader of the Opposition also did go to Ottawa shortly after his inauguration as Leader of the Liberal Party, and he went up there saying that we have to make peace with Ottawa. That is the appeasement approach that Neville Chamberlain made. Remember?

MR. BARRY:

Peace at any price.

MR. HOUSE:

Peace in our time.

MR. BARRY:

Peace in our time.

MR. HOUSE:

Yes. So, I suppose this amendment is to try to get us to go along with you to take Trudeau off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this resolution because it is not giving us quarter of what we want.

MR. FLIGHT:

Talk to Elmer McKay (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Would the minister answer a question?

MR. HOUSE: I am not permitting questions, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member had his -

MR. AYLWARD: If I thought you had a good question I would permit it, tell him.

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have gone along saying something to the effect that with regard to the Charter of Rights we will go along if certain things are in there, our mobility thing. Our offshore preferential treatment is in jeopardy.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I apologize for interrupting the hon. minister, but pursuant to Standing Order 31(h) it is now five o'clock and I can inform the House that I have received notice of one motion for debate at five-thirty when a motion then will be deemed to be before the House. Notice was given by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the subject matter is repealing the water rights of the Upper Churchill Falls.

MR. HISCOCK: Is that the only one? Is that the only one?

MR. SPEAKER: Just one Notice of Motion, yes.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Not according to the Standing Orders, no.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to make some reference to the entrenched rights, and I said that the Charter of rights, government policy has been that we can go along with a major part of that provided, of

MR. HOUSE: course, that the two parts of this resolution are involved and, of course, that our preferential treatment to Newfoundland is not jeopardized.

Now, there is something about that offshore thing that people are missing. The only way that we can get Newfoundlanders on these oil rigs, or the offshore, is by doing what we have done. We do not have to do that, for instance, to protect teachers from coming - from outside the Province, or nurses for that matter, or any other groups, because there are groups who are protecting them, groups within the Province; the Teachers' Association, and so on. But there is nobody to protect Newfoundlanders against the foreign countries that are coming out there, and we had to do it. The federal government was not doing it. They were not doing it. So we have 1,000 people out there working, 1,000 people. And that is bad, that is hurting some of these people up-along because we are getting some jobs out there.

Mr. Speaker, we want to maintain that capability. We do not want to have it ever and always, but certainly we want the capability to do it when we see that it is necessary.

Now, I have some problems, Mr. Speaker, with the Charter of Rights anyway. From a philosophical viewpoint I have problems with entrenching rights in a constitution. It may sound like motherhood, you know, it may just sound like motherhood, but once you start defining a right you start limiting it. Once you start to define a right you start to limit it, and anybody who has had any administrative - any person who has had any administrative, or has any administrative capability will know that.

Mr. Speaker, we saw the other day in the closure debate in Ottawa people getting up, the

MR. HOUSE: Liberals getting up and beating their chests, beating their breasts and saying, 'We are the country in this world that has the most rights. We have more rights than the United States, we have more rights than Russia,' and so on. 'We have those rights so now let us entrench them and become like these people who do not have as good rights as we have'.

Mr. Speaker, I always prided myself on living in a society where we had an unwritten constitution -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: - and it evolved that we have the most rights in the world. And now, at this particular time, they said, 'We have arrived. There cannot be any more rights, let us write them down'. Mr. Speaker, I believe that is going to restrict rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have that in Russia.

MR. HOUSE: You read the rights in Russia and see what they are like. Just read them.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to think of an analogy to use, and I say, by entrenching our rights to think that we are going to have more rights, is almost like taking a laxative in case you might get constipated, and that is bad for your public constitution and your bodily constitution. And I think it is just as bad for the constitution here to be entrenching these rights in the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the one that we are talking about, or the Opposition's resolution is talking about is religion. That is an entrenched right in the United States since the revolution, the freedom of religion has been a right, and the meaning of that freedom has changed, almost a complete turnabout, and it has gone from a freedom of religion to - somebody has said

MR. HOUSE:

it is a freedom from religion because it just protects minority groups. That is right. The courts have done that and that is who is going to interpret all the rights in the future in our constitution. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that will be determined - once a person's rights are challenged they would have to be tested in court.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

There is one other thing we have you know, in this Charter of Rights, about the language - a person will have the freedom to be educated in his or her own language where practical. And, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is aware of some initiatives taken a few years ago; the First Ministers met and the Ministers of Education met and decided that that would indeed be the case, but the practical part of it would be 'that where practical' and that would be determined by the Province, by the school - the Department of Education and the school boards in the Province. It would be left to these people to interpret. And what 'practical' meant-is there enough for a class, and so on? But now if we entrench it, what does practical mean in terms of law? No one knows. Possibly it perhaps - you may have to set up classes for one person.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No. No.

MR. HOUSE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, you have to look at all of these eventualities. You have to look at it because - it is nonsense for people to say, "This cannot happen." Anything is possible to happen and I think we have lived alongside of a neighbour, the United States, that can give us some classic examples of what can happen in terms of interpreting entrenched rights.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The United States is a republic.

MR. HOUSE: Well, it is a republic.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are not a republic yet.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we are not a republic yet - those timely words - but this Constitution is leading us to it, inexorably to it. And the referendum, of course is - the referendum process is a unitary process. It is a unitary process -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. HOUSE: - the referendum is. And that referendum, of course, is repugnant to the people of Newfoundland; when somebody in some other part of the Province can determine their fate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to sit down, I am going to say in summing up, the amendment is too restrictive, it is immature, and it is an embarrassment to send that to Ottawa from this Province.

MR. AYLWARD: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: I am going to vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Before I recognize the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) I wonder if I might, having now had the opportunity to review today's Hansard, give a ruling on a point of order raised earlier today during Question Period. And in checking Hansard, the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) that gave rise to the point of order were, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, well I am glad that in this case the minister was not attempting to mislead us."

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Now, it has been ruled in the past that it is not unparliamentary to say that a member has misled the House as long as there is no imputation of intentional falsehood or intention to deliberately mislead the House. And the key words here of course are, 'intentional' and 'deliberate'.

The Fifth Edition, Beauchesne, paragraph 322, on page 115 states, "It is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible." In this case there does not appear to be imputation that the minister deliberately misled the House.

The hon. member for Burin-
Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in spending a few moments speaking in support of this amendment to the resolution, one finds it very difficult to know where to start. There have been a lot of personal feelings, some partisan politics, and a lot of rhetoric that has gone on in this House, in my opinion, over the last several days.

Mr. Speaker, the matter becomes more complex as we study it more and in particular in the, "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED" in our amendment that, and it states, "adequate to ensure that the territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador would not be interfered with."

Mr. Speaker, I have argued this point for quite some time, not against as much any action that the Province of Quebec may take, because I have heard from several members opposite that the Government of

November 27, 1980

Tape No. 2485

NM - 4

MR. HOLLETT:

Quebec does not officially recognize the Quebec-Labrador border. I have done some research on that and I have not been able to find where it

MR. HOLLETT:

is a firm commitment of the Province of Quebec, But what I am very concerned about is a statement our own Premier made at the First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa when they met to discuss the proposed constitution and all its ramifications. Now, Mr. Speaker, his statement there certainly made me think, it made me ponder, and really wonder if the Premier of our Province honestly knew what he was up to and what his inferences were. We all know that the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, worked long and hard to try and bring Quebec out of Confederation, set up a separate state and run it as he saw fit. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the record I would like to quote from what our Premier said at that conference in Ottawa. He said, "The Prime Minister and Mr. Levesque articulated two different visions of Canada", and our own very Premier went on further to say, "I would have to side with the one advocated by Mr. Levesque".

MR. WARREN:

What? What?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

When was that? When was that?

MR. HOLLETT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that be so -

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) vision of Canada.

(Inaudible) of Quebec inside Canada (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

What? Oh, Oh, yes, ten

Canadas. Ten.

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) Canada, you have lost

Quebec.

MR. HOLLETT:

Yes, without Quebec, Mr. Speaker,

and also including Labrador as said by several members in caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT:

And to me, Mr. Speaker, as a

Newfoundlander, a good Newfoundlander, I find statements like

MR. HOLLETT: this somewhat repugnant and, to put it mildly, it certainly sets a seed of doubt in a lot of people's minds, just where the Premier really wants to lead us.

Mr. Speaker, if I could refer to some comments made by some of the early speakers as well, especially the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan - and I will be very brief there seeing he is not in the Chamber, I can wait until a later date. But in his comments I think he is quite genuine in some things he said but certainly a lot he said had to be with tongue-in-cheek. You know, to illustrate probably how best our Minister of Fisheries reacts rather than acts, just a few days ago, on the media, he was asked what he thought of the report as tabled by the Economic Council of Canada. So immediately, right off the top of his head, he said, literally speaking, "It was no good, flush it down the toilet". Then as an afterthought he said he would study it - no, he said he would look at it and then study it and then after that possibly make some intelligent comment on it, when the latter part of the statement was the only intelligent part of the statement he made, in my opinion. Because when a minister of the Crown will take a document which, in my opinion, says a lot and there are a lot of good guidelines there, there is a lot there that could help us, and make flippant comments like that, how do we as Newfoundlanders ever expect to have shared jurisdiction in the fisheries? You know, shared jurisdiction is not something that is given, it is something that is earned, and I am somewhat ashamed to say, Mr. Speaker, as a Newfoundlander, that for the last thirty-one years I do not know of very much that any provincial government has done to earn us the right to have the shared jurisdiction that we all would like to see. I am sure every fisherman and every fish plant operator in this Province would love to see the Province have a greater direct input in the management of our fisheries resources. And until some time - and in the future it has to be - until we ourselves decide that we are

MR. HOLLETT: going to work together to demonstrate our responsibilities, to do things in a proper manner, get out of the forum, get out of the arena, the confrontation, the fishermen of this Province - sure they are going to look up to the executive of their unions, sure they are going to look up to Mr. Cashin, and quite properly so in my opinion, simply because they have been consistent in their views and their objectives. They do not take a shotgun or a scatterbrained approach to it. I would suggest to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) right now that if he is going to be the minister in this Province who is going to put together a package and have some direction, in relation with this Province going with fisheries, we have to become sane, sensible. We have to be able to talk to people. Not like the minister who received an invitation to the annual conference of our fishery's union, acknowledged it in writing and said he would be there and then went public and said that he did not get an invitation. Now, how can the fishermen and the fish plant workers and that, you know, have faith in a minister such as this who will get up and rant and tear and not tell - I have never heard the Minister of Fisheries tell a lie in his life, Mr. Speaker, but I have heard him say, in my opinion at least, other than what is the whole truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the total constitutional thing and the resolution of the government and, also, our amendment which I am definitely supporting, you know, I am not as old or

MR. HOLLETT: probably not as experienced as a lot of hon. members in this Chamber, but there is one thing I have observed down over the years, that when a person, or an organization, or a government know they are right they quite directly - they do not deviate, they do not change in midstream because they have the full confidence of the decisions they have made.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to make an observation in relation to the drummed-up issues, as I call some of them; the half hour that the Premier of this Province, in my opinion, abused the public media in this Province. Then when the proper reaction did not come in, the strong arm twisting that went on to try and encourage telegrams and letters, that is fine with me. Then, when the reaction still was not as positive as some people would have liked to have seen it, spent public funds for newspaper and radio advertising. Then that was not even getting the result anticipated or hoped for and the government, itself, has to appoint its own spokesmen to do their paid radio commercials.

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. HOLLETT: You know, the government of this land today has their own Lord Haw-Haw or Tokyo Rose, or whatever you want to call it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, you know, it is just getting to a ridiculous stage. I hardly believe what is going on. Mr. Speaker, those types of things I do not feel are necessary in Newfoundland. I for one, have a lot of respect for the electorate and the residents of this Province, and I think I have travelled this Province as much as anybody, and I think if we are all being fair and honest with each other, sure people are concerned about the

MR. HOLLETT: constitution, sure they are concerned about denominational education. And on that particular point I would like to make my own observations. I was somewhat disappointed in the terminology used by the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) the day when referring to this amendment, he referred to it as being an anemic resolution. I am sure he was not thinking when he said it.

MR. TULK: He never does.

MR. HOLLETT: Because, Mr. Speaker, if anything in this Province should be preserved and enshrined it is our denominational education system, not necessarily because it is a better system than elsewhere in the free world, not even necessarily because to a certain extent it is still church controlled, but if there is ever a monument to the people who made Newfoundland what it is today, I think we should preserve this particular system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: A sensible point. More sensible than the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can all agree on one point, that if it had not been for the direct input and the sacrifices made by all denominations in this Province, and still - up to Confederation in particular and even since, then, Mr. Speaker, I think we all have our heads in the sand. If it was not for the churches and the clergy, the local garden parties and the sacrifices made - in a lot of cases the church itself, as a physical unit, suffered to ensure that there was an adequate schoolroom and the kids had heat. And there was no government of the day that wanted to take that responsibility. And, as I said, I think we should pay all due respect to every denomination in this Province that built up the education

MR. HOLLETT: system that we have. As a parent I am more than proud that my kids had a good education there. I did, and I am sure it will continue to be there. And also, in my opinion, not being an educator like some of my colleagues here in the House, I feel that we have as good an education system in this Province as you will find anywhere in this country or on this continent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: They are getting the message, Don. They are getting the message. They are going to vote for it.

MR. WARREN: They are getting the message, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, not to spend too much time on the government's resolution, I might add there are certain things in it I can agree with. I feel saddened, to a certain extent, that it was not broken down differently so that one could have a choice to vote for one, two, or a combination of

MR. D. HOLLETT: the proposals and vote against something else. And rather than belabour the point, there is one section in there I would like to speak to or speak against and that is the rights of the Province as enshrined now. And I would like to, also, at the same time talk about the free movement of people in this nation of ours. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many people here remember, but I do, that prior to 1949, any residents of this Province who went out of it to the mainland of Canada were treated as foreigners. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we had to have our little bit of paper to go through customs and to even go farther than that, you had to have a fifty dollar bill to make a deposit to prove that you were not a vagabond, to show them you had one. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have seen lineups in North Sydney -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: You would not understand that. You never had to go there.

MR. D. HOLLETT: I have seen lineups in North Sydney, Mr. Speaker, where one fifty dollar bill had to get ten men into Canada so that they could acquire some ready cash so their kids would not literally starve to death the next Winter. They would stand in line. They would show it to the custom's officer and make out they were putting it in their back pocket and pass it to the guy behind. They had to do it, they only had one amongst them. Now, Mr. Speaker, whereas sure I think that Newfoundlanders can and will earn first crack at jobs in offshore oil and not only in offshore oil. I sort of resent just having oil. We have had a lot of interference in our fisheries and our other industries. I do not see any reason why the government should single out just one, it is terribly important all over. But I think we will only get and retain those type jobs when we earn the right to occupy and to show people that we can do it. We have many people now who could

MR. D. HOLLETT: be working but are not and in my opinion are qualified. Mr. Speaker, I find it - words really cannot describe how I think and feel, that if in the future other provinces decided to take the same type of unilateral action with no consultation. As a Canadian and a Newfoundlander I feel that I have the right to travel anywhere in this country, to work anywhere in this country -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT: - where my abilities entitle me to a job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I feel right now that I have the competency to go and work in this country and make a living for my family. But I am not so much concerned about me as a person, or probably anybody in this Chamber, but what I am terribly concerned about is if these types of rules and regulations are applied all across this great nation of ours, we could well be looking at my children and everybody else in this Province being locked into this Province because they will not be welcomed elsewhere. They will not be allowed to get a job. They will be looked upon as are migrant workers from Taiwan and other countries who presently work in West Germany; come in and get a permit and if we do not want you we will ship you back. I do not think anybody here wants that, Mr. Speaker. I do not think anybody here should tolerate it. And for that reason alone I would have to vote against the government's resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. D. HOLLETT: No, it is not a matter of being doubtful at all, Mr. Speaker. I think this issue is too big

MR. D. HOLLETT: to play straight, blatant, partisan politics with. Members on both sides have done it to a certain extent. Certainly I can be party to that if I care to, and I am sure in the past, and in the future hopefully, I will be accused of it. But when it comes to the denominational educational system, when it comes to the Newfoundland and Labrador - Quebec border, I think it is of concern to all Newfoundlanders. I think that it is important enough that if in some way our House functioned in a manner where a resolution like this could be introduced in a non-partisan manner, where we could all look at it and discuss it and forget about the political stripe, forget about covering up mistakes, forget about muddying the waters with matters that are irrelevant, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this Province would be well served by this House instead of, on a lot of occasions, just wasting the taxpayers' money. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Is the House ready for the

question on the amendment?

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if no one on the other side is going to speak, I would take the remaining four minutes to say a few words on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, since I only have four minutes, and I do not particularly want to get into the main part of my speech, I might direct myself to some of the remarks which were made by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here today when he talked about why the Province should have shared jurisdiction in the fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I sat and listened to that hon. gentleman twist words and throw out his, I suppose you would call it bile, it was a very, very difficult experience to sit here and listen to it. But, Mr. Speaker, I have yet, after sitting in this House for five and one-half years, I have yet to hear a consistent fisheries policy from this particular government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Five year plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that we will be able to debate the Five Year Plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: We would settle for a five month plan instead of a five year plan (inaudible) coming up.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, as soon as this resolution is over and as soon as we get down to the normal business in this House, I would be very, very pleased to debate the Five Year Plan, particularly as it relates to Fisheries, and particularly as it relates to fisheries on the West Coast. When that particular minister stands up here and says that we need shared jurisdiction because we

MR. HODDER: can do it better, I would say to the hon. minister that when he gives \$35,000 for fisheries access roads for the whole Province, that shows where his priorities are. When you look at the West Coast at the present time - how many minutes do I have, Mr. Speaker? Because I am only going to devote about four minutes to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member has about two minutes remaining.

MR. HODDER: I have two minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: You will destroy him completely. Just use one minute and just demolish him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. the minister talks about what he would do and why he should have shared jurisdiction, my mind goes back to when the minister took over the Fisheries Loan Board at first and found that the fishermen who were running the Fisheries Loan Board, who used to make decisions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - who used to make decisions, Mr. Speaker - I heard the hon. the minister in silence, so I would ask that he hear me in silence.

When the minister took over the Fisheries Loan Board, there was a situation which existed whereby the fishermen on that Fisheries Loan Board who had turned down applications and then found to their dismay that the political pressures had come and that these applications were approved, the minister then tried to blame the fishermen.

And one other thing I would like to say is that last Summer when the fisheries strike was on, in the districts of Bay of Islands, Port au Port, Stephenville and partially in the district of St. George's where not one of the fishermen was on strike, where not one of the fishermen

MR. HODDER: belonged to the unions, and where the fishing season was very, very bad - and I promised my constituents that the first chance I had to speak that I would say this - that this government came out on the side of the companies. They knew that the fishermen were thinking of forming a union there and they decided to give them a taste of what could happen, so they cut off social assistance to those fishermen in one of the worst seasons that we had had at that particular time for the fishermen of that particular area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: So we saw where that minister comes down when the crunch is down, and what happens. Here were fishermen, Mr. Speaker, who had never, never been members of a union. There were no fishermen -

MR. MORGAN: Two fishermen, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! The hon. member has about ten seconds.

MR. FLIGHT: You denied them. You denied them.

MR. HODDER: - and denied them, in one case, Mr. Speaker, enough to say that one fisherman in my particular district actually had to sell his boats and gear to keep his family in food. So, Mr. Speaker, if that is the kind of fisheries policy that we are going to get from that particular government, from the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) aided and abetted by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave. Is there leave?

Is the House ready for the question?

Is the hon. member finished?

November 27, 1980

Tape 2489

EC - 4

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
colleagues.

I was listening to one of your

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker, I just decided to speak for that five minutes just as a point of clarification.

I would like to have more time, but tomorrow I will get on to more serious things, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Move the adjournment of the debate then.

MR. HODDER:

I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being 5:30 P.M., a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is repealing the water rights on the Upper Churchill Falls.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, following the introduction of a bill, after a Ministerial Statement by the Premier in connection with repealing the water rights of the Upper Churchill and thus pulling the switch, shutting off electricity to fulfill a contract with Quebec Hydro, and the State of New York, a lot of people started asking questions about whether or not the Premier of this Province had taken leave of his senses, whether it was a gigantic bluff, or whether he was determined to go ahead with the plan to repeal the water rights.

Now, following the introduction of the legislation I put a number of questions to the various ministers about the cost of this. And, Mr. Speaker, believe me when I say that I hope that it works. I am all for it. I am all for reopening the contract with Quebec Hydro. I am all for that. And I hope it succeeds. But before I can vote for legislation that has such serious ramifications and repercussions, I would like to have the answers to some questions. So I already put a number of questions to the ministers and one of the questions that I put to the Minister of Mines and Energy, for instance, was the cost of nationalization of the Churchill Falls Corporation. The minister gave me the answer yesterday. He did not have the courtesy to calculate the interest for me, I had to make a stab at it myself, and as far as I can estimate, Mr. Speaker, the cost of nationalizing the Churchill Falls Corporation, which was in itself a gigantic blunder, the timing was wrong, is over \$500 million. Now, the answer came across yesterday. The press did not even think it worthwhile to pick it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. NEARY: Over \$500 million, \$320 million plus the accumulated interest for eight years -

MR. BARRY: What figures are you using?

MR. NEARY: I am using ten per cent interest, which is low. It is more like eleven and a half but I am using ten per cent.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: \$320 million.

MR. BARRY: At ten per cent it takes seven years to -

MR. ROBERTS: 7.2

MR. BARRY: - 7.2 to be precise.

MR. NEARY: Well, all right. But anyway I figure - if the minister wants me to I will reduce it, I will say it is between \$400 million and \$500 million. How is that?

MR. BARRY: I am glad to see you were so precise in your calculations.

MR. NEARY: Between \$400 million and \$500 million for a gigantic blunder and in order to introduce this legislation, implement this legislation, it was not necessary to nationalize Churchill Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER: - that is right.

MR. NEARY: So here we have \$400 million or \$500 million to pay out and the government - Newfoundland Hydro is not even collecting enough interest, not collecting enough revenue to pay the interest on that loan. And that is sad indeed, Mr. Speaker. But it is not worthwhile for the media to pick that up. That is not important to the people of this Province.

Therefore, we have to ask a number of questions in connection with this repealing of the water rights and breaking the contract. I asked the other day, how much will it cost? I am told that the buying of the shares, paying off the bondholders and purchase - no, paying off the shareholders and so forth is about \$750 million. Then in

MR. NEARY: addition to that, Mr. Speaker, how much will it cost to pay for the transmission line across Quebec from Churchill Falls to tie in with the Quebec power grid? I figure about another \$600 million. Then there are damage suits and law suits. The government has told us that Quebec Hydro is making a profit of \$600 million a year and they still have fifty-five years to run on the contract. Well, if it goes to court, Mr. Speaker, the court is not going to allow damages any less than what their profit is, so there you have over \$3 billion right there. And then the State of New York will take action against Quebec Hydro; that will be passed on to the Newfoundland Government. And then there is the Anglo Saxon route, another \$600 million or \$700 million. Then we have 4500 megawatts of power sitting there, no revenue coming in on it. What are we going to do with it? Are we going to use it in Labrador for industry? Bring it down to the Island here to be used? A combination of using some of it on the Island and dropping it off on the way through the Anglo-Saxon route? Or send it all via the Anglo-Saxon route back down to New York whom we are taking the power away from in the first place?

Now, these are just a few of the questions that are bothering me, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this Province. And before I can vote, before I can have blind faith and vote for a piece of legislation that has the ramifications and the repercussions that it is going to have - probably wreck the economy of the Province - perhaps the minister when he speaks could give me some of the answers and he may be able to persuade me to vote for this piece of legislation.

November 27, 1980

Tape No. 2490

NM - 4

MR. ROBERTS:

Well said.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) directed a number of questions to this side of the House. He sort of shot them around.

DR. COLLINS: I think I caught one or two of them the other day he asked the hon. Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) in regard to the purchase of some shares earlier on. The question he asked me was in regard to the paying of the bondholders and the payments to shareholders when the Water Reversion Act comes into force. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a number of questions that are going to be answered when we debate this bill which, hopefully, will go before the House very shortly, and I am sure that he is being a little bit facetious when he asks that all this information be given today. If all that information was to be given in five minutes, clearly we would not need to have a debate on the bill itself, and I can just make a few comments on what he said.

The first thing I think we should remember is that when the principal agreement was entered into with BRINCO way back - I think it was 1953 - there was a provision in that agreement that this Province had the right to withdraw power from any waters of this Province that were developed for hydro-electric purposes, that this Province had the right to withdraw power from such a development for the benefit of the citizens of this Province as it was needed. That was embedded in the principal agreement. Now, when the lease agreement was entered into, I believe in 1961, that same or similar clause was entered into the lease agreement, and it was quite clearly put forward there that this Province retained the right to withdraw the power as we need it, to recall the power as we need it. Now, the need did arise and the Province quite properly requested CFLCo to have that power made available, and for a number of reasons CFLCo decided they could not make the power available. Now, the Province at that point in time could have taken the action it is contemplating, that we are now taking. It would have been a hard action. It would have meant taking away the means whereby CFLCo could

DR. COLLINS: honour, could service the power contract, the power contract subsequently entered into with Hydro Quebec. It would have been hard action, and this Province took a much more responsible action than going at that right off. It undertook a number of other moves. Firstly, it asked the courts to make a declaratory judgement that that right, indeed, was a valid right, that what was stated in the lease agreement was a valid right, and it asked the courts to do that. It would have been a very, very simple thing for Hydro Quebec to expedite that court action, that request to the court to declare that we did, indeed, have that right. And what did we see, Mr. Speaker? We saw the exact reverse. We saw Hydro Quebec put all sorts of obstacles, all sorts of difficulties, all sorts of manoeuvres, in the way so that that question after four years - it was 1976, I believe, it was first referred to the courts - after four years the question had not even yet got to the courts. During this time the Province was still faced with the possibility of bringing in what we are doing now, but the Province still said, "We will not take that very hard action. We will try to do something else." But what did we do? We bought the Lower Churchill water rights and, in doing so, we had it mind that we would develop the Lower Churchill water rights to supply the needs. We would still pursue our rights under the lease contract, under the lease agreement but, nevertheless, we would lay hands on the Lower Churchill water rights to fulfill our needs that way while still pursuing the Upper Churchill. And that was a very reasonable thing to do. To do it we did need the co-operation of Hydro Quebec for a number of reasons, both to transmit the power that was surplus to our needs and, also, to be able to regulate the water flowing down through the river so that we could do it in a sensible and logical fashion. Again, that was a very reasonable

DR. COLLINS: thing we asked. What do we find?
We find that Hydro Quebec, again, will not allow us to do that
very reasonable action. In a number of ways like that,
Mr. Speaker, and other things we did; we undertook tremendous
expenses on the Island by bringing in electrical generation
facilities. Again, a soft action, a soft response. We have
now reached the point that it is

DR. J. COLLINS: no longer justifiable, we cannot in any way justify not taking this very hard action and I think that everyone will agree that we have taken it in a very responsible way. So any expenditures, any expenditures we incur for doing what we have been forced to the wall to do, will be seen to be totally justifiable, and any expenditures we make will be a lot cheaper, taking into consideration the block of power, that is 5,255 megawatts, whatever it is, To make that block, that huge, massive block of power available to us, any expenditures that are likely to arise out of our action will be well worth spending and will be a cheaper alternative than any other alternative.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well done!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: Now, the hon. member will want more detail and this will come up in the debate on the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 28, 1980 at 10 a.m.