

VOL. 3

NO. 61

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1981

June 16th., 1981

Tape No. 2504

DW - 1

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPöile.

A point of privilege? A point of order?

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think this is the right way to do it, to stand on a point of order rather than a point of privilege, because I do not wish to raise a matter of privilege at this time. I just want to put the House under notice that we are not sleeping on our rights as far as the schmozzle that developed at twenty minutes to six yesterday evening is concerned, that we have tremendous research to do on this matter, and when our research is complete -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: What is so funny?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: - when the research is complete,

Mr. Speaker, then we will take the appropriate action.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: On that point of order, whatever that point of order is, first of all a point of order must be taken up at the earliest possible opportunity. Secondly, Mr. Speaker - and I do not wish to get into debate about what happened yesterday. It is unfortunate what happened and it is even more unfortunate the hon. member has got the gall to bring it up again - but the situation is, Mr. Speaker, that there was a motion for adjournment that was made by the hon. gentleman, that the hon. gentleman interrupted another

MR. W. MARSHALL: hon. gentleman when he was speaking and took over again from the Opposition, which is against the rules. A division was called, a division was properly held, everything was in accordance with and in concert with the rules.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman takes this attitude that he is taking towards the House. But I would remind the hon. gentleman this is not a high school, it is not an elementary school neither is it kindergarten: It is a parliamentary body, Mr. Speaker, that is ruled by established rules that have been set down for the ordering of public bodies such as this legislature or a House of Commons I would ask the hon. member, I would hope the hon. member would in sober reflection realize that and not raise up on points of order like this. If anyone wishes points of order, he can quote page 91 of Beauchesne that I have before me, and on and on as you can go on.

But, Mr. Speaker, the whole operation of this House is going to get out of order itself if members are going to get up on points of order without having them grounded in the established parliamentary practices. No matter how much it may rankle hon. members what may be said in the debate, if it is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of actual order it should not be brought up. It is certainly fair for the cut and thrust of debate to take place in the House of Assembly or in any House, it is intended for that purpose, but, Mr. Speaker, it has to be within the rules because if it is not within the rules parliamentary democracy itself falls by the wayside.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further to the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman took advantage of my

MR. NEARY: point of order, which was a legitimate point of order, and a very important point of order, I might add, because it has to do with the rules of the House, that everything that happened in this House yesterday happened, as far as I am concerned, as far as my rights are concerned, an individual member's rights are concerned, happened within the rules of the House. But we are not quite sure whether the proper procedure was followed or not, and unless we follow the British parliamentary tradition, unless we stay within the rules, the Standing Orders and the rules that govern this House, then we will have nothing but anarchy. The hon. gentleman does not run the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Neither does the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: No, but, Mr. Speaker, we all have equal rights in this House. And the hon. gentleman's rights is no more or no less than any other member's rights in this House. So the reason I raised the matter, Mr. Speaker, was to put the House under notice, because you have to do that at the earliest opportunity. I have done that. And when we finish our research I am sure that the House will appreciate that we may not raise the matter again, or we may raise it again, depending on what conclusions we come to after we do the necessary research.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the point of order, let me first of all say that I recognize the point the hon. member is trying to make about privileges and rights of hon. members to raise matters which they believe to be out of order or whatever. My own recollection of what happened yesterday, and my own research to this point in time, I will tell the hon. member for his own information, and for the information of all other hon. members, points out clearly,

MR. SPEAKER: in our minds at least, that what transpired yesterday was perfectly in order, even though it took us twenty or twenty-five minutes to get through it. There was a motion to adjourn, made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), which is perfectly in order. There was a division called, which is perfectly in order. It took us fifteen or twenty minutes to get through a number of points of order and points of privilege, which in fact should not have even been heard or raised because when a division is in progress no other business is to take place. I will read a couple of references for hon. members so they will be able to reflect on those references.

May, the 12th. edition, page 241, "The proceedings of the House may be interrupted at any moment, save during the process of the division, by a motion based upon a matter of privilege, when a matter has recently arisen." Which in effect says that points of privilege can be raised and supercede other matters of business except during the process of a division. That is quite clear.

There is a further reference

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): in Beauchesne, paragraph 236, "If the Speaker's attention has been called to a breach of order in the course of a division, he has directed that the division be completed." And there are a couple of other references here which I will not read. I will read one other from May, nineteenth edition, under matters requiring immediate intervention of the House. "Urgent matters which require the immediate intervention of the House if they should occur during the sitting of the House may be raised at once in spite of the interruption of the debate or other proceedings except a division in progress." So I think one of the major points yesterday was whether or not the hon. member could have had a point of privilege heard during the division. The Chair disallowed that and these are the references which it used. But in any event I make those comments and we will leave it as it is. The hon. member says he may wish to raise it again, that is fine.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: May I say, Mr. Speaker, for Your Honour's information and for the information of the House, that the main point that we want to research is the fact that the Speaker did not leave the Chair at six o'clock. Now my understanding of the rules - and this is something we have to research - is that the Speaker has to leave the Chair at six o'clock. The matter could have been disposed of at eight o'clock in the evening. The Speaker leaving the Chair, the House then would automatically meet at eight o'clock and then the first item would have been the disposal of the motion to adjourn. And that is the item we want to research, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, again I do not wish to debate that point with the hon. member. I just want to point out that the division occurred at five forty-three, I believe.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I just wish to make this observation alluding to what the hon. member said. Your Honour has given a ruling giving his impression and the hon. gentleman gets up again - and this is all a part and parcel of it, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentleman wishes to raise a point of order let them get up and let them raise it, but let them use Beauchesne or use the Standing Orders or use May or use what have you. But the hon. gentleman is showing just how deficient the hon. gentlemen are with respect to the rules in saying 'when we research something we will bring it up.' But perhaps we will bring something up that came up five, six, seven or eight years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

Order, please!

I think at least to this point in time we have dispensed of the matter until such time that it may be raised again.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in April of this year I stood up in this House and outlined for the information of hon. members the negative effect on this Province of having Northern cod, which were caught in Newfoundland waters, processed in Nova Scotia. Just to remind the House, I had indicated that Newfoundland lost 200 man-years of employment which translated into \$2.4 million in wages. These figures make no mention of the indirect employment which would be created as a result of these additional dollars in the Newfoundland economy. We have recently been made aware of the federal government's decision to grant licenses to Japanese fishermen to harvest 17,000 metric tons of squid.

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2506

ah-3

MR. DINN:

Once again the action taken by the federal government is at the expense of the people of this Province. While the impact is not as clear-cut as the case with the Northern cod, it is a fact that the harvesting and

MR. DINN:

of squid offshore will mean less fish available for harvesting by Newfoundlanders. Officials of my department and the Department of Fisheries have estimated that the harvesting of 17,000 metric tons means a loss of 350 man-years of employment and \$2.5 million in wages to fishermen and another approximately \$5 million in wages to plant workers. In total, therefore, the loss of employment with respect to both the Northern cod and the squid will be 550 man-years and a loss in wages to the economy of almost \$10 million.

It is becoming more obvious all the time that Newfoundlanders will continue to be deprived of opportunities that are rightfully theirs until such time as the Province has greater control over the decision making process in not only the fishery but other sectors as well.

My colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), has indicated his intention to pursue this matter with the federal Minister of Fisheries to find out more information on the reason for the federal government's decision and action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia

West has about one minute.

MR. HOLLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know in this Ministerial

Statement it is just -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Make sense now, boys.

MR. HOLLETT:

- an ongoing rhetoric simply because the minister just said we have recently been made aware of this particular 17,000 metric tons of squid. For the advice of the House, Mr. Minister, and I am sure the Minister of Fisheries is aware, it is exactly the same amount as was available to the the Japanese last year and -

MR. MORGAN:

It is changed. You are wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, the statement said they had been recently made aware, that means this year. And for three years previous to that it was even worse because the larger fish companies in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland had almost unlimited quotas to sell to the Japanese without even-

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) no trade off in 1979.

MR. HOLLETT:

I would just like to make that point,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) in 1979 (inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT:

The other think I would like to question is how the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) arrived at his calculations? I think it is only fair to the House and to the press and everybody else when he quotes figures such as \$2.5 million and everything else it should be substantiated, whether it is based on dried squid, which is labour intensive, if it was for bait purposes -

MR. DINN:

\$2.5 million for the catcher's.

MR. HOLLETT:

Okay. Well, the labour content aside, okay.

MR. DINN:

(Inaudible) content (inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT:

But when you say the \$2.5 million, Mr. Minister, it is still based on - dried squid is a dollar something a pound, for bait squid it is probably eight cents and for frozen squid it is something else.

MR. TULK:

He does not know that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT:

I just said it should be substantiated because anybody could question the figures.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT:

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to briefly say that my colleague the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has already indicated his intention to pursue this matter and find out what it is all about from the federal department. I suggest to the Minister of Fisheries that we would all get along much better, especially the fishermen, if this type of work was done first and then there is valid reason to give the statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon: the Minister of Mines

and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of hon. members of the House to a report which is being tabled at this time. This report entitled The Economic Impact of Future Offshore Petroleum Exploration is a result of the joint efforts of the Petroleum Directorate and the Department of Development.

Mr. Speaker, our previous forecasting exercises have dealt with the offshore in fairly broad terms and at a level of detail commensurate with the existing data base. This previous work has been made public in earlier reports of the Petroleum Directorate such as the The Economic Analysis for the Hibernia Development, Petroleum Resource Potential of Offshore Newfoundland and Labrador and The Effects of Federal Energy Policy on Offshore Newfoundland and Labrador. These reports, Mr. Speaker, re-emphasize the enormous significance to the future of our Province of the petroleum resources on our Continental Shelf.

Mr. Speaker, as the body of information on the offshore increases and as the possibility of a major development at Hibernia becomes more imminent, it becomes possible and even more vital for our forecasting, analysing and planning work to enter a new and more detailed phase. This phase will deal with offshore development in more human terms, for example, the number of jobs, the

MR. BARRY: skill requirements and the demand for goods and services.

The reports resulting from this work will therefore be extremely useful for a large number of planning purposes ranging from questions of personal career choices to business development opportunities, and to requirements for government infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the present report presents forecasts of the potential direct economic impact of oil and gas exploration offshore Newfoundland and Labrador during the period 1981 to 1990. Now, I stress, Mr. Speaker, this relates to exploration only and this does not include the figures with respect to employment, goods and services and so forth that will result from the development of a field such as the Hibernia oil field. So we will have to add into the numbers of jobs and business opportunities, the jobs and so forth that will flow from development. We are doing another report and we will have further statistics as to the impact of future development. This relates to exploration only, and I want to reiterate that again.

Subsequent, related reports which will be published this year will deal with the direct effects of development and operating expenditures and the direct effects of payments received by government on our budgetary position. In addition, we will

MR. BARRY: also be examining the indirect impact of all facets of the petroleum industry on the economy of the Province.

I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that forecasting and impact assessments for a dynamic, changing industry such as offshore oil and gas over a ten year period are not easy tasks. This is a task which draws upon the capabilities of many departments of government, in addition to the Petroleum Directorate, notably the departments of Development, Labour and Manpower, Finance and the Planning and Priorities Secretariat. Co-ordination is effected through the offshore petroleum impact committee. To accommodate the complex and dynamic nature of offshore forecasting, this work will all be computer based using models constructed in-house. Formulation of the model for the present report was based on an analysis of data from a variety of sources. Areas such as the North Sea, the Beaufort Sea, and from publications issued by groups such as the New England River Basins Commission, the United Kingdom, the Norwegian government.

Statistical data from those wells drilled in the Newfoundland and Labrador offshore area over the past fifteen years was the primary data source along with valuable information obtained from discussions with the petroleum industry officials. On the basis of a geological analysis of offshore prospects, a range of forecasts was developed for the number of exploratory wells expected over the ten year forecast period. Now, this forecast ranges from a low of sixty-three wells expected under the present federal energy policy to a high of 279 wells anticipated if the negative effects of the federal energy policy are removed and if industry develops the technology for drilling in deeper water.

Based upon the anticipated number of wells forecast, together with the depth of each well and its location, this report provides detailed information on

MR. BARRY: the quantities of goods and services
by major expenditure item, manpower requirements by major
employment category and total cost in terms of resulting
wages and salaries and expenditures on goods and services.

 Goods and services consumed in
offshore oil and gas exploration activities are given in
terms of rig days, supply boat days, helicopter days, seis-
mic vessel days, marine fuel, jet fuel, barite, bentonite,
other drilling fluid additives, casings and cement.

MR. BARRY: The employment forecast is broken into five major categories; drilling crew, offshore support crew, marine crew, onshore support personnel, and seismic operations personnel. Each category is reported in man-years and peak requirements. These categories include such occupations as drillers, professional engineers, derrickmen, roughnecks, roustabouts, divers, technicians, masters, mates and seamen.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is a synopsis of the report from the point of view of the Petroleum Directorate. I have attached to the press release a copy of the summary and conclusions which is contained in three pages right at the beginning of this report. And of course full copies are available for all members. But it is worth-while pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that total employment over this period could range from an annual low - this is yearly - of 472 man-years if the current federal energy policy continues to depress the industry, to an annual high, Mr. Speaker - and I think this is extremely significant - an annual high, it is possible that from exploration alone we could see 2,859 man-years under the high forecast. Almost 3,000 people could be working every year just from the exploration activity, Mr. Speaker, that we anticipate under the high estimate that could be carried on between now and 1990. And this again, I reiterate, does not include the employment that will result from development of fields and from the operation of fields once they have been developed.

And, Mr. Speaker, expenditures, just to end off, total expenditures would range from an annual low of \$193 million to an annual high of \$1,434,000,000 constant 1981 dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is all I have to say at the present time. We will be having a press conference at four o'clock. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) will now provide you with further details on the content of this report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has stated the report entitled "The Economic Impact of Future Offshore Petroleum Exploration", has been a joint undertaking between the Department of Development and the Petroleum Directorate

It is the first of several reports that individually and collectively will help us plan, amongst other things, an industrial development strategy not only for the petroleum industry but for the economy as a whole.

The report considers the ten year period 1981-1990 and its detailed forecasts are based on the number of exploratory wells anticipated during the decade under review. Using these well forecasts the report provides an impact forecast in terms of goods, services and employment needed to support the drilling of these wells.

MR. WINDSOR:

the drilling of these wells. Total expenditures on exploration over the forecast period are also discussed and analyzed. The report also discusses the current provincial share of these expenditures and the possible future share accruing to the provincial economy.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, total local labour directly employed in offshore exploration is high, ranging anywhere from 55 per cent to 71 per cent. By the end of the forecast decade the rate of local labour participation is anticipated at between 90 per cent and 95 per cent. While local participation in the provision of goods and services has been low relative to total expenditures, it represents a maximization of the opportunities available to our businessmen considering the erratic level of exploration and the seasonal nature of the activity in the past.

Many of these negative factors are now disappearing, or are at least being significantly lessened. There has now been continuous drilling on the Grand Bank since May of 1979. Sectors of the service and supply industry that in the past were not considered good opportunities because of low volume or a high degree of seasonality, may now be reaching the level necessary to sustain local involvement.

In addition, the development of fields such as Hibernia will certainly increase the demand for offshore related goods and services and help add to the demand created by the exploration phase.

In the introductory section of this report there is a table showing the possible range of the direct impact in 1990, compared with the 1981 impact. There are several important conclusions which may be drawn from this analysis.

The first is that exploration

MR. WINDSOR: alone, independent of development, has the potential to have significant impact on the provincial economy, and under the high forecast would approach that of the development phase of Hibernia. Total expenditure on exploration over the ten year forecast period ranges from \$2.4 billion to a little under \$10 billion. The current estimate for Hibernia development is in the range of \$5 billion to \$7 billion.

The second conclusion is that the ultimate level of impact depends, to a large degree, on the level of exploration and to a lesser degree on the rate of participation. If the federal energy policy is maintained, the actual level of exploration attained will be at the lower end of the forecast. Therefore, the level of economic activity in the Province, as a result of exploration, could decrease substantially unless the Province succeeds in providing a significantly higher share of goods and services than at present. It is, therefore, crucial that the Province continues its efforts to modify the federal energy policy to make it more compatible with the objectives of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Another important conclusion in this report is that the provincial government has been successful in ensuring a high provincial share in the direct employment generated by the petroleum industry. Policies will continue to be directed at improving this share even further. A significant improvement, however, can be anticipated in the provision of goods and services increasing from \$17 million in 1981 to a possible high of \$99 million by 1990.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

This would be an increase of approximately 600 per cent in the dollar value and an increase from 11.5 per cent to 20 per cent of the share of total expenditures going into the local economy. Such a change would result in a significant increase in indirect employment. Since the direct employment measures have been relatively successful and employment offshore is gradually reaching a saturation point, government policy emphasis should shift more to the indirect employment which could be generated by increasing goods and services provided from within the Province. The current strengthening of the offshore services unit in the Department of Development is an important element in this shift in emphasis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this report clearly indicates that a large number of drilling rigs and supply boats will be required during the next decade in the provincial offshore. Local ownership of some of these rigs and supply boats would greatly enhance the benefits that the Province would obtain from the offshore. In order to investigate this matter in more detail, the Department of Development and the Petroleum Directorate will make an estimate of the requirements for supply boats, rigs, etcetera, during the period 1981 to 1990 in relation to all petroleum related drilling in the Province including exploratory, delineation and development drilling.

Additionally, the Department of Development intends to undertake a study of downstream activities associated with oil and gas production. Considering that under our regulations the government has a right to accept its royalty in the form of oil and gas rather than in cash, it may prove very desirable to further process oil and gas in the Province

June 16th., 1981

Tape No. 2512 DW - 2

MR. N. WINDSOR: not only for our own use but for export as well.

With the tabling of this report, Mr. Speaker, I feel we have not only demonstrated that this government is giving serious consideration to planning for future oil and gas activity but we have provided an order of magnitude to an aspect of this important industry that I am sure will be of immeasurable help to the business community and to the general public at large.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about seven minutes.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to compliment the authors of the report-although it was just delivered to the Opposition side. I would also compliment the ministers; they read it very well, exactly as it was written, and it may be a new trend now that we have the ministers sharing the responsibility. And I wonder if the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), who is playing second fiddle to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), will really be upset that what happened when the Minister of Mines and Energy presented his statement he attached it - this insignificant thing that he attached, was also the statement that the minister gave as being from the Minister of Development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if press releases and material being turned out could only guarantee the prosperity of this Province, we would be wealthy beyond dreams. We have seen two or three years of press releases. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this really say? This really says that somewhere in the Department of Development and the Department of Mines and Energy

MR. STIRLING:

another consulting assignment has been given. They have not told us what the cost of this consulting assignment is. What they have said is that they are now going to buy a computer and they are now going to create computer models in-house. Now, does that mean that we now have a new computer company being set up in addition to Newfoundland Computer Services? Are we now going to create all of the jobs involved with the offshore really in-house?

Mr. Speaker, two or three things included in this that are worthy of comment: first of all, Mr. Speaker, that everything to this point has to do with exploration. With full co-operation of the federal government we are using the provincial government's regulations and at this stage, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter as brought out in this statement is that the only benefit gathered by local business and local indirect employment amounts to 11 per cent of the total expenditures in the offshore. And that is under their regulations, Mr. Speaker, under their total control. Only 11 per cent, Mr. Speaker, 11 per cent, and they are hoping -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STIRLING: - they are hoping, Mr. Speaker, to bring that up to 20 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Having recognized, Mr. Speaker, that there are more people working at Woolco than are working in the offshore operation, more impact here by Woolco, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this kind of preliminary work which is now being brought out by this government is so academic, it is so basic, Mr. Speaker, that it should have been done ten years ago by the two Ministers of Mines and Energy, now the Premier and his -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: All of this material, Mr. Speaker, does only point out that there is no training school in Newfoundland for any of these jobs. It is going to take our consultant - Who is the consultant? - Dr. Pedro Van Muir, who was the first man authorized by this government to talk about guerilla warfare, the first man authorized in Alberta, because I did not recognize Dr. Pedro Van Muir as a member of the government. But I understand that he is also a consultant to China, and it is appropriate that the consultant to China and the consultant to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: In summary, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this government has now reached the point where they are doing the most basic thing. They have done nothing with training schools. A young man who is involved in the offshore said for all of the noise about

MR. STIRLING: employment opportunities in the offshore, there is no local training being done. And this is a good first step, Mr. Speaker; the most basic thing that should have been done ten years ago is now being introduced as saying we are now going to do some projections dealing with exploration, and they agreed that has nothing to do with development. Exploration has been going on for ten years and this government finally now is bringing out a great deal of paper to say they are going to look at the most basic assumptions, what are the jobs and what are the opportunities involved - not with development. It will be developed for about twenty years before they get around to doing some of those assessments. Mr. Speaker, they are ten years behind in this very basic piece of work. And, Mr. Speaker, from this side we certainly welcome it. We assumed this was done ten years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to seeing some results. These 7,000 Newfoundlanders that are involved now on a waiting list - not on the offshore, involved on a waiting list - a Premier who would not answer a question about what he was going to do on the West coast of Newfoundland to give fair opportunities to people throughout this Province to at least get on the waiting list, and the kind of deception that says to Newfoundlanders, 'Just be satisfied' and you get this kind of thing that only tends to confirm that there are about 400 jobs being created in the offshore at the most realistic estimate, 2800 at the best and wildest estimate. If the petroleum industry learns or develops the technology to explore in deeper waters, that is where the 2800 jobs will come in.

Mr. Speaker, on this side we welcome this most basic step but we would like for the government to get on to the real problems of this Province, dealing with

MR. STIRLING: the here and now, dealing with the fisheries, dealing with roads, dealing with the opportunities for development and dealing with the education and training. A good basic start should have been done ten years ago, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

The hon. Minister of Forests,
Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide the hon. House with the following summary of Crown Land applications received during the fiscal year April 1, 1980 to March 31, 1981.

During the period, 5,475 applications were registered which represents a 40 per cent increase over the previous year. This total was broken down into 38 per cent for cottages, 29 per cent for residences, 9 per cent under "squatters rights", a part of the act, 8 per cent for agriculture and 5 per cent for commercial purposes and 11 per cent for miscellaneous.

Over the year the department approved 3,370 applications for survey and refused 2,346. A total of 2,420 titles were issued which represents a 40 per cent increase over last year. 270 of these titles, Mr. Speaker, were in the form of permits-to-occupy issued under government's recently approved remote cottage policy. In addition, the department responded to 63,000 inquiries and investigated 180 reported cases of unauthorized occupation of Crown land. The latter resulted in 35 charges being laid to date.

As a result of improvements in Crown lands administration, I am pleased to advise that 15 per cent of applications now being accepted are receiving a final decision within one month and another 50 per cent are being considered within a six month period.

MR. POWER: In terms of revenue, the department received a total of \$334,607.80 of which \$212,797.61 represents revenue from applications submitted and titles issued over the past year. The balance reflects rental payments on outstanding leases.

My colleagues may also be interested in knowing that for the ten year period from April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1981 my department received a total of 35,893 applications for Crown land of which 31,054 have now been processed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Fogo has about one minute.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, on this side, I suppose, we are happy to see any improvements that come about. The minister had now made his annual statement on what must be for most Newfoundlanders the biggest nightmare that they have to go through in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: Crown Lands Division of the minister's department and getting Crown land in this Province is a nightmare. The Department of Transportation is involved, the Department of Health, development control and so on. And, Mr. Speaker, there are serious problems in this Province for people in non-municipal areas who have to have Crown land for house construction.

In the statement, Mr. Speaker, the minister pointed out that there were 63,000 inquiries and that he investigated some 180 cases of unauthorized occupation of Crown land. It might be a better statement for the minister in this House if he would tell the House where these unauthorized occupations were and what were the nature of the occupations that he prosecuted in court. In the statement he also says that 50 per cent of the applications being received are being considered within six months. The question is, how much above 50 per cent and how long does the remainder take? He has given no answers to those type of questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. TULK: Already, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, could I take a second to clue up?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): No, I am sorry the hon. member's time has expired. I asked if there was leave, I understand there is no leave.

Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). It is with regard to the Chairman of Hydro, Mr. Vic Young's presentation to the Public Utilities Board yesterday and I will quote for the minister that Mr. Young said, "that Newfoundland Hydro's credit rating is the lowest of any Crown corporation or any province in Canada". Now I find that difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro is backed by this Province, Newfoundland Hydro's credit rating is tied to this Province, we stand behind every dollar they borrow, we stand behind their credit. So what Mr. Young is saying in effect, and maybe the minister would confirm it, is that this Province's credit rating is the lowest of any province in Canada. Does the minister want to comment on that?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the way the Liberals drove the Province into the ground for twenty-three years, we are still trying to get over it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: You know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Young also indicated what must have caused most Newfoundlanders to shiver in their shoes, he indicated that we are going to be looking at an in excess of a 60 per cent increase in electrical rates in the next five years. As a matter of fact, it is close

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2515

SD - 3

MR. FLIGHT: to 80 if you use his figures. He
said 50 per cent at the hearing, 55 per cent - 11 per cent per
years. But if

MR. G. FLIGHT:

you look at the figures in the chart he gives where the present rate is \$80 in 1985 it will be \$139, it is closer to 80 per cent. Now I want to ask the minister if he will confirm that the people of this Province are looking at in excess of a 50 per cent increase in hydro rates over the next five years, between now and 1985?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying to confuse the issue. The statistics for the hydro increases for the past two years have been lower than the rate of inflation. What the member is referring to are the figures supplied by his friends, his Liberal friends in Ottawa, with respect to fuel escalation. And I might say it is about time that the member read the document that came out from his friend Mr. Lalonde several months ago, because it is right there in a chart predicting the increase in fuel prices over the next ten years, Mr. Speaker. So not just for five years. The federal government have laid out their predictions for what the increase and the price of fuel will be over the next ten years.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, must not the minister be concerned? I am quoting directly from the Chairman of Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Victor Young. I am not quoting Ottawa or Mr. Lalonde. I am quoting Mr. Young, the man who supposedly advises him on hydro in this Province and hydro costs. And Mr. Young says very clearly that electrical costs will rise by 11 per cent per year until 1985 and that is 55 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: So what I want to ask the minister is why that is? We have Hinds Lake just come on Hydro, we have Upper Salmon under construction and we have Cat Arm - all the energy that is going to be generated in this Province until 1985 or 1986 is hydro. The cheapest possible - there will be some increase in the cost of oil at Holyrood. But why is it, Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us why the people of this Province are going to be looking at a 55 per cent increase in electrical rates when one considers and realizes that all of the hydro generated in this Province until that time will be hydro not fuel, hydro! The only oil we are talking about is the increased consumption to Holyrood. Why 55 per cent?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I really find it hard to comprehend that the member opposite who has been the energy critic now, I think, for a year or two years, Mr. Speaker, still does not realize that Holyrood is out there burning oil and that there is close to 40 per cent or something over 40 per cent of the energy supply presently supplied by oil, Mr. Speaker, not by hydro! By oil! And these figures that Mr. Young is supplying are based upon the oil projections received

MR. BARRY: from the member's Liberal colleagues in Ottawa. Their energy prices, those same people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - those same people who said that they would not let gasoline go up eighteen cents a gallon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - and have driven it up many times that already, Mr. Speaker. Those same people who are making the consumer in Newfoundland pay for buying Petrofina where there is not a Petrofina service station in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Young goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, in his presentation to PUB, that it is critical, it is critical that we have an intertie in this Province with Labrador power by 1985/86, and that that intertie will cost \$1.5 billion, and he further says that that is the reason, the reason he is asking for the 55 per cent increase in electric rates over the next five years is to strengthen Hydro's credibility and another reason he wants to strengthen it is so that he can look at borrowing the \$1.5 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the indication is that -

MR. MOORES: What has that got to do with oil from Ottawa?

MR. FLIGHT: - Hydro is going to saddle the people of this Province with a 55 per cent increase in electric rates in order to raise the money for an intertie with Labrador in 1986. And that is the issue. And are the people of Newfoundland,

MR. FLIGHT: over the next four or five years, going to be saddled with the cost, as envisioned by Hydro, to build an intertie in this Province from Labrador?

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

MR. BARRY: Again, Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly what the member is saying, he is saying that we should not charge rates to affect the cost of service, we should put Hydro in bankruptcy and somehow that is going to make it better for the electrical consumer when we have to build new generating facilities and new transmission lines, that somehow by putting Hydro into bankruptcy this is going to improve the position of the electrical consumer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the people of Newfoundland accept that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And if that is the policy of the Liberal Party, that is a policy that they will fall on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Raise the money on the bond market.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for what I should call the Minister of Distortion, but I will not. I will call him the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and

MR. STIRLING: that this government has not allowed the Public Utilities Board to take all of these sources of income into consideration in setting the rates?

MR. MOORES: Get up now and squirm on that one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I must say I get terribly embarrassed whenever the Leader of the Opposition jumps up to try and bail out his energy critic. Why do you not let the energy critic do his job? If the member opposite would let the energy critic -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - if he would not continually undermine him, the energy critic might develop a little confidence during Question Period.

MR. STIRLING: Oh, come on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: But everytime he knows that the Leader of the Opposition is going to jump up and cut the legs from underneath him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister would provide an answer rather than debate.

MR. FLIGHT: This is supposed to be a man of intellect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: He will get a chance if the Leader of the Opposition lets him, maybe tomorrow, to have another shot at one question before-

MR. FLIGHT: This was the man who was going (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If everybody is ready, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, with an answer.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board has the jurisdiction to look at and to bring in recommendations to government on all matters relating to increased cost to the consumer in Newfoundland.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Do I understand the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) now to say that they will give authority to the Public Utilities Board to consider all sources of income from Newfoundland Hydro and its affiliated and subsidiary companies, all of the things that we own in Newfoundland, in order to set that rate? Is that a now announced change of policy?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I said nothing at all about an announced change of policy. I said that right now, at the present time, today, without any change in policy the Public Utilities Board has the jurisdiction, not will get it, has the jurisdiction to look at all matters relating to anything relating to the cost of service to the electrical consumer in Newfoundland.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows
that this morning when my colleague asked a question deal-
ing with CFLCo and costs, the board ruled that they had not
been given that authority, that they were only to deal with
the retail sales. They could not examine into the income of
CFLCo and other related income, income from the Iron Ore
Company of Canada and that sort of thing. The minister knows
that and that is why I am going to take his answer as a
new piece of information because we have something like ten
pieces of legislation that we are told we are going to debate
that are not even here and he allowed the legislation to -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, has been raised
by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is the Question
Period. The hon. gentleman a speech. I am hesitant to in-
terrupt him because everytime he opens his mouth he drives us

MR. MARSHALL: into an overwhelming victory
in the next election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - but the rules are the rules,
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition,
I believe, was entering into a little bit of debate
pertaining to the answer he received. I would ask him to
ask his supplementary question.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I think when we get
an interruption from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)
it is to encourage long debate.

The question for the Minister of
Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) - do I understand him now to say
that the Public Utilities Board are wrong in their judgement
or assessment of their mandate which is to look into all
sources of income and that now the minister is telling us
that they are wrong in that judgement?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the
Opposition is either not listening or he cannot hear well.
What I have said is that the Public Utilities Board has
the jurisdiction to look into all matters relating to the
cost of service to the electrical consumer in this
Province. If they have disallowed a question at the
Public Utilities Board hearing, obviously they have
concluded that that matter does not relate to the cost
of service to the electrical consumer in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And members opposite, I mean,
really, members opposite have been trounced three times

MR. BARRY: in three elections now on that philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that the member is holding up there, that philosophy that they are asking the people of this Province to bury their heads in the sand and ignore the fact that just as the cost of everything else is going up, the cost of electricity is going up and the cost of oil is going up more dramatically than anything else because we do not have our own sources of oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in three elections the people of this Province voted for a government that will solve our problems by getting our own supplies of oil, by getting electricity based on hydro, and if hon. members opposite want to go into another election on the same old philosophy they are going to get wiped out once more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: This question is related to the cost of electricity. The hon. gentleman just raised the matter of the government having to buy the oil to generate the electricity at Holyrood at the thermo generating plant. Now, in connection with that, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if it is correct that when Newfoundland Hydro ordered its Bunker C for the thermo generating plant last year, in view of the mild winter that we had where it was not possible to use all the Bunker C, there was no place to store it, and in order to take delivery of the Bunker C that a generator had to be shut down in Bay d'Espoir? - which drove up the cost of electricity in this Province the government's short-sightedness in having been forced to take delivery of the Bunker C and no storage facilities to look after it.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will look
into the matter raised by the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - by the hon. member -

MR. DINN: The real leader of the
Opposition.

MR. BARRY: - yes, the
real leader over there -

MR. MORGAN: That is right, the real
leader.

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell
the member and members opposite that the contract which
Newfoundland Hydro had for the purchase of that Bunker C
saved the electrical consumer millions and millions and
millions of dollars, as everybody who saw the reduction in
their fuel escalation charges in the Province knows. They
know that Newfoundland Hydro saved them money on that Bunker
C contract. That is the bottom line. Whether they had to
store it in milk bottles, in Pepsi bottles, in beer bottles
because they did not have enough storage, they saved, and
I do not remember the figure, but it was between \$12 million
and \$20 million, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount of money
that was saved the electrical consumer in this Province by
that contract.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the saving that
was shown on the consumers' electric bills was the result of

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Light and Power overcharging the consumers. And that is why the saving was put on, it had nothing to do with the cost of -

MR. BARRY: It was the fuel escalation charges.

MR. NEARY: No, it had nothing to do with the cost of Bunker C. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman again, in connection with this contract - I presume it is a take or pay contract that Newfoundland Hydro has with an oil company to deliver Bunker C at Holyrood. Now, in the event that the storage tanks -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: In the event that the storage facilities cannot accommodate the Bunker C when it is supposed to be delivered, what are the alternatives? Because by allowing the thermal generating plant to operate more time than it usually operates, it is driving up the cost of electricity - if you shut down the generator at Bay d'Espoir. So could the hon. gentleman tell us is it a take or pay contract? What happens when the time comes to deliver the Bunker C and there are no storage facilities for it? Does the government have a plan, that they can sell the Bunker C? Do they have to take delivery of it? Are there penalties involved? What is the situation? Because this is a pretty critical matter. And I understand that last Winter, because we had a mild Winter and the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member's question is very lengthy. There are other members who wish to ask questions so perhaps he can get to the point.

MR. NEARY: I understand, but in order to get the message across, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that.

MR. NEARY: But I will ask the hon.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro has bought oil before, they buy it to co-ordinate with their ability to store. The member opposite, I think he may be a bit confused. If he was referring to a shut-down at Bay d'Espoir last year - it seems to me that at one point in the year the water in the reservoir was getting dangerously low - as a matter of fact, there had been -

MR. NEARY: No, that was not last year.

MR. BARRY: Yes, last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: Last year. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the three years prior, every year the water was getting lower and lower and it was looking, Mr. Speaker, as though there was going to be a serious situation develop because of God's lack of moisture. However, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform members that as of today the Bay d'Espoir reservoir is full and there is more water there than there has ever been. Hinds Lake is going full tilt, it was designed to run seven hours a day and it is running about 20 per cent over capacity, twenty-four hours a day. Mr. Speaker, there is lots of water in the reservoir and the good Lord has seen to it that we will have sufficient hydro to meet our current installed generating capacity. But what the hon. member is referring to is some sort of hypothetical scenario, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. NEARY: No, it is not hypothetical, it is a fact.

MR. BARRY: - I am sure will never develop.

MR. NEARY: Well, will the hon. gentleman agree to get the information?

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). With regard to

MR. HISCOCK: the price of oil that Hydro is paying that the federal government, the international price is \$39 a barrel and Hydro is buying it from the federal government by way of subsidization for \$20. With regard to another point that he just said of Newfoundland Light and Power, with regard to the Newfoundland Light and Power they did not consume as much oil as last year because in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, and to the question, in actual fact they consumed less because they had more of their own generating plant capability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: My question to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is that at these hearings where I have presented briefs on behalf of the Party and my district, that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro said that they will not connect any part of the Labrador Coast with regard to hydro of the Upper Churchill, Muskrat Falls or the Lower Churchill. I want to know if this is a political decision - and these are the original people of Labrador - we would not be bringing all this power down to the Island to interconnect;

MR. HISCOCK: my question is that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro does not have the power so is this the official position of this government that they are also supporting it that it is economically unfeasible to give the people on the coast of Labrador any form of power from hydro in Labrador?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to correct the member opposite, the new energy critic opposite. Hydro does not buy oil from the federal government. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the member is referring to the fact that for technical reasons it would be extremely costly, Mr. Speaker, to bring transmission lines to the small communities. I guess the average population on the coast is-what? 5,000 spread in how many communities? Fifteen communities, Mr. Speaker. You know, the facts really, I think, there speak for themselves. However, the member is - and I appreciate the intent behind his question; it is sincere - pointing out that the people in these coastal communities do not want to look at paying higher rates. I think if they were getting their electricity at the same rate it would not matter whether it was being from diesel generators or from hydro, Mr. Speaker, but the real concern that they have right now is that above 500 kilowatt hours the higher rate kicks in, Mr. Speaker, as a conservation measure to discourage electric heat and so forth. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have stated before-and I made this statement first in Labrador- that as we see more and more of our isolated communities that are now on diesel interconnected to the hydro grid, and as we see the remaining few that are isolated being fewer and fewer in number, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will get to a point in time-and it is not now and I doubt if it will be next year or the year after-

MR. BARRY: but I see, Mr. Speaker, where this Province, granted, if it is given and if it has the support from members opposite of getting control of its resources, of getting control of oil so we will have the revenue from oil, of getting fair treatment with other Canadians so that we will be able to develop Gull Island and Muskrat Falls to export power across Quebec as surplus to our needs, I believe that this government, this Province is going

MR. L. BARRY: to be in a sufficiently wealthy position to be able to ensure that the few communities who will then be still isolated and will probably always be isolated from the hydro grid will be able to see that they get their power at exactly the same rate as communities all around the Province. That would be my objective, that would this government's objective, Mr. Speaker, but it takes time, it takes money but this is what we are working towards.

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

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, that this is a Tory administration operating out of St. John's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: - and, Mr. Speaker, operated by ministers out of St. John's who have no regard whatsoever for Labrador, do not mind giving extra money for the synchrolift or the crosstown arterial road or X number of things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Is the hon. member going to ask his question?

MR. E. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's Government.

MR. W. HISCOCK: He does even know where Labrador is.

June 16th., 1981

Tape No. 2523

DW - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Would the hon. member mind, please?

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech, Mr. Speaker. This is the Question Period and he is into a supplementary question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: He is into a supplementary question. He should practice asking questions as succinctly as I hear they do when they ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) in caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the hon. member should ask his supplementary as some of his colleagues are waiting to be recognized.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the supplementary - and as I said more speeches in this House should be given on Labrador and how this administration is treating it - but with regard to the supplementary Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has no intention of connecting up two places in Southern Labrador, Pinsent's Arm and Northern Bay; because, again, of the economic costs it would have to be a political decision. Does this administration have any intentions of giving people who have been living there since the eighteenth century, long before we ever had the decision of the Privy Council and long before we were ever part of the country of Canada, does the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) have any intention of giving them hydro instead of having individual generators?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, at the present time
the taxpayer in this Province is subsidizing the communities
which are on diesel power to the tune of more than \$20 million -

MR. C. POWER: A year.

MR. L. BARRY: - more than \$20 million a year,
Mr. Speaker, subsidy is going into the smaller communities
because we are compassionate on this side of the House,
because we do feel concerned -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: - because we do feel concerned
for those people living in the small communities which most
of us here came from, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, wherever members
on this side of the House now represent, their roots are
in the smallest communities of this Province-except for
the hon. member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, more than \$20 million. Now the only thing I conclude that the member opposite is saying is that the cost to the other electrical consumers in the Province should be increased substantially in order to pay a higher subsidy to the people in these communities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Okay, he is saying no. You are saying yes, he is saying no. When you get your act together, let me know, will you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the subsidy, or whatever, if we do not subsidize Labrador, then as I said, -Labrador (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: They are subsidized now.

MR. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is if the Federal Government is subsidizing the thermo plant at Holyrood eighteen dollars on the barrel, if that had to go up now to the world prices or the 75 per cent, as the minister wants it, then the rates in the Island part and St. John's would be now doubled. And that is a reality. So it is subsidized by 20 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is not a question. Does the hon. member have a question?

MR. HISCOCK: The question that I want to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry): Does he have any longterm plans either to uniform the rates or to take the people off our diesel power in Labrador? Because Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro does not have any longterm plans.

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

MR. BARRY: Alright, Mr. Speaker, first things first. The people in this Province elected a government which said to them, in order for us to do certain things in this Province we need to have money. In order to get money we have to get control of our resources, Mr. Speaker. When we see the development of our resources with control in this Province, when we see members opposite being prepared to get up and go against their political colleagues in Ottawa, which they are not now, - they do not now have the courage to do. You do not have the courage to criticize your Federal Liberal colleagues. You support their petition to take our oil resources, to block transmission of electricity through Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: This government, Mr. Speaker, supports the notion of running -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - a fiscally responsible administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. members do not wish to carry on, that is fine. But if they wish to carry on, I ask them to please restrain themselves.

The hon. the Minister.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in three elections the people of this Province have shown that they are willing to support a government which tells it like it is, which says that we do have plans for this Province but we are going to

June 16, 1981

Tape NO. 2524

EL - 3

MR. BARRY: move into them in a careful well-planned way: We are going to develop our resources, we are obtain revenue, and we are going to provide services-and that is the way it is done, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

In light of the fact that the minister's department curtailed all funding to the Indian Band Council in Davis Inlet some weeks ago, could the minister advise why this funding has been cut off? And seeing my time is short, could he advise, would the Indian Band Council of Davis Inlet be treated the same way as the other six communities, the designed communities in Northern Labrador?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the House last week, the funding for the community of Davis Inlet had not been curtailed. There are quite a number of dollars left in the accounts in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. As soon as the invoices are received they will be paid. Davis Inlet is treated the same as every other community under the old agreement and under the new agreement which will be signed some time or other, anyhow, when Mr. Munro is ready. Davis Inlet will be treated quite the same. As a matter of fact, just as one example of how Davis Inlet is treated, the funding for the community tripled over the year before last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a statement that I released this morning to the press: Response of the Government of Newfoundland and

PREMIER PECKFORD: Labrador to the Recommendations of the Economic Council of Canada Study - Newfoundland from Dependency to Self-Reliance. Copies will be provided to all hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not make the statement in the House, Mr. Speaker, because I thought that hon. members opposite might know it to be out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: What was it we just had from the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: Tabling of reports - tabling a report.

MR. STIRLING: Tabling a report?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I can answer the Leader of the Opposition. It is the government's detailed response to the Economic Council of Canada's report that was released last Fall to which we made a preliminary response, and now we are making a detailed response.

I saved the Leader of the Opposition the agony and the burden and the embarrassment of reading it here in the House today but released it to the media this morning in light of the Opposition's response to my statement on Friday past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A further point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Was that a Ministerial Statement? What kind of a report? It appeared to me that that was a

MR. STIRLING: Ministerial Statement,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I think the practices of this House allow for the tabling of such documents. We have certainly had it done before many times.

MR. STIRLING: Without debate?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of twenty-five residents of the community of Kippens.

The petition states: "We, the undersigned, who are householders in the town of Kippens, petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to provide the community of Kippens with the second phase of the water system for our town. Areas of Kippens have an inadequate water supply,

MR. HODDER:

"and therefore a number of home-owners have to make a decision as to whether or not they should drill wells and install sewerage tanks or wait until the second phase is implemented. We also understand that an environmental study is being undertaken by the Department of the Environment to see if a sewerage system will be needed for parts of Kippins. This has put many residents in a situation whereby they do not know whether sewerage services will be provided or whether it will be both water and sewerage services. We therefore further petition the government to complete the environmental study as quickly as possible so that the new home-owners and older residents of Kippins can proceed with future planning."

Now, Mr. Speaker, four years ago the first phase of the water system for Kippins was announced. At that time there had been an outcry in the community because residents of the community had contaminated water and the community was starting to grow and you had houses - there was not particularly good town planning there at that particular time. I think at that time the town was negotiating a town plan but had not received one. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first phase of the water system after it being announced was not completed until the year before last, and last year the residents of the community asked for the second phase and it was denied for a number of reasons: one, that there was a lot of development going on in Kippins. The rate of development had accelerated quite a bit because the government had built lots in Stephenville, or the area known as Area 13 which has been there for some four or five years and not one lot has been taken because of the expense, but at that particular time people were starting to move into Kippins rather than into Area 13, and the

MR. HODDER: Department of Municipal Affairs disallowed it last year although , I think, for improper reasons. They felt that people were moving into Kippens and buying unserviced land and the government did not want to put water and sewer through this land and increase the value to those people that were moving in. But that was an incorrect assumption because, Mr. Speaker, the area which the second phase would cover is an area in which a lot of the older residents of the community resided and where the water was really needed in the first place. In other words, the people who complained about the water in the first instance would have gotten their water in the second phase but they have not received it yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this year the people of Kippens were expecting the second phase to their water system again. It is the outskirts of Stephenville. If you drive through it you cannot tell one from the other. It has the same type of developmental problems and it needs a water and sewer system. Now the government has now said that there will be

MR. HODDER: an environmental study. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me to understand why an environmental study has been decided upon at this particular point in time when the government knew these problems existed two years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, we now have a lot of people who have moved into Kippens. These are twenty-five householders - that is twenty-five houses - who are in a position at the present time they do not know whether they should drill a well, they do not know if they are going to get water or not; if they do drill a well they do now know whether they should put in a septic tank or whether they need septic services or not because the environment study may say they need water and sewer or they need only one. So, Mr. Speaker, they are really in a - they have homes built there, they really have a problem and they are sort of sitting there wondering what is going to be in store for them. And they have asked the minister if she would make sure that this water and sewer environmental study is carried out quickly because otherwise some people cannot move into their homes and some of them may have to spend money which will be unnecessary if water and sewer is designated for their particular areas. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there is a potential health problem in the other parts of Kippens because you have a lot of development, a lot of houses close together, and the people are drinking from shallow wells. And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to make sure to look carefully at the town of Kippens. It is one of the largest growth areas in the Province, it is a dormitory town for the community of Stephenville; many people who work in Stephenville and moving out to Kippens and the situation is becoming more intense all the time. They want this environmental study done quickly and they would like to see funding, and I understand the minister says that funding has not been totally ruled out but is pending on the environmental study. So they would like to have the

MR. HODDER: environmental study as soon as they can. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, our department certainly will be responding to the petition from the hon. member. I am quite sure he is aware that any phases of water now have to be approved by the Department of Environment, they have to ensure that when we put in a distribution system for water that they have to make sure that there are not going to be any sewer problems as well. And we have checked this with the Department of Environment and Environment are saying that there has to be a study in Kippens to determine just what the environmental problem will be.

This study is now underway and I shall check and just see how far we are advanced with it and we will respond to your petition.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3. Concurrence debate on the report of the Government Services Committee.

We have one hour seven minutes remaining in this debate.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first I want to deal with the statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) yesterday on water and sewer projects throughout the Province. And I want to tell the minister how disappointed the residents of Burnt Islands are that the minister did not see fit to fulfill a promise that was made by the Premier when he was campaigning prior to the 1979 Provincial General Election and that was to install water and

MR. NEARY:

sewerage in the community of Burnt Island in the electoral district of LaPoile. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refresh hon. members' memories as far as that commitment is concerned. In 1979 on June 8th, during a Provincial general election, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who was the hon. Neil Windsor at that time, wired the mayor of Burnt Island and told the mayor that he would see, I am quoting directly from the telegram "I am pleased to advise that funding in the amount of \$300,000 has been approved for you water system projects. The department will be contacting you at a later date advising of further details concerning this project. Neil Windsor, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing." And on the same date, Mr. Speaker, a telex was dispatched from the Premier's office and just listen to what this one says, Mr. Speaker. It says, "This telex is to confirm an understanding given by Mr. Cabot Martin on behalf of myself to the effect that \$350,000 will be included in this year's Budget to complete the water system for your community. This commitment is being given in recognition of the needs of the people of Burnt Island. You are quite at liberty to make the contents of this message public."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, in one telegram, in the minister's telegram it was \$300,000 and in the Premier's telegram it was \$350,000. Now, perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs can tell us what the figure really is. Is it \$300,000 or is it \$350,000? Now, in the list of announcements made by the minister yesterday there was \$20,000 listed as a capital grant for water and sewerage in the community of Burnt Island, \$20,000, and the minister's department wired the town council in Burnt Island to tell the town that this \$20,000 was to take care of an over-run

MR. NEARY: on the original contract. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the town council in Burnt Island, and I discussed this with the mayor this morning, has no knowledge of an overrun. And yet the minister has listed \$20,000 to take care of an overrun, which means that there will be no work done this year on the second phase of the water and sewerage that was promised by the Premier in '79 in the community of Burnt Island.

It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, absolutely shameful. Burnt Island, as hon. members know, is a community that has no drinking water. The first phase was started last year that will cost in the vicinity of \$300,000 and the people were promised that this year phase two would commence. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the people picketed last year and the people picketed the first phase again this year, and they picketed objecting to allowing the first phase of water and sewerage to be completed until they had a commitment from the minister that phase two would go ahead this year. And as a result of that picketing, three ladies were hauled into court by the RCMP and they were put on a suspended sentence, fighting for their rights, fighting for a promise that the Premier had made.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that as a result of the government going back on its promise, as a result of double-crossing the people in Burnt Island, that there is likely to be further picketing. The people were led to believe, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier and by the former minister and by this minister, that phase two of that water and sewerage would start this year. And they are extremely disappointed and are outraged at how blatantly the list was drawn up along partisan political lines. It is absolutely disgraceful and outrageous, Mr. Speaker. All you have to do is take the list and go over it item by item. They threw in the odd one - they threw in the odd little project to make it look like it was non-political.

MR. CALLAN: Norman's Cove.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the odd little one, but go down over the list and take a look at it, Mr. Speaker, and you will find out that the list was drawn up along political lines, something they used to accuse Joey of doing. This crowd - Mr. Clean, who was going to run a clean and honest government, who was going to run a government of integrity, a government of the people, by the people and for the people, would not dare dirty his hands like Joey did in drawing up lists of road work.

And I might say, in connection with the road work programme, there is \$19 million of which \$12 million was spent last year. They have not told us that. Now, I am talking about the water and sewerage as it relates to Burnt Island. It is an absolute disgrace, Mr. Speaker. The minister should hang her head in shame for double-crossing the people in that community that comprises primary producers in this Province, and not put everything in St. John's, inside the overpass. These people deserve

MR. NEARY: better, they are the primary producers in this Province, they work in the fish plants and they are fishermen and they fish year-round. They are not sports fishermen like you would find in most communities in Newfoundland, they fish year-round down there. They are hard-working people, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve better treatment from the minister and from this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: They generate new dollars.

MR. NEARY: They generate new dollars in this Province. They are the primary producers. They keep St. John's going and half the other places in Newfoundland. They keep her afloat and yet a large chunk of this money goes in and around St. John's. And what do they get? The people of Burnt Island, the primary producers, the rural parts of this Province get a kick in the teeth from this government. And this is the crowd that went around this Province in two or three elections, talking about what they were going to do for rural Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, 'rural' Newfoundland, they do not even know what the word means. They know nothing about rural Newfoundland, they have city vision, St. John's vision. They

MR. NEARY: cannot see beyond the over-pass, Mr. Speaker. And I will tell you this, that the people of Burnt Island are pretty mad, they are pretty sore about this.

MR. TULK: And so they should.

MR. NEARY: And so they should, Mr. Speaker. They should be sore about it. Because they have been double-crossed, they have been let down by this government.

MR. TULK: They were promised it by Frank Moores first.

MR. NEARY: And I just read the telegram where the promise was made by none other than the Premier of this Province. And I will read it again just in case hon. members do not understand what I am saying.

"This Telex is to confirm an understanding given by Mr. Cabot Martin -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. NEARY: - on behalf of myself, to the effect that \$350,000 will be included in this year's budget to complete the water system for your community. This commitment is being given in recognition of the needs of the people of Burnt Island ."

Recognition of the needs of the people of Burnt Island. Mr. Speaker, the federal government put the water supply down there. The federal government paid the cost of putting the reservoir there, of putting the tank there to act as a reservoir for the water. The federal government put the water supply there and this crowd cannot even see that it is put into the homes.

MR. TULK: They cannot do anything.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister may be penny-wise and pound-foolish in this matter, because now 50 per cent of the community will not have water and sewerage.

MR. TULK: They should be ashamed of themselves.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. minister will not now be able to force the property tax on the community of Burnt Island.

MR. BARRY: 71 per cent.

MR. TULK: He will try though.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. BARRY: 71 per cent of the towns -

MR. NEARY: Seventy-one per cent are communities and towns represented by the Tories. There are no priorities taken into consideration, straight political decisions.

MR. WARREN: The dollars are about 90 per cent.

MR. NEARY: The dollar so my- the expert in mathematics down here tells me that dollar wise, it is 90 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat I will have to say again the people are disappointed. They feel that they have been let down and doubled-crossed by this government. And the minister will hear more about this, Mr. Speaker, in the future.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to reply to the hon. - unfortunately he is not here - member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who got up and talked about the number of teachers in this Province who are disgruntled and disappointed and upset -

MR. THOMS: You want to believe it.

MR. DINN: - and so on with the government.
What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is just reflect for a little while on how the negotiations took place previously versus how the negotiations take place now.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) government.

MR. DINN: Right now the teachers, of course, have collective bargaining, they have all of the rights that any worker in this Province has and, of course, they go through the normal process. And in the latest negotiations, of course, we all know that the teachers went through the normal process. They requested a conciliation board, they got a conciliation board, they went through the whole process and eventually signed a collective agreement.

Now, I did not think it was fair that we should leave on the record the fact that we as a government provided collective bargaining for teachers and -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think, we need a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Count the members.

We have a quorum.

The hon. the Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is

another childish display today, I guess.

The fact of the matter is,

Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House were meeting in Committee with members on the opposite side of the House so that they could clear up and arrange their meetings further on down the road. And, Mr. Speaker, I guess what we will have to do is cancel those kinds of meetings.

But the fact of the matter is,

Mr. Speaker, what we were talking about was in answer to the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) when he talked about collective bargaining and the fact that the teachers were upset. The teachers at this point in time went through the collective bargaining process, every process that is available to any worker in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, in contrast I wanted to point out the contrast to what we had by the former Liberal administration when they were in power. We will just go back to 1970. Let us see what happened in that process. What happened was, Mr. Speaker, the teachers requested collective bargaining and were not allowed collective bargaining in this process. What they would do was the NTA would get together and they would select a committee who would go in and talk to three ministers. The three ministers appointed in 1970 were the Minister of Education, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Minister of Finance. And they sat down around the table. They had no collective bargaining whatsoever, were not allowed. They were driven

MR. DINN:

into the ground basically.

The teachers came in and made a request as to what they would like in their salaries for the next three years and the government said, 'Tough bananas! You will get this.' So, Mr. Speaker, the teachers did not like that and they went on strike. The strike was kind of a rotating strike. They went out here in St. John's and they went out in Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook and so on, and, Mr. Speaker, they had no collective bargaining rights. So what happened then when they went into that rotating strike position? What happened was the government called them up and they said, 'Go back to the bargaining table. Come on in - send your committee in to us and we will bargain in good faith, we will bargain collectively.' So they called off the strike, they went in to sit down and they got exactly what the government offered them in the first place, just exactly what the government offered them in the first place. That was what they had. That was their collective bargaining rights in those days, Mr. Speaker. And I did not think that I should leave it on the record that the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) should get up in this House and criticize what happened in the past negotiations, because everything that was capable of happening in collective bargaining was given to the teachers in collective bargaining in the last negotiations, Mr. Speaker. They went through the process with the conciliation board, conciliation officers and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I was interrupted by childish displays -

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. member (inaudible).

MR. DINN:

- by the hon. member, who is

interrupting again now and breaking the rules of the House -

MR. DINN: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted by the hon. member who is interrupting again today, who does not seem to care, who tries to cloud issues, who tries to disrupt this House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Who gave the NTA checkoff?

MR. DINN: Who gave the NTA checkoff?
Yes, we will collect some dues for you. They did not have collective bargaining. They sat down with three ministers who were sent out by the little dictator who said, 'Give them that and do not give them anything else.' That is what happened in 1970 and that is what happened back to 1949 and beyond, Mr. Speaker. That is what happened, they gave them nothing. Three ministers sat down with a position. They said, 'Here is what you are getting, nothing else.' The NTA got a little militant at that point in time, the hon. member may remember. He was busy at that point in time, Mr. Speaker, in 1970, with social welfare on Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: He was too busy in 1970 with a few little things that were recorded in the Mifflin report. The hon. member should keep quiet. He is apt to get a little burnt if he keeps interrupting. The hon. member is not

MR. DINN:

not going to stand back for the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary). He is not going to -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - take the hon. member for Pleasantville (J. Dinn) on his back.

MR. NEARY: I was not (inaudible) the telephone company (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, there is the hon. member making another accusation, another accusation across the House. He had the Andy Davidson affidavit placed on the table of the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not denying it.

MR. DINN: Yes, I deny it in front of everybody and for all the world to hear, I deny what the hon. member is saying. Yes, Mr. Speaker, deny. And the hon. member comes into this House, puts affidavits on the table from guys who are not believable, not believable and that is what Judge Mahoney said, not believable and he puts it on the table of this House as truth, as the truth, Mr. Speaker, and destroys reputations. That is what he is good at. That is what the hon. member thrives on. That is what his forte is, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to lower myself to that level of debate. The hon. member tries to take this House on his back and he tried yesterday and did not succeed and he is trying again today by his continuous interruptions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that should settle the teachers' thing. The fact of the matter is that the teachers have all the collective bargaining rights that any worker in this Province has.

MR. NEARY: Who gave them the checkoff?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member got up yesterday and said, 'the bottom is falling out of the economy.' Well, Mr. Speaker, he is the only expert in the field that is saying that. No other expert, no other economist, no other economic expert in the field is saying that the bottom is falling out of the Newfoundland economy. What are they saying? They are saying that we had the highest employment growth rate of any Province in Canada last year and by the looks of it, we will have the highest employment growth rate of any province this year, Mr. Speaker. The economic growth rate -

MR. FLIGHT: And the highest unemployment (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - projected by economists, Mr. Speaker, projected by economists. They are saying that our economic growth rate is going to go from 3 to 3.5 this year and the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - Federal Canadian Government is zero, flat -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the unemployment (inaudible).

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is entitled to his time speaking. He does not have to speak, to shout over the hon. or the member for LaPoile (S. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I ask the hon. members to my right to restrain themselves. The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J. Dinn) has three minutes remaining.

MR. DINN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have three minutes left, Mr. Speaker?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the employment is growing in this Province. The year before last at an average of 9,000 for that year over the previous year, last year it was 9,500 and the hon. members opposite will be disappointed to hear that for the first five months of this year the average growth over the same month last year is 9,800.

MR. FLIGHT: How many young men (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: Growing at a phenomenal pace.

And Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - the hon. members opposite should also know that in the 60s, back in those -

MR. BARRETT: Check the studies that were done then.

MR. DINN: - back in those bad days, the outward migration, outward versus inward, there were 8,000 more going out than were coming in. Right now it is just a little over 1,000. Last year it was 2,000 and 6,000, I believe, more out than in. This year it is down -

MR. FLIGHT: Where did you get the figures? Are you going to table them?

MR. DINN: - this year it is down - yes, Statistics Canada. The hon. member just has to call his buddies in Ottawa and get them from Statistics Canada, Mr. Speaker. And I would also like to record and report today to hon. members opposite who do not -

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - to hon. members opposite who do not like our local preference policy offshore,

MR. DINN:

Well, I would like to inform hon. members that there are now - the latest report out says that there are 704 people working offshore and onshore related to offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before the regulations in 1978, there was not one Newfoundlander working on a rig offshore.

MR. MOORES: Rubbish.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, not one - and I challenge the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) who said, 'rubbish', I challenge him to get the figures - to back it up with figures, Mr. Speaker. Name me the Newfoundlanders - but I can name, Mr. Speaker, 704 Newfoundlanders who are working offshore and onshore directly related to offshore. And, Mr. Speaker, we are anticipating that we will have three more drill rigs coming this year which will improve that situation dramatically.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude, my time is up, but I will get some more time in the debate to outline more positive things to hon. members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member for Grand Bank I would like to welcome on behalf of all hon. members Mayor Sam Connors of Pouch Cove, from the district of St. John's East Extern. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad to see the Premier in his seat - whoops! I guess I spoke too soon.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer specifically to the two Heads, Transportation and Municipal Affairs, as they relate to the district of Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: You know, I sit here and I cannot help but ask myself the question why me, why the people of the district of Grand Bank, why are they being punished?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: What have I ever done -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: - to the biggest maw mouth ever to come through the backroom doors of this House of Assembly? What have I ever done to him? What have I ever done to the Premier of this Province? What have I ever done to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

MR. NEARY: What have the people done?

MR. THOMS: What have I ever done to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook)? And more importantly, Mr. Speaker, what have the people of Grand Bank done who for eight to ten years in this Province returned a Tory member to the House of Assembly?

MR. HISCOCK: Attitude.

MR. THOMS: What have they done? My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke about new dollars coming into the economy of this Province and into the economy of this country. Well, there is no other district, bar none, in this Province that brings more new dollars. I am not talking about old, stale dollars that are turned around in Ottawa -

MR. NEARY: Re-cycled dollars.

MR. THOMS: - re-cycled dollars that are turned around in Ottawa and sent flying down to this Province, I am talking about the American dollar, I am talking about the European dollar, I am talking about the new dollar that the people of Grand Bank, a district that is 100 per cent dependent on the fisheries, the dollar that they bring into the economy of this Province. Two years ago there was a roads programme brought in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2533

IB-3

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I really do not mind, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can sit over there and yap like a puppy all day,

MR. THOMS: he does not bother me, but I would ask my colleagues to refrain from answering -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. THOMS: - from answering the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: I do not mind, I do not mind the lapdog from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), that does not bother me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: - but I would ask my colleagues to refrain -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - from answering him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, two years ago the roads program was brought into this House. Not one single, solitary mention of the needs of the people of the district of Grand Bank. Now, Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) brought in another roads program for this year and not one single, solitary mention of the needs of the people of the district of Grand Bank. I challenge any member on the other side of the House, any minister, any backbencher, to come to the district of Grand Bank with me and to travel the approximately eight miles of road between Lord's Cove and Lawn. I have challenged them, and then to come back here and say that the people of that district should not have that new section of

MR. THOMS: road upgraded so that it can be opened. The ridiculous thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is this: they constructed a new section of road from Lawn to Lord's Cove. It is constructed. All it needs is a bit of Class A gravel or Class B or C or D or whatever the heck they put on these things, and to put a couple of culverts across and it is reopened. But you can mark my word, Mr. Speaker, you can mark my word, that sometime in the very near future that some person in this Province, some man, woman or child in this Province is going to be dead because of that particular section of road.

MR. MORGAN: Ineffective members.

MR. THOMS: Somebody is going to be dead. You can sit there and you can talk about ineffective members all you like but the blame falls squarely on the shoulders of the hon. minister who is yapping off again. The blame falls squarely there.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) next election.

MR. THOMS: Why do you not call a new election? Call an election. Put your money where your mouth is and call an election.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration for one minute believes, if this administration believes for one minute that the people of Grand Bank are going to knuckle under because of the treatment that they are receiving from this administration, then they have another thought coming to them. Because the people of Grand Bank are not used to knuckling under. They are fishermen, they are hardy fishermen, they are good Newfoundlanders, they are hardy Newfoundlanders, they are hardy Newfoundlanders, they are not soft and pretty -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, they are not soft and pretty and maw-mouthed like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), they are not like that. They are hard-working, upstanding Newfoundlanders who deserve better treatment than they are getting from this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please! There are about four or five hon. members to my right and one at least to my left speaking at the same time as the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) who has the floor, by the way.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
Like I say, I do not mind -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: -I do not mind the whale that comes up every two minutes to have a blow, the Minister of Fisheries, the whale that comes up to have a blow every two minutes. But I would ask my own colleagues to ignore him. Ignore him just like the people of Bonavista South are going to do in the next election.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, so I talk about the roads programme and the people being ignored. Now, we come to capital works programmes for this year. Not one single solitary community, not one community in the district of Grand Bank, not even an honourable mention, Mr. Speaker. You talk about your \$20,000. I cannot even brag about \$20,000 going to the people of Grand Bank. Where is the honourableness in this administration? Where is it?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) law.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous.

MR. THOMS: Leave him alone. Mr. Speaker, leave the man alone. Because every time he opens his mouth the people of this Province - and do not forget there is a multiplier effect, every person in this gallery listening to the hon. Minister of Fisheries is a multiplier. They go out and they tell somebody else., somebody else tells somebody else and eight turns into sixteen, sixteen into thirty-two and before long there are 200,000 voting Newfoundlanders who know what an ass the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) really is.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! Jackass.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, not one single, solitary community in the district of Grand Bank got one cent. For two years not one single, solitary community got a cent under the roads programme. And, Mr. Speaker, I can give absolute assurances to any member on the other side, and if the pothead from Bonavista South wants to try me out on it he

MR. THOMS: can do it, but the people of the district of Grand Bank will not knuckle under. Anybody on the other side who thinks - maybe it is because I voted against the flag, Mr. Speaker. I am being punished for voting against the flag. Now, I am one of the Newfoundlanders who has accepted the flag. I accept the rule of law, I accept the fact that this House has passed an act creating a new flag. I wear it proudly. I voted against it in the beginning but I wear it proudly. Now, maybe I am being punished for voting against the flag. Maybe the people of Grand Bank are being punished because their member voted against the flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say yet and I am sure somebody will intervene to give me another ten minutes at this.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have heard - I cannot resist getting into the debate to hear the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) who is issuing the same refrain that is from time to time given by the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock), no roads, no monies paid in. Now -

MR. THOMS: I did not say that.

MR. MARSHALL: - I am looking at the roads programme for 1979 and 1980, for example, and Grand Bank got \$1.5 million

MR. MARSHALL:

out of a total expenditure that year of \$27 million. St. Mary's - The Capes, what did they get at that particular time? \$3,300,000 out of \$27 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING:

(Inaudible) so bad.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would not bet on that. I

would not bet on that.

\$1.6 million in 1977-78

for Grand Bank, St. Mary's - The Capes \$1.4 out of a total budget of \$1.8 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Those two districts over

the past seven or eight years, have gotten very much more than the amount would call for if you divided it into the fifty-two districts. I would say that those two districts, Mr. Speaker, over the past ten years have received more money in roads than any other district in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And the hon. gentleman can

howl all he likes about it and the two of them can make all the accusations they wish, but the fact of the matter is in the days before the 1970s, with St. Mary's particularly, there were completely dirt roads in the area, there was not a single mile of pavement. And as the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), who has a district alongside of St. Mary's knows, there have been many, many, many miles, -

MR. PATTERSON:

Thirty million, provincial

monies were since 1970.

MR. MARSHALL:

How many millions?

MR. PATTERSON:

Thirty million dollars.

MR. MARSHALL:

Thirty million dollars put

into one district on its own. Down in the district of Grand Bank there were many millions of dollars as well. And

MR. MARSHALL: we hear this type of accusation pass

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - and we will take, as -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) Bellevue.

MR. STAGG: Port au Port cannot take it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, those are the

facts of the matter. It is the same way throughout the Budget. With respect to the Budget itself, we have here one of the major expenditures in this Budget, one of the major expenditures this year is the provision of a hospital in the district of LaPoile. And we all know that the district of LaPoile is not represented by a member on the government side of the House, and yet that same member proposes a non-confidence motion in the Budget which, if passed, would cancel out the hospital which we have provided.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is

not a single iota of truth in what the hon. gentlemen are charging. Since this party has been in power, over the previous ten years, there have been many millions of dollars put into rural Newfoundland, in particular into St. Mary's district, in particular into Grand Bank district, and time after time after time the hon. members get up and say that there is now no money being put into the districts. The fact of the matter is there are more districts than those two areas. The area of Baie Verte, for instance, Baie Verte-White Bay -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - which has a tremendous number of dirt roads, Mr. Speaker, is now getting appropriate attention, long over due attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We intend, Mr. Speaker, in due course, to blanket all of Newfoundland with pavement -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: -from coast to coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: And Labrador as well, Mr.

Speaker. So, I mean, there is not, as I say, any justification to what the hon. gentleman said.

Another item that I want to speak on, in the limited time available to me, is the remarks made by members of the Opposition yesterday in connection with the labour aspects of these estimates of Government Services with respect to the employment policy of this government.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Let us hear it.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, I would like to know how members on the opposite side, who represent people in their districts who are seeking jobs, can possibly justify their stand against the employment policy of this government, the preference

MR. STIRLING: I can.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the hon. gentleman can justify it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is number one.

MR. MARSHALL: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS: What a despicable policy.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, that is fine. The more we hear that the better it is, Mr. Speaker, and the more we hear it the more it should be promulgated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that that particular policy is most necessary because of the jobs it has brought to Newfoundlanders which they would never otherwise get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I am going to repeat once again an instance for this House in the hope that hon. members opposite will see the wisdom of our ways. I realize that is probably a very vain hope but I am going to try anyway.

One of the oil companies, Mr. Speaker, that was drilling offshore, complained bitterly about the policies of this government with respect to having to employ Newfoundland labour. And we received, Mr. Speaker, the same hackneyed complaints as to the reason why it could not be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) listen to that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we do not have to listen to it but we have to listen to you over and over again.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, it is because of the insistence of this government for the employment of Newfoundland people, many young Newfoundlanders got a chance to work on those offshore rigs where they would not have gotten a chance before.

Now, if the hon. gentlemen have got the courage of their convictions, they will go out - and I hope they will go out - to their constituents and they will give them the very reason as to why Newfoundland - the present local preference policy should not apply.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) people.

MR. MARSHALL: I beg your pardon?

MR. FLIGHT: You tell (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker, I really should not be distracted by the mice.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, all the gentlemen there opposite are capable of this carping criticism and they do not see the broad issues of this Province. They fail to see what this local preference policy is doing for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. BARRETT: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I can guarantee the hon. gentlemen there opposite, despite their complaint and despite their derogation of Newfoundland that that local preference policy is going to be in effect for a good many years yet to come, until this Province enjoys a rate of employment equal and commensurate with the sister provinces in other parts of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Because that is what it is intended to do. And the hon. gentlemen by speaking about it are against the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right. Dead on.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want, in the limited time, to mention just one other thing. It is about the matters that have been raised in this debate from time to time about the way the government business is ordered in this House. It was particularly mentioned in considering the Government Services Committee. As far as the government is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this government is determined that it has a legislative programme. It is going to present it within the time frame set down and we are going to sit until such time as the legislation is passed.

Now, from time to time over the past week, Mr. Speaker, I have had members of the Opposition come to me and ask when we are going to rise because they want to rise. And I am going to observe, Mr. Speaker, that the scene which we saw yesterday -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name them.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I am not going to name them. The scene which we saw yesterday was because, Mr. Speaker, it was set up, and I believe - and I am just going to point this out. Just in case hon. gentlemen are attempting to do it, they are trying to set up a situation, Mr. Speaker, where, as they have done in their infantile ways before, they get ejected from the House so that they will not have to sit in the House and the business will go

MR. MARSHALL: go through and they can go home. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the whole purpose for the exhibition, the disgraceful exhibition, which we saw yesterday. Mr. Speaker, we have also seen as to what is happening in this House and I say this quite frankly, that there have been reports - the members of the Opposition there opposite - that two, three, four or five of the members have indicated that they are not going to follow the present leader. They have certainly shown that, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately the tail is wagging the dog and the people who are chasing it, on the opposite side, cannot even catch up with the dog. So I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we got down to the business of this House. We are talking about Government Services Committee, we are talking about the departments under the Government Services Committee. We have been talking for almost three hours on this, almost three hours on the other - three hours on each of the other Headings and we have heard very precious little about the Committees that were constituted, the Standing Committees that were constituted to look into these departments. The only comments that I have heard myself which were relevant, certainly this afternoon and perhaps yesterday, were those which were given by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) today, even though I draw issue with him. He was speaking about municipal affairs, he was speaking about highways, and these come in the Government Services Committee. Now, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to exercise their time in talking about the things like that which went on yesterday and as have gone on for a part of the day today, we are not going to make any progress, and that is their prerogative if they do not want to be relevant. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is this government that is running the Province, this government has a legislative

MR. MARSHALL: program and this government is going to sit here until its legislative program is passed. If the hon. gentlemen want to try their antics, as they tried yesterday, they can try them all they want to but they will find out this government is ruling this Province and will continue for years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) has been recognized.

MR. MOORES: I will yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear yields to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: If the brave member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would now come back into the House, he might get an answer to some of that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Garbage.

MR. STIRLING: - garbage that he is putting out. Mr. Speaker, we have seen an attempt in this House by the government not to govern -

MR. NEARY: But to divide the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: - no, Mr. Speaker, not to govern - the people of this Province would like to see them govern. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that that minister, that member, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who has not got the intestinal fortitude to sit here after spewing forth that kind of dirt, that kind of slime - slime and dirt, Mr. Speaker, and he has not got the intestinal fortitude to come in and face up to it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. Order, please! Order, please! A point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY: Just for clarification, I am not absolutely sure of my ground on this one, Mr. Speaker, however, I am sure I will get the assistance of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) who is a great expert on Beauchesne. I think 'slime' is unparliamentary, as is 'dirt'.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, there is -

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

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in Beauchesne concerning that in any way, shape or form.

MR. BARRY: We do not care if there is nothing in Beauchesne, we are running our own Parliament here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: We are not just following along blindly, we have our own practices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Order, please! The hon. member for Port au Port is responding to the point of order.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not know what was - But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of how much the member opposite protested it is not in Beauchesne and to my knowledge it has not been ruled out in this House. The hon. member opposite cannot just, you know - however much he would like to - he cannot make up the rules as he goes along.

MR. HOLLETT: No. They are trying to, but they cannot do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2538

GS - 4

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal
with this issue, let us deal with this issue that the

MR. L. STIRLING:

President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) does not have the intestinal fortitude to stand up or sit in his place and hear the response. Because we have seen, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a distortion of the rules when they went on public airways and said 'okay, we are now going to have rules that everyone can understand, we are going to speed the business through the House'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two days and two days.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, they have ignored them, they have then dumped the rules, they have tried to antagonize the members of the opposition.

MR. NEARY: Shagged up the House.

MR. L. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that we take our job very seriously.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ha, ha. Yes!

MR. L. STIRLING: We think that the people on the government side were elected to govern, Mr. Speaker. They have an opposition mentality and they will get their fondest wish, Mr. Speaker, as soon as they get themselves in a state of mind where they can go to the people, where they finally come to the conclusion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - that we are getting so bad -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: -that we are getting so downhill that the question is do we preserve a corporals guard by going for an election now? Now, my prediction, Mr. Speaker, is that they will find excuses to postpone and postpone it and they will have their fondest wish, which is to be back in opposition. Now, let us deal with the order of business, Mr. Speaker. There are something like 45 pieces of legislation on this Order Paper. Most of them are all delayed being brought in. We have allowed

MR. L. STIRLING: the agreement with the Lower Churchill Corporation to expire, Mr. Speaker, it has expired since the 24th of May.

MR. BARRY: Nonsense!

MR. STIRLING: They have started it off, Mr. Speaker, they have started it off by not bringing in the budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: They delayed the budget because they wanted to try another distortion in Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: They tried to pretend in Bellevue there was a good budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: The day after they lost Bellevue they brought in the budget. And another man who does not have the intestinal fortitude to sit here is that great debater from Dalhousie, the former -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - there are more cowards, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition, withdraw.

MR. STIRLING: Withdraw what, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Coward.

MR. STIRLING: Coward?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The hon. gentleman -

MR. STIRLING: I said there are more cowards on the other side - not a specific, not a specific person, Mr. Speaker. Using -

MR. SPEAKER: I asked for a withdrawal because of the tone in which it was presented to the House.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the tone.

MR. SPEAKER: You withdraw - no, no, you withdraw.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, but what do you want me to withdraw?

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2539

RA - 3

MR. STIRLING: You mentioned -

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Cowards. 'Cowards' is unparliamentary-
unequivocal withdrawal.

MR. L. STIRLING: I withdraw whatever it is the Speaker,
wants me to withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. Specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a withdrawal.

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

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. member for Port au Port has a point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Page 110 says that since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions: And 'coward' is listed as one of the expressions which is used parliamentary - now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that a word can be ruled parliamentary and unparliamentary. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was speaking he just made a general reference, he did not specifically call anyone a coward.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The Chair has the right to rule whether words are used because of the context in which they are put and the manner. And I asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw. He has since withdrawn. Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has four minutes to conclude.

MR. STIRLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will - well, I have withdrawn, You have accepted whatever it is that you wanted withdrawn. We are going to see a new set of rules, Mr. Speaker. I mean, I get challenged over here to quote from Beauchesne. When we quote from Beauchesne it is not acceptable.

Now, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has just probably, before he stormed out Mr. Speaker, before he could not take it. He is like the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who does not have the intestinal fortitude. And if that tone, Mr. Speaker, requires that I withdraw that, I will be subject to somebody popping up and asking that. They do not have the intestinal fortitude to sit there and take the debate, the thrust of debate. They hope that they can get up and take something which the press, they hope, will take verbatim. And then when they get it back, when it gets challenged, Mr. Speaker, because

MR. STIRLING: we assume that people understand, when it gets challenged somebody is up on a point of order because of the tone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) just said the ultimate, 'We do not care about Beausheve, we have our own rules here in fortress Newfoundland with Emperor Peckford and all his little knights that come and bear - and that is what we are headed for. That is the anti-Confederate, anti-Canada, anti-people movement.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Here is a government, Mr. Speaker, concerned about the power of the Newfoundland and Labrador government. Well, on this side, Mr. Speaker, we are not concerned about the power of the government, we are concerned about the power of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: This bunch, Mr. Speaker, all these silly little technical rules of whether or not you can call a liar a liar in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, we accept it because you have to keep the rules and keep decorum. We cannot call a liar a liar even outside the House. The fact that you take his statement and in one part of the statement he says one thing, 'No I did not read the report', in another part of the statement he says, 'Yes, I read the report three weeks ago', everywhere else but in the House of Assembly the man would be called a liar. But we accept the fact that because the Speaker has to keep decorum in the House you cannot use that kind of language, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Yes you can, you can call him a liar but you would be (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: But, Mr. Speaker, with the rules of this House at the present time, this government is abusing the rules of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: They are abusing the rules of this House in this way, they set the legislation, they decide what goes on the Order Paper, they decide when they are going to close the House, and we will debate in a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Every one.

MR. STIRLING: I would challenge the government anywhere, anytime to show that we have had anything in the way of a filibuster in this debate.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it has been an abuse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: They cut back on the rules, they set the three hour limit on the Concurrence debates, they were the ones who put three committees working at the same time so the press cannot cover it. Mr. Speaker, when history records the experiences of various governments, this government will go down - and I am not talking about individuals, I am talking collectively - this government will go down as the most deceitful government this Province has ever had in its history. The most deceitful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING The brave man returns.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up today and he said,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: We are supposed to be discussing Government Services Estimates the Department of Labour and Manpower, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Speaker, what did he talk about? He was ruled out of order for using unparliamentary terms, he lost his cool in the House. The hon. Leader is not a leader. He issued a challenge, 'I challenge the hon. member'. The last time the hon. Leader issued a challenge he backed out. The hon. Leader of the Opposition should observe the rules of the House, be a little more relevant, and put his points across and maybe the press would cover him.

MR. WARREN: He is trying, you know.

MR. DINN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition should put his points across and maybe he would get a little press time, maybe the press will cover him; maybe the people of the Province would be given something so that they could decide on what the hon. member stands for. The hon. member is obviously against local preference, we know that. The hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is against local preference.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Is the hon. member against local preference in the North? The federal government says that the people of the North get the jobs first. Is the hon. member against or for that?

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Is the hon. the member for Grand Bank against or for local preference in the North?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! Order, please!
I think we are discussing Government Services, the concurrence debate.

MR. DINN: Absolutely. This is Labour and Manpower and employment and local preference, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you questioning the Speaker?

MR. DINN: No, not a bit.

So, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. the member for Grand Bank in favour of local preference in the North? The federal government says that in the North when we are building a gas pipeline, that the people of the North get first call at the jobs. They call it affirmative action. Is the hon. member for local preference in Nova Scotia? The federal government gives Michelin millions of dollars to build a tire plant in Windsor, Nova Scotia, and they say in Windsor, Nova Scotia, 'Because we are putting federal

MR. DINN: dollars in here, you have to employ people from Nova Scotia.' Local preference - they call it affirmative action. Is the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) for or against that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: In 1978, Mr. Speaker, we had no local preference in the offshore. For fifteen years during the former Liberal administration, we had people drilling offshore. No oil companies came here, Petro-Canada was not thought of. No oil companies - Mobil was not here, Texaco was not here, Gulf was not here.

MR. HOLLETT: Mobil was here.

MR. DINN: Mobil was not here.

MR. HOLLETT: A subsidiary of Mobil was here.

MR. DINN: A subsidiary of Mobil!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: We are talking about drilling offshore. Mobil drilling offshore were not here. They simply were not here. I tell the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West, they were not here. Mobil was not here. They had no onshore facility for the operation offshore, Mr. Speaker, I tell the hon. member as fact, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you still have them?

MR. DINN: Yes, we do have. Yes, today we do have.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, where (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Well, I can tell the hon. member, I can go down through the whole book of

MR. DINN: Well, I can tell the hon. member, I can go down through the whole book if the hon. member wants me to. I only have ten minutes.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the offshore.

MR. DINN: Mobil - the hon. member, name the company and I will tell the hon. member where they are and how many are working there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mobil, onshore, they have forty-nine people here directly related to offshore, directly.

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

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. minister has the floor and he does not have to shout over the hon. gentlemen opposite. He is entitled to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just name the company and the minister would answer.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order every hon. member has the right to be heard in silence. I would ask all members on both sides to restrain themselves.

MR. DINN: The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, talks about Mobil. Does he want to talk about the drill rigs? Does he want to talk about SEDCO, the Ocean Ranger,

Zapata Uglund? Does he want to talk about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Speaker. Your Honour has just given his ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is speaking in the debate. The hon. gentlemen there opposite are again interrupting the hon. member while he is speaking.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is shocking.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, it is shocking.

MR. NEARY:

To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I distinctly heard the non-existent Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) say, 'Does the hon. member want me to talk about this? Does the hon. member want me to talk about that?'. The hon. non-existent minister was putting questions to my colleagues. Now, the question is is the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) trying to stop my colleagues from answering? If the hon. gentleman wants to proceed with his speech in silence, Mr. Speaker, then he should not be asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. But I would remind all hon. members that every member in this House has the right to be heard in silence. The Chair has the responsibility to see that everybody does and I think the responsibility also rests with the members on both sides.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite cannot have it both ways. If they are against local preference, affirmative action, they have to be against it all over. They have to be against it in the North. They have to be against it in Nova Scotia. They have to be against DREE. They have to be against whatever the federal government puts out, because where they do work

MR. DINN: in high unemployment areas, they have affirmative action programs. Now, what they say is that Newfoundland is non-Canadian, Newfoundland is anti-Canadian, because they have affirmative action here in the form of local preference, but when they have it in the North it is okay. When they have it in Windsor, Nova Scotia, when they are building a Michelin plant in Windsor and 232 people are required to be hired for that job, and they specify in the deal they will not give any money to Michelin unless they hire locally, and they specify areas in Nova Scotia - Windsor - you have to hire from Windsor, Nova Scotia, first, Mr. Speaker. You talk about local preference, Mr. Speaker, they are for local preference when it serves their purpose, when it serves their purpose. But you hear the Rt. Hon. Pierre Elliot saying how anti-Canadian it is for us to have local preference. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1978 I challenge -

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) is interrupting. He is out of order again, as usual. I challenge hon. members to tell me what Newfoundlanders were working on drill rigs offshore in 1978 when they get up to speak in this debate. I tell them, I tell them, I tell them that there were no workers, Newfoundland workers, working on drill ships offshore in 1978. I tell them that. When the regulations came in 1979, we had 700 people working offshore and onshore related to that offshore activity. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we had 900 people working. To this point in time this year - and we are expecting three more rigs, and I will name them for the hon. gentlemen, the Peleran is coming, the PacNorth is coming and the Ben Ocean Lancer is coming.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just six for the whole year?

MR. DINN:

That is what the program is at this point in time. Well, the hon. member should know that that is because of the national energy program, the policy of the federal government. They are cutting back a little bit. We had anticipated that there would be ten to twelve rigs this year but there are only going six rigs. Now, that does not count, of course, the seismic vessels and you have the supply vessels that go along with supplying the rigs offshore. Right now, to this point in time, despite the national energy program, we have right now 704 Newfoundlanders. Now that is not the total employment. That is not the total employment. The total employment is 1,049 to this point in time, 1,049 to this point in time offshore and onshore directly related to offshore, and 704 of those are

MR. DINN: native Newfoundlanders, thanks to our local preference policy, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, we will have that local preference policy and we will have jobs for Newfoundlanders and the unemployment rate will go down again this year. The year before last it went down, in 1979, it went down in 1980, it will go down in 1981, and it will go down in 1982. I tell the hon. members for their information that the average month to month figure this year versus last year is 9,800 more jobs this year than last year. Now, if the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) were here and were interested in speaking in the debate, he would probably challenge as to whether they were new jobs. They are new jobs relatively. They were not there last year, they are here this year.

So the hon. member - Mobil has people here working, forty-nine total, onshore, thirty-one of them are Newfoundlanders, onshore workers, Mr. Speaker. There are three rigs, Mr. Speaker, the Sedco 109 people, 74 - this is offshore now - are native Newfoundlanders; onshore they have nine, five of them are Newfoundlanders, 67 per cent. The average of all the workers working offshore, the total versus the number of Newfoundlanders, is 67 per cent at this point in time. We have three rigs, we have seven supply vessels, and we have five vessels doing seismic work.

So if any hon. members opposite want more information, what companies are here, who their constituents should go to to get employment, they just call and ask and I will tell them when, where, why, -

MR. HOLLETT: What percentage of Newfoundlanders are on the seismic vessels?

MR. DINN: On the seismic vessels? Well, Mr. Speaker, it takes a little time to get through this, I do not know if I got all of the time in the world here, but I will have another ten minutes a little later on and I can outline in detail the number of people, where they are, who they are, what trade they are, Mr. Speaker. Whether they are drilling superintendents or environmental co-ordinators, engineering supervisors -

MR. HOLLETT: All of them are Nova Scotian vessels crewed by Mainlanders, and you know it.

MR. DINN: - or technologists or production clerks or accounting supervisors, geologists, I can give the hon. member how many, who are they, where they are working, what shift, Mr. Speaker, any information the hon. member wants to know is all available here. I will give it to the House, I will give it to the hon. member and if he wants it, Mr. Speaker, all he has to do is call up and ask. The hon. member is out of order, he will get a chance to speak in the debate. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I will sit down if the hon. member has some questions to ask.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. member for Port au Port, I believe, was trying to get the Chair's attention. The hon. member has four minutes remaining for debate.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to reply to some of the statements that the House Leader opposite made prior to the last speaker. Mr. Speaker, first of all, he said that the members on this side were not taking part in this particular Concurrence debate in a way that we should. In other words, he was saying that we were not asking questions of ministers, I take it, and not getting

MR. HODDER: responses from ministers.
Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look in the House right now we see that we have two ministers here - one just left. But all this afternoon we have had two ministers in the House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) was not in the House. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) was in the House because she sits in the House all the time. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was in the House because he has to be in the House. Because he is under the gun so much from the Premier that he sits here all the time. He is taking part in debate however inane he is.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have watched the three concurrence debates. In order to have a proper concurrence debate we have to be able to ask questions of ministers. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has not been in his seat since this debate took place, nor has the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The only two who have been consistently in their seats are the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

When we did the Social Services estimates we had the same circumstances. I checked up and 90 per cent of the time the ministers were not in their seats. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was out in her district when we were doing the Social Services estimates.

MR. MARSHALL: Any minister on this side can answer any question you want answered.

MR. HODDER: Oh, certainly, I am sure, they can answer the question. Yes, I would agree with the House Leader opposite that any member on that side can certainly answer the question, but whether they answer it correctly or whether they give any information to the House or not is another question.

MR. HODDER: The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is the whole Committee system. Now, when the Committee system was drawn up, I thought it was a good system, except after the first year, Mr. Speaker, it started to go to pieces. And the reason it has gone to pieces is because first of all, it does not allow any member of this House to attend any session of the Committees. Because the Committees have been running side by side and simultaneously. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but this year the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) called the Committees while the Easter recess was on so a couple of Cabinet ministers stayed home, the rest went to Florida and the members went home for their Easter break, only to find out that a week later the Committees were on again. So certain members were travelling back and forth across the Province. It is deliberately designed to create confusion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new system. We were told in the beginning that we would try it for one year and if the system did not work we would go back to the old system.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, and there are people in this House who can verify that.

MR. STAGG: Who thought of that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee system is not working. The concurrence debates are not working. The Committee system is not working because there are too many Committees going on at the same time and members who may be sitting on one Committee cannot get to where he has an interest or whatever. It is total confusion. They could be spread out over a longer period of time. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the concurrence debates are not

MR. HODDER: working because the ministers are not sitting in the House and the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) knows whereof I speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The time for the debate has now concluded.
Motion, that the report of the Government Services Estimates Committee be concurred with, carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker:

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, His Honour is due here any moment to give assent to certain bills. He will be here - I think he is - I do not know if anyone would look outside to see whether his car is there or not but I believe he is there. And what we intend to do, we will be going into the Budget Speech next but I think the best thing to do, after His Honour gives assent to the bills, is to move the adjournment, which I will, you know, move the adjournment as soon as His Honour - and perhaps we could -

MR. SPEAKER: Switch to a recess then until His Honour arrives?

MR. MARSHALL: His Honour is here.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we have a recess then until His Honour arrives?

MR. NEARY: Let us do some work while we are waiting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. NEARY: No (inaudible) wasting the taxpayers' money.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentlemen there want, I move that we move into Committee of the Whole and we can consider certain bills while we are waiting for

June 16, 1981

Tape 2546

EC - 4

MR. MARSHALL:

His Honour.

On motion, that the House resolve
itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills.
Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Advisory Council." (Bill No. 31).

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee last met on this bill, as I understand it, an amendment was made to Clause (2) and that amendment did not carry. There was still debate on that amendment.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause (2) as amended, carried.

On motion Clauses (3) through (22) carried.

Motion, that the Committee report the bill with amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act, 1975". (Bill No. 35).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Mining And Mineral Rights Tax Act, 1975". (Bill No. 10)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2548

GS - 1

MR. MARSHALL:

Bill No. 9.

"An Act Respecting The Garnishment
Against The Remuneration Of Public Officials". (Bill No. 9).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Amend The Local School
Tax Act". (Bill No. 7).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Amend The Newfoundland
Teachers' Association Act, 1974". (Bill No. 8).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Amend The Judgment
Recovery (Nfld.) Act". (Bill No. 16).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Amend The Attachment
Of Wages Act". (Bill No. 53).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Enable Insurance
Corporation Of Newfoundland Limited To Become A Federal
Corporation". (Bill No. 51).

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Repeal The Income Tax
Discounters Act". (Bill No. 27)

Motion, that the Committee report
having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Change Of Name Act, 1978". (Bill No. 26).

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Shall clause 1 carry?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for
Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I was not in
the House when this one was debated on second reading. I
have mentioned to the minister one of the changes that I
would like to see, as well, in the Change of Name Act, and
it came about because of a particular situation that I
found myself in on acting for a person who had the legal
custody of a child. This was a situation where a mother was
making an application under the Change of Name Act to have
the child's name changed. And under the act as it now
stands, the consent of the other spouse is required before
the application for change of name is approved. In other
words, a person who has legal custody of a child cannot
obtain a change of name for that child without the written
consent of the separated spouse or divorced spouse or
whatever the case might be.

In the situation that I had,
where I was acting on behalf of the mother, I prepared a
consent and sent it to the father who was separated and had
been separated for some time from the mother. The mother
had the legal - de facto and the legal custody of the
child. The response that I got back from - in this case
it was the husband - was 'you can tell So and So that -
literally what he was saying, 'you can tell her to go to
hell, I am not interested in her and I am not interested in
the child and I will not give consent to anything', so that
at this point the only alternative for the mother, in this
particular case, was to make an application to the court.

MR. THOMS:

to have the court order change the name which puts her into a great deal more expense than normally. I would like to see the act changed so that the consent of the separated spouse, where the application is made by the spouse having the legal custody and the de facto custody of the children, that it would not be required. It would take a simple amendment. I do not think it would prejudice anybody at all. But at the present time the act puts the spouse, be the person, the husband or the wife, in a very awkward position when it comes to making an application under the Change of Name Act. And I would like to see the act changed so that the consent of the spouse that no longer has the legal or de facto custody of the child dispensed with.

MR. NEARY: Well said.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, very briefly the hon. gentleman did discuss that matter with me before and I undertook certainly, you know, to have it looked into and to get back in the Fall session with a definitive reply. Presumably there are two ways it could be accomplished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There presumably would be, you know, at least two ways that the effect could be accomplished. One, by absolutely not requiring the consent of the other person other than the parent who had custody. The other, I suppose, would be to introduce an area of judicial discretion where there was no consent. These are sort of the two possibilities we are looking at. But certainly it is a matter which we have discussed before and we will pursue.

On motion Clause (1) carried.

Motion, that the Committee report the bill without amendment, carried.

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2550

IB-2

A bill, "An Act To Amend The
Newfoundland Human Rights Code". (Bill No. 23)

Motion, that the Committee
report the bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Private Investigation And Security Services". (Bill No. 22).

Motion, the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Admit His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

Arise, please!

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed certain bills, to which in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

A bill, "An Act Respecting Freedom Of Information". (Bill No. 3).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Personal Privacy". (Bill No. 2).

A bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1974". (Bill No. 24).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act". (Bill No. 47).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973". (Bill No. 41).

A Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Environment". (Bill No. 4).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act For The Purpose Of Integrating The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation And The St. John's Housing Corporation". (Bill No. 19).

June 16, 1981, Tape 2551, Page 2 -- apb

A bill, "An Act To Amend
And Consolidate The Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure
Vessels And Compressed Gas". (Bill No. 28).

A bill, "An Act Respecting
Amusement Rides". (Bill No. 29).

A bill, "An Act Respecting
The Drilling Of Water Wells And The Conservation And Use
Of Ground-Water". (Bill No. 6).

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973".
(Bill No. 18).

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Landlord And Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act, 1973
(No. 2)". (Bill No. 88).

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant Governor): In Her
Majesty's Name, I assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for
Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and
reports having passed bill number 31 with amendment, and
the following bills without amendment, bills nos. 35, 10,
9, 7, 8, 16, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: 53, 51, 27, 26, 23 and 22,
and asks leave to sit again.

On motion, report received
and adopted, bills nos. 35, 10, 9, 7, 8, 16, 53, 51, 27, 26,
23 and 22 ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee
ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

The Committee also reported
having passed bill number 31 with amendment.

On motion, report received
and adopted, amendments read now, by leave.

On motion, amendments read
a first and second time bill ordered read a third time on
tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the
House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday,
at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its
rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, June 17, 1981,
at 3:00 p.m.