

VOL. 3

NO. 64

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1981

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: On a point of privilege,

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the morning's news is carrying a story that has to be corrected.

I am not sure whether it is a misprint by the press or a quote that is directly quoted from the federal minister, but they are talking about the selling of squid to Japan and the statement is being made in the paper that I have been critical as a provincial minister of the decision of the federal government to sell 17,000 metric tons of squid to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, this was never mentioned in the House or outside the House. It is not 'sell'; I used the term 'giveaway' because we are not selling the squid, there is no mention of selling squid to Japan, it is where the Japanese fishermen are allowed to come to take and catch 17,000 metric tons of squid from our waters. So the story is incorrect and inaccurate and I want to correct that because I was never critical of the selling of squid - in fact, the more we can sell the better, - but I am critical now and was then of allowing the Japanese fishermen to come and take 17,000 metric tons of squid from our waters. I want that to be on the record as corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with respect to the point of privilege, there really is not a point of privilege. The hon. the minister has taken the opportunity, as we have seen many times in the past, to clarify remarks

MR. SPEAKER: that have been attributed to him in the press and that does not constitute a prima facie case for a point of privilege.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am today tabling a report entitled Labrador Resource Development and Transportation Plan. This report is the result of considerable detailed study undertaken on behalf of government by internal experts and private sector consultants. The report outlines government policy on Labrador and planning efforts to date, summarizes current resource potential and identifies the major constraints and issues affecting development in Labrador. It provides a development strategy for Labrador which represents an ambitious mix of projects and programmes designed to maximize the benefits of our resource endowments.

Development in Labrador is a complex and sensitive issue. The reasons for this are a mixture of social, cultural, environmental, economic and political factors. It is interwoven with resource development generally and economic development for the Province as a whole. Government is acutely aware of these interrelationships and this has in part accounted for the lengthy planning process.

Over the last ten years considerable effort has been expended by commissions, task forces, committees and consultants to establish a comprehensive data base on which to formulate specific development plans for Labrador. What these efforts have shown is that Labrador consists of three distinct social and economic regions, that developments in Labrador

June 19, 1981

Tape 2643

EC - 3

MR. WINDSOR: will have different impacts
depending on the nature of the developments, that the
costs of resource development and transportation invest-
ments will be enormous and that the federal government
will be required to provide substantial

MR. WINDSOR: assistance in Labrador's developments to realize the potential identified.

In April 1979, a Steering Committee of senior government officials was established to oversee the preparation of a Labrador resource development and transportation plan. That committee was composed of representatives at the deputy minister's level from the Executive Council, Departments of Public Works, Transportation, Mines and Energy, Development, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. In addition to this Steering Committee, a Technical Co-ordinating Committee was established to co-ordinate the large number of field investigations initiated and was composed of representatives from all involved departments supervising specific activities in Labrador - Municipal Affairs, Forestry, Environment, Mines and Energy, Public Works, Transportation, Development, Executive Council and a representative as well from DREE. Considerable time and energy has been devoted to ensuring that the projects which are included in this strategy are technically, financially and environmentally feasible. The development strategy proposed in this report is based on the conclusion of previous efforts and the eleven specific studies which were initiated by the committee to provide essential information in determining the mix of projects to be included in the plan.

The studies that were done included: Harbour works and subsidiary facilities; Trans-Labrador highway; Trans-Labrador railway; Energy intensive industries review; Further processing of iron ore; Environmental assessment; Biophysical ecological land survey; Regional mapping for Happy Valley/Goose Bay; Municipal plan update for Happy Valley/Goose Bay; Hydroelectric development; and Winter navigation.

The total cost associated with the

MR. WINDSOR: implementation of these studies is in excess of \$2 million, excluding the time of government officials.

Most of these studies were cost shared with DREE.

The strategy outlined in the report is based upon development of the Gull Island hydroelectric project in combination with an energy intensive industrial customer and export sales of surplus power across Quebec to markets in other provinces or the United States. The strategy recognizes that access to Upper Churchill power is the highest energy priority of the Province but because of the timing of the resolution of the court case for recall power and the application of the Upper Churchill Water Rights Reversion Act are both uncertain, the report concentrates on Lower Churchill hydro development as an alternative option for meeting our energy requirements and at the same time stimulating industrial development in Labrador. This, however, in no way reflects any intent on the part of government to diminish the priority attached to the Upper Churchill in the Province's hydroelectric development strategy.

The development of Gull Island hydroelectric project is estimated to cost in excess of \$4.3 billion and take six and a half years to complete. It will provide over 8,000 man-years of construction employment and is seen as an essential precondition for the establishing of an aluminum smelter.

The Labrador Development strategy has proposed the location of an aluminum smelter at North West Point in Lake Melville.

MR. WINDSOR:

This is one of several energy intensive options available. Negotiations and investigations for energy intensive users have been ongoing for some time but no decision has been finalized on location of this type of industry either on the Island or in Labrador as yet. Additional work is required before such a decision can be made. At this point it is anticipated that the smelter would be built in two phases over a five year period, cost in excess of \$950 million, provide 7,000 man-years employment during construction, have a capacity of 300,000 tons annually and provide on completion 1,200 permanent jobs. Essential conditions for the realization of this project, exclusive of the energy pricing issue, involve: a) financial participation with industry and the Federal Government in the provision of a docksite estimated to cost in the order of \$70 million; b) a water supply system estimated at \$30 million; c) a new townsite which would cost up to \$145 million over a ten year period; and finally, negotiation with the Federal Government to assume its responsibility with respect to Winter navigation into Lake Melville. Careful planning and scheduling of these events is critical in view of the dramatic impact they would have on Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

The development strategy involves a major role for Federal participation through cost-sharing agreements for the construction of the Trans-Labrador highway from Goose Bay to Labrador West. This highway would cost approximately \$320 million and again create short term economic benefits both for eastern and western Labrador and would strengthen Happy Valley - Goose Bay economy in the long run as a service centre and entry point for goods destined for Labrador West. Such a major transportation artery is vital to further development in Labrador and a start on the highway is critical.

MR. WINDSOR:

The Community Development Subsidiary Agreement for Coastal Labrador, which was signed on May 29th of this year, provides some \$39 million for transportation, community services, improvement in local administrative capabilities and feasibility studies over the next five years and will provide substantial benefits to coastal residents.

The signing of the Native Peoples Agreement, hopefully in 1981, will provide additional benefits to native communities along the coast.

The remaining components of the strategy essentially re-emphasize the need to continue existing northern development programmes. Approximately \$10 million will be spent in 1981 - 82. These programmes are aimed at improving government services to coastal Labradorians.

If all of the components of this strategy are successfully implemented, the total capital investment will be in excess of \$7.5 billion in 1980 dollars and will create more than 17,000 construction jobs within the next six to eight years.

Various items which form part of this strategy have already passed the conceptual stage. Portions of the Trans-Labrador Highway have been designed and the attraction of the aluminum smelter to the Province, which will trigger development of the Gull Island hydro-electric project, is being actively pursued. Over the last two years government officials have carried out a number of studies on energy intensive users, both inhouse and through outside consultants. Extensive discussions have been undertaken with a number of companies respecting the establishment of operations

MR. N. WINDSOR: in the Province and detailed analysis is presently ongoing.

Scientific, engineering and technical investigations into the feasibility of Winter navigation in Lake Melville have been ongoing since 1972 but have intensified in the last two years. The two voyages of the Coast Guard Icebreaker Franklin in January and March of 1980 and the M.V. Arctic probe in February and March of this year have demonstrated the technical feasibility of year round navigation. The economics associated with any Winter operation have yet to be assessed but further studies are slated for 1981/82 to refine the technical and economic aspects of year round navigation.

Government's strategy in pursuing this plan is based on the premise that the establishment of a major industry and the provision of required infrastructure and transport improvements will trigger other resource and developments. Considerable potential exists for expansion of our fisheries resource, mineral production, tourism, forest based industries and offshore oil and gas.

The potential for increased cod landings, commercial exploitation of other species such as turbot and shrimp as well as maintaining a substantial yield of salmon and char will mean a significant impact on the employment activity in this sector. Commercial wood harvesting activity, particularly in the Lake Melville/Goose Bay region, is very promising and several forest related opportunities are presently being investigated. In the mineral sector, further exploitation of the large iron ore deposits of the Labrador trough in Western Labrador and the uranium deposits located at Kitts Michelin

MR. N. WINDSOR: show strong potential development. Tourism development presents a real challenge and opportunity. The potential of Labrador's unexplored Northern wilderness offers a variety of assets suitable for outdoor recreation which can be capitalized. In addition, the oil and gas sector holds tremendous promise for Labrador. There is substantial evidence that favourable conditions existed to facilitate the formation of major oil and gas fields. There is a 50 per cent probability that reserves of some 45 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and/or some 1.6 billion barrels of oil are present under the waters off the Labrador coast. The realization of these resource potentials depend in large part on the implementation of the various components of the development strategy.

During the preparation of this report, Mr. Speaker, the Steering Committee has maintained regular contact with Labrador Resources Advisory Council which has been extremely beneficial. However, because of the importance of this strategy, a much wider representation of public opinion is desirable therefore other organizations and individuals are invited to express their opinion on this report and its recommendations. Indeed, meetings will be held in Labrador shortly to discuss concerns of these various groups.

In summary, I would like to reiterate that while the resource potential in Labrador is very high, so too are the costs associated with its development. No matter what avenue of development government chooses there will be extensive constraints, both resources specific and those associated with its development in general. These range from financial restraint to environmental sensitivities, from the need for technical innovations to the resolution of jurisdictional disputes. Government is committed to ensuring the development of Labrador. However, this will require

June 19th., 1981

Tape No. 2646

DW - 3

MR. N. WINDSOR: a concerted effort on the part of various government departments, meaningful dialogue with the federal government and the people of Labrador so that project details and scheduling of activities are organized

MR. WINDSOR: in such a way as to ensure the best returns to the people of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has about five and a half minutes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are all tapping their desks over there on a statement really that says nothing. It took the minister fifteen minutes to make a non-statement. The minister announced nothing, Mr. Speaker, that we do not already know. He ended up by saying that there should be concerted efforts and meaningful dialogue. Meaningful dialogue! We thought the minister when he passed over this eight or ten page statement was going to make an announcement of a big industry for Labrador, some big development in Labrador, when in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, all it is is pure rhetoric. It is academic. The whole statement is completely academic. And the only reason I can see for making the statement was that it is meant to try to offset an announcement that the Federal Minister of Fisheries made yesterday in connection with Labrador. That is the only reason I can see for making this statement at all.

MR. LUSH: Political stratagems.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is political - what is it stratagems?

MR. LUSH: Stratagems.

MR. NEARY: Stratagems is political trickery, is it?

MR. TULK: Political trickery.

MR. NEARY: It is a new word now we are developing, Mr. Speaker. We are branding that as political stratagem, which means it is political trickery. And, Mr. Speaker, it does nothing. We thought the hon. gentleman was going to get up and announce a project like the Upper Churchill or the iron ore

MR. NEARY: deposit in Labrador and in Wabush that was started by the Liberals. But no, none of that, Mr. Speaker, just a fifteen minute statement just wasting the time of the House. It is something that should be turned over to the intellectuals and the academics and let them go off with it. The minister could have tabled it and saved the time of the House. And I think it is shameful. If that is all they have to offer Labrador, Mr. Speaker, I say God help the development of that part of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have two statements to make this morning. I will make the negative one first, Mr. Speaker.

I am extremely disappointed to -

MR. NEARY: You should table it, boy.

MR. MORGAN: - now have confirmed to my office from the federal minister that the federal subsidy on new commercial fishing vessels will now be reduced from 35 per cent down to 25 per cent, and this indeed a real "slap in the face" to our inshore fishermen -

MR. BARRY: You can say that again.

MR. MORGAN: - and indeed a "slap in the face" to the Newfoundland Government, as well as the Fishermen's Union of our Province. The Provincial Government is now paying, and always did pay, 15 per cent bounty or grant on top of the existing, up until now, 35 per cent federal subsidy, so that both subsidies to the fishermen amounted to 50 per cent of the total cost of a new vessel. This action by the federal government means that the overall cost of a new boat to an inshore fisherman will now be increased by an additional 10 per cent. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is a fisherman building a \$300,000 boat, it means

June 19, 1981

Tape No. 2647

NM - 3

MR. MORGAN: it will cost that fisherman now \$30,000 more to build that boat. Also of course financing charges will also be increased proportionately. This means the interest subsidy on loans, made by this government through the Fisheries Loan Board and the chartered banks, that that cost will also rise by 10 per cent, thus reducing the total funds otherwise available from the loan board for new construction

MR.MORGAN: by a similar amount. I also understand, Mr. Speaker, now that the minister has confirmed it,that concurrent with the federal subsidies being reduced the maximum amount of subsidy will be set at \$100,000 for a new wooden vessel and \$125,000 for a new steel vessel,which is even worse for the fishermen of our Province.

While I knew for some time the federal minister was contemplating a reduction in subsidies, I am most upset that the federal government would act at this time when inshore fishermen are facing ever increasing costs in their operating costs,at a time when the prospect of keeping pace with such increases through higher prices are not that bright right now with the price being paid to fishermen for their catch. And in recent weeks the Fishermen's Union has indicated to me that as a result of the existing economic conditions indeed many fishermen are facing imminent bankruptcy.

So at the very least the federal minister should have deferred the implementation of his proposed new subsidy policies until the Royal Commission into the inshore fishery has reported on the economic needs of the inshore fishermen.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say this is yet again another example of the total disregard by the federal government of the views of this Province and the fishermen concerned.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West has about one and a half minutes.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to this

MR. HOLLETT: statement, we are also aware of the reduction of 35 to 25 per cent and needless to say we do not agree with it in principle. There is probably a good rationale behind it but I do not know all the background in it. But I would like to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that it seems both the federal and the provincial government are acting tandem in making it more difficult for fishermen to acquire boats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: I mean, if you look at the basic requirement of what a fishermen who qualifies for a loan is now -75 per cent income, a full-time fishermen for two years, the increase of interest rates from three and a half, to eight per cent, they are cutting out completely the bounties for small boats except in Labrador and I can go on and on.

MR. TULK: They did that two years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: And from our side, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say quite emphatically, I mean, it is high time that the provincial Department of Fisheries and the federal Department of Fisheries sit down and negotiate sensible on behalf of all our fishermen because it seems that one hand does not know what the other hand is doing and the only people that are hurting are the inshore fishermen in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements? The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: With th indulgence of my colleagues, I have some statements here.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave for a second statement, at this time a more positive statement, Mr. Speaker, and some action taken by this government to help the fishermen of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce today a number of changes that have been made to the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board, which is strictly and totally our provincial jurisdiction. These changes have been brought about in response to requests made to me and to the officials of the board by fishermen, and in particular by the Fishermen's Union. Officials of the Department of Fisheries and the board have assessed and reviewed the various suggestions made by the fishermen and the Fishermen's Union and the following changes have now been approved by provincial Cabinet:

We have made some amendments to the Fisheries Loan Regulations effective May 1, 1981. Some of these amendments are to clearly define certain present sections of the regulations which are primarily housekeeping changes. However, two major amendments to the regulations are now being brought forward: One, the maximum loan term for wooden boats has always been ten years. We are now going to increase that period from ten to twelve years for boats which are over ten tons underdeck - that is usually thirty-five feet in length. This has been done since we feel that the life of these wooden vessels have been increased given today's construction standards and maintenance facilities. And that, of course, will mean lesser yearly payments to be made by the fishermen by means of a longer term to pay off their loans.

MR. MORGAN: Number two, Mr. Speaker, we have amended certain sections of the regulations so that the board will have greater decision-making discretion in certain extenuating circumstances since some parts of the present regulations are extremely rigid. And because we find they were somewhat too rigid, we are now changing these regulations and giving the board more power, discretion with regard to what we call extenuating circumstances. In this regard, the amendments enable the board to use discretion in these extenuating circumstances with regard to the eligibility requirements - which was a point just mentioned a few minutes ago - the application of net gain from the sale of an old boat to obtain a new loan, and with regard to the transfer or assignment of an interest in an existing loan between borrowers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased also to announce that we have completely rewritten the Fishing Ships (Bounties) Regulations. These new revised regulations - and I say again they are only revised as a result of the input from the fishermen around the Province to the Fishermen's Union revised regulations now come into force effective May 1st. This is resulting from action that was taken last year when amendments to the Fishing Ships (Bounties) Act allowed for a transitional period of twelve months to enable new standards and specifications and guidelines to be developed. The major changes we have now made in these regulations are mostly technical ones with regard to the construction of boats. We are now going to be developing standard specifications - which are

MR. MORGAN: long overdue in my view in the Province - standard specifications for longliners and guidelines for these standard specs will now be developed.

Therefore the effect of these amendments is to remove all the technical provisions from the Fishing Ships (Bounties) Regulations and to provide in its place the creation of a committee of not more than five departmental officials to establish guidelines, specifications and directives respecting the construction and equipping of ships. Most of this technical work has now been completed and discussions have been held with fishermen, the Fishermen's Union and the Ship Builders Association of the Province concerning the implementation of these new regulations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the most important announcement today to be made with regard to the provincial fisheries and from our government which will be of benefit to the fishermen of our Province, concerns changes to the Province's small fishing boat bounty programme. When the re-organization of the Loan Board occurred and new regulations were put in place little over a year ago, it was felt that the bounties for both small and large boats could be administered using the Fishing Ships (Bounties) Act and regulations. Having now functioned using this system for the past year, and in response to numerous representations - some from MHAs, members of the House of Assembly here but more particularly from Fishermen's Committees themselves and the Fishermen's Union - it was felt that a more efficient and effective administering of the small fishing boat bounty programme could be made by having this as a separate programme. So today, Mr. Speaker, I am announcing a new small fishing boat bounty programme and it contains the following requirements in detail: Bounties will now be paid on all open fishing boats seventeen feet and over for all residents of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, for all other fishermen around the Province, it will be boats twenty-five feet and over. Bounty will be paid on partially and fully decked fishing boats which are less than ten tons underdeck, which means usually thirty-five feet. The outlined regulations here, I will table these following regulations, But there is one important one which I want to go on record on and that is the bounty will be paid based upon a rate per foot. In this regard we have made modifications to this rate - and by the way, it is a slight increase to the fishermen, not a decrease as the federal minister has done with his subsidies and bounties - based upon the type of boat that can be built under the small fishing boat bounty programme. And these are open fishing boats, in other words, not decked, they will receive \$45 a foot, Mr. Speaker. - that is a grant from our Newfoundland government - and partly decked fishing boats at \$80 per foot and fully decked fishing boats at \$100 per foot. That is action from our government when we have jurisdiction over the Fisheries Loan Board assistance to fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will close this statement by saying that these changes are made after lengthy consultations with all parties concerned. We do have a mechanism in place for consultations, that a consultation practice will be carried on in the future and if any further changes are made to any regulation of the loan board, it will be only after, only after extensive consultation. But I am convinced, after this consultation and now these changes, it means a benefit to all the fishermen of our Province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in linking with the Fisheries Loan Board and these regulations, of course, the most important thing - and I gave a copy of this to my colleague, the spokesman on fisheries in the Opposition, copies of all these statements - is the makeup of the board, the Fisheries Loan Board. This is the final announcement regarding the Fisheries Department today. The makeup of the Fisheries Loan Board; some time ago when we announced the new Fisheries Loan Board we said then we would rotate the fishermen serving on that board.

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. Peddle? Where have you put him?

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (S. Neary), who is not concerned with the drift-net salmon fishermen problem and the other problems, would keep quiet right now -

MR. NEARY: Where did you put him?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order please!

MR. MORGAN: - I could make this statement which is important to all fishermen around the Province, including LaPoile fishermen.

MR. NEARY: Where did you shove Peddle?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the makeup of this new board for the coming year which will be effective July 1st and will serve until next year, due the same time, July 1st. And of course, the same chairman, Mr. Fred Pike; Mr. Ray Andrews, who is an assistant deputy minister of the Department of Fisheries, will serve as deputy chairman. Mr. Eric Wells, who is the director of internal audit in the Department of Finance, will serve on that loan board. Mr. Charlie Parrott, who is a federal employee, the regional manager of the Fishermen's Assistance Plans, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, we will be working in close co-ordination with him. He is an excellent civil servant and we find him very valuable on the loan board. Mr. Kevin Carroll, he is an official of the Newfoundland Fishermen's Food and Allied Workers Union, he is there on the board as an official representative of the Fishermen's Union because he is really an employee of the union. And, importantly, Mr. Speaker, the last two, but not the least important, are two very valuable fishermen. In this case we are appointing Mr. Peter Hennebury, an in-shore fisherman of Lord's Cove. He has been fishing for the last eleven or twelve years, full-time. He is the chairman of the Fishermen's committee in his area and he has good close working relationship with all the fishermen in his general area. He has now been appointed, as of July 1st, to the Fisheries Loan Board, and of course, he is from the South coast of the Province.

MR. MORGAN:

Also, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Wicks. I think Arthur Wicks is well known to all fishermen around the Province, in fact, to members of this House of Assembly. He is known to be a straightforward, sensible, solid individual and also a good fisherman and we are pleased to have him appointed now to the loan board to represent the Northwestern part of the Province-or the Northeast coast, rather, of the Province. And he is indeed a man who is always bringing forward problems of the fishermen. The fishermen seem to have good faith in him because I know he is calling me every second week or so with problems, and not on his behalf, not on his own problems, but

MR. J. MORGAN: on behalf of other fishermen, he is working on behalf of other fishermen. And we are glad to have him working now with us on the Fisheries Loan Board to the benefit of all fishermen in our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West has about five minutes.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I must say it is music to my ears to hear the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) come up with some improvements and modifications and that and like the hon. minister I would like to congratulate the Fishermen's Union for their major input into those changes. They have been working for quite some time. And also I would like to compliment Mr. Pike and the previous members of the Loan Board because they were also greatly involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments in relation to some of the proposed changes. I think, as I have already said, the majority are a great improvement, and I trust that the fishermen in the Province will be notified in the very near future of the changes made. Standard specifications and guidelines: I think it is long overdue but I would also like to suggest to the minister here and his colleagues when he makes up his committee that when we are talking about standard specifications and guidelines that it will go a bit further. I certainly think that it is high time in this Province that if we are going to finance machinery and equipment for fishing

MR. D. HOLLETT: boats then it should only be purchased from suppliers who will make a commitment that they will keep spares on hand. I know the minister, and I think all of us who represent fishing districts, it happens only too often in the peak of a fishing season that a simple mechanical part would give out and the boat is tied up because there is not a spare probably in Canada. I think that is terribly important.

In relation to the little small fishing boat bounty regulation, personally I am still at a loss why the subsidy only applies to Labrador fishermen. I do not think the cost of fishermen -

MR. J. MORGAN: (inaudible) put boats in Labrador.

MR. TULK: Well, why not the rest of the people in the Province settling for twenty-five?

MR. J. MORGAN: The people of Labrador use seventeen foot boats.

MR. TULK: They use them here too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to be argumentative but I think it is fair to say, as I think the minister said the other day in relation to fishing areas in the bottoms of bays and there are thousands of boats from seventeen to twenty-five feet used by full-time fishermen in this Province. And I do not think it costs the fishermen in Labrador any more to build his own eighteen foot boat than it does in Gander Bay or in Bay d' Espoir. But if there is a rationale, I am sure in due course the minister will let us know.

June 19th., 1981

Tape No. 2652

DW - 3

MR. TULK: As a matter of fact, Gander Bay sells them to Labrador.

MR. D. HOLLETT: The other thing which is not here, if the minister would care to inform the House, I would like to know, referring to section six in the new regulations, he says these are open fishing

June 19, 1981

Tape No. 2653

NM - 1

MR. HOLLETT: boats of \$45 a foot, partly decked fishing boats at \$80 a foot in the rates, you know we can have trap skiffs which are open fishing boats up to forty, forty-odd feet. And just for the sake of clarification, if the minister would care to make it, I am sure it would be appreciated by us all.

In relation to the new appointments to the loan board, Mr. Speaker, I think that is an excellent selection. Personally I know Mr. Andrews, Mr. Parrott, Mr. Carroll and Mr. Hennebury, and slightly know Mr. Wicks, and I am sure that with those people on the board, and with the new guidelines which the minister has agreed to, I am looking forward to more improvements in the loan board over the next year or two.

Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question was going to be for the Premier but I will have to direct it to the Minister of Health, seeing that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat.

I was shocked and amazed to hear the Minister of Health admit this morning on CBC radio that he is aware that senior citizens are being charged \$4, a dispensing fee, for drugs and they are only receiving one month's supply from certain drug stores in the Province, which creates a real hardship and creates an awful lot of inconvenience. And the hon. gentleman, I was surprised to hear him say that there was nothing he could do about it, that this was a matter for the Newfoundland Pharmaceutical Association.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this is the highest court in the land, this House here, and I am sure that the House could deal with that matter. Would the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman care to tell the Legislature, tell the members of the House of Assembly what he intends to do about this rip-off?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made a press release yesterday regarding the senior citizens programme and of course - a drug programme - which is one of the better senior citizens drug programmes we have in Canada. What that drug programme does, of course it helps those people on high cost drugs. And that was the objective of it, to help the people who needed it most.

The fact is that there has been - the policy with the Department of Health is still that we permit a 100 day supply of drugs. And sometimes we have known in a couple of cases, a few cases, and I have been notified of this, there have been pharmacists who feel that they have the right to determine that they will only fill a prescription for 30 days. And we are working on that now and of course we are meeting constantly with the Pharmaceutical Association on it.

As a matter of fact, there has been a tremendous amount of improvement.

MR. HOUSE: there were a fair number only giving thirty days but we know now that the policy is still up to one hundred days for certain drugs. There are certain drugs that you cannot give a three month period for because of the chemical and that sort of thing. But the doctor is the prescriber and it is the doctor who determines the length or the volume of the prescription and the pharmacists are bound, as far as we are concerned, to fill these prescriptions. There are some cases where we are not quite happy about it but we are working on it and I am sure that we are going to evolve one of the better drug programmes in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Senior Citizens Drug Programme is in such an incredible mess when you get weak statements like that by the minister who says the doctor can recommend three month supply, six month supply, a year's supply but the druggist does not have to fill it.

MR. HOUSE: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: Well that is what is happening. The doctor is recommending and the druggists are saying, "no". But I will deal with that shortly, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that every prescription that is taken to the drug store, that the senior citizen has to pay \$4.00? If he takes two, three, prescriptions at any given time he has to pay \$4.00 for each prescription. If there are three or four items or half a dozen items on one prescription he is charged \$4.00 for each item on one prescription. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that and if he is what does he intend to do about it?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is a traditional practice that is traditional with the pharmacist, That is the way pharmacists dispense: Every drug is separate prescription. That has always been the case. The only reason it is identified now is because we are isolating the dispensing fee from the cost of the drug. We are paying the cost of the drug for senior citizens and they have to pay the prescription fee. That is not new, that was always the fact even when the hon. member was the Minister of Social Services, so any difference now is that it is isolated and set apart. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Pharmaceutical Association of Canada deems that it costs about \$3.50 to fill a prescription and, you know, that is standard practice everywhere in Canada.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely shameful. The hon. gentleman just attempted to deceive the House by saying that this is tradition. This is not tradition. One prescription - the charge before was on one prescription but since the introduction of this programme the druggists are now charging \$4.00 for each item on a prescription. If there are four items on that is \$16 for a prescription, and that is not traditional and never happened before. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman again what he is going to do about it? Is it necessary to have a dispensing charge at all? Why a dispensing charge? If you go to buy food or a piano or a television or any other type of goods you do not have to pay a dispensing charge. Why do you have to pay it to

June 19, 1981

Tape No. 2654

ah-3

MR. NEARY: a drug store? Why can it not be made illegal by this House?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, pharmacists are like other professional people and

MR. HOUSE: that is the way they make their money, through dispensing fees. They do not charge - there is no markup on the drugs. The drugs are dispensed at cost and there is a prescription fee. Heretofore, as I have mentioned, it was always put together and some of them did have a markup on the high cost drugs. But what it is now we have no markup on drugs and a dispensing fee is charged and, Mr. Speaker, it has always been - if there is four or five items on one prescription, it means four or five different prescriptions. A pharmacist has to label and document every one of these in the dossier that they keep on each particular client.

I am not overly happy. I am not able to determine a pharmacist's fees any more than I am able to determine a lawyer's fees or anybody else. We are able to determine somewhat a medical fee because of the fact that we pay it and we are able to negotiate that. There are negotiations we have with pharmacists on fees for indigent drugs because we pay it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not new and the great advantage to having a dispensing fee rather than having the markup on drugs is that a twenty-five dollar drug marked up would be very costly to the consumer. Now, a person can get a twenty-five dollars drug for four dollars - and he may have had to pay four dollars for a two dollar drug. But the fact is that it is a tremendously good programme. As a matter of fact, it is amazing to receive letters from senior citizens giving us credit and praise for the programme because we have people today -

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we had people last year who were spending \$100 a month on drugs who are getting them now for no more than \$16 and that is the great advantage to the programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing if the hon. gentleman ever received one letter from senior citizens as a result of the incredible mess that the hon. gentleman has made of this programme. The letters are coming in, alright, but coming to the Opposition office critical of the programme and of the minister for not taking steps after representation was made to remedy these situations that I am raising.

Number one, is the hon. gentleman aware that as a result of druggists only allowing one month's supply of drugs - for instance, if they have to break a bottle of pills, that there is a higher charge to the taxpayer as a result of that, that the cost, instead of being ten cents a pill could be twenty cents a pill and that the government is forced to pay more for that drug than they would if they allowed the prescription to be filled as recommended by the doctor?

And is he also aware that in the rural parts of this Province, as a result of people being forced to hire taxis and to drive longer distances to see doctors and go to drugstores, that it is costing them more? And the hon. gentleman also made a statement that that is how the pharmacists make their money by charging the four dollars.

MR. NEARY: Is he aware that they are making - it is one of the most lucrative businesses in the world where they can make more than 50 per cent profit on their drugs. Now is the hon. gentleman defending that policy?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the profit that the drugists make on drugs are made from their dispensing fee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOUSE: The fact that it is costing -

MR. NEARY: Do not be so naive, boy.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman knows all the answers, I am wondering why he is asking the question?

MR. BARRY: He thinks he knows all the answers.

MR. HOUSE: He thinks he knows, yes. He gets a few little clips from somebody and, of course, he makes a fool of himself by standing up and saying, 'That is going to cost more by breaking a particular bottle of drugs'. The fact is the drug is the same whether they dispense the cost to us -

MR. NEARY: They went to the Premier and he would not do anything about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: The cost to us is the same whether they dispense it in thirty day amounts or sixty day amounts or 100 day amounts, it is the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of doctors who will not prescribe over thirty days, there are other doctors who will prescribe up to 100 - it is standard. We have standards across Canada, a 100 day prescription is not abnormal for certain drugs; for others the drug just cannot stand up that long. And we leave that entirely up to the doctor.

There have been a few cases, and I stated that at the beginning, where -

MR. NEARY: Why do not do something about it?

MR. HOUSE: - pharmacists have refused, and I have asked people to contact me about that, and it is very few cases and that is being remedied, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: No wonder they call you House (inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Well, boy, that is a bad cut.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power),

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: It concerns the spray for the spruce budworm. I understand that the minister said yesterday that given the weather conditions and so on that it may be difficult to get the programme completed and perhaps we would end up with, I think it is one-sixth done now and it may indeed be difficult to get it completed as it was originally planned. So the question for the minister is what areas have we sprayed, what areas are we putting priority on, where are they, are they mostly on Crown lands or are they on company lands?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the spray programme, obviously as everyone knows from the news media and here in the House that we have had some very serious problems with weather conditions. It seems that when the weather is fine the winds are too high to allow the spray programme to be conducted, and as we have made a commitment to the people of this Province not to spray in winds in excess of ten miles, we have not been spraying in any conditions like that. We have had a lot of foggy, rainy kind of weather that the spray

MR. POWER: programme was not able to be conducted in. So far, I think, up to yesterday morning we had 270,000 acres that received the first application of matacil and we had 30,000 or 40,000 acres that received the first application of Bt. All this spraying is taking place in the Central Newfoundland portion of the Province. It is primarily in the areas where the highest budworm counts are. I am not sure exactly the breakdown between company and Crown limits, but we are monitoring the programme every day, we monitor the spray blocks that we have delineated as priority areas. The areas where the budworm counts are highest are going to be sprayed

MR. POWER: first, just in case we do have further delays in the spray programme because of weather conditions.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the effect of the spruce budworm in this Province is well-known if you travel around the Province. I would like to ask the minister, if he ends up with only one-sixth of the spray programme done this year, since it is deemed to be so important, what effect will that have on the overall timber supply in this Province four or five years down the road?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows from last year's Royal Commission report and its presentation here in the House and the reason and decision that government made in relation to the spray programme, we set down about a million acres that needed to be sprayed this year as high priority areas where infestations were projected to be very high. I am delighted to say that at least one block that was projected with high infestation of the budworm, the counts, when we went back to check on a daily basis - we have been checking all through May and all through June every single day - that one of those fairly large spray blocks has less budworms in it than was projected and we were able to drop it from the spray programme. So that is certainly good news from a government management point of view. As it relates to the effect of what would happen if we did not complete all of the spray blocks this year, then we would lose

MR. POWER: another significant amount of timber this year. I think the figures that were presented in the Royal Commission report was something like sixteen million cords of wood that had been lost out of a total cordage in the Province available for the resource of ninety million or ninety-two million or something in that area. So we have lost up to this year about 23 per cent of productive forest in the Province. Certainly, any further losses will make it extremely difficult to run the forest industry in the Province the way we would like to see it run.

We are still optimistic, Mr. Speaker, that in the next two weeks we can get most of the spray programme carried out and that that in conjunction and in combination with the massive forest management money that is being put into the industry over the next five years we will be able to continue to have a very viable forest industry in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, if he does not get his spray programme off, will that be, in a sense, money wasted? And what else is the government planning on getting into such as thinning, replanting and so on? What other restrictions are they thinking of placing on the (inaudible), supposing that the spray programme in this Province, given the regulations that you have are not successful?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, anyone in the Province who is informed on the forest industry certainly is fully aware of the massive improvements we have made since 1974 with our Forest Management Taxation Act and certainly the major initiatives and motives that we did last year where we first of all convinced the companies to put in \$24 million to \$25 million, where with the signing of a DREE agreement we have \$45 million to put into silvicultural operations over the next five years, the massive amount of money that has been put into the forest industry by both companies and individuals, the new land tenure arrangements we are working out with both of the paper companies to make sure that we have full control over the management of the forest resource, all of those things, Mr. Speaker, are being done so that we can have a very viable forest industry and a forest resource in Newfoundland for hundreds of years down the road.

The problem related to the spruce budworm is

MR. POWER: exactly what balance you have and how much you lose this year. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House, and the government particularly, support the spray programme for the protection of the forest resource. I am not equally sure that certain members opposite support a spray programme or the protection of the forest resource, from petitions being presented as of late, being signed by members opposite who are saying that they are against a spray programme, against the protection of the forest resource. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has done everything that is humanly possible to protect the forest resource and we are making great efforts in managing that resource and making it better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MOORES: Terra Nova?

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy House Leader.

MR. MOORES: Deputy House Leader.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), I will ask the question to the Premier, and I wonder if the Premier can -

MR. MOORES: Here he comes. Here he comes. Here he comes. Here he comes.

MR. LUSH: He is coming?

MR. MOORES: Yes, he is coming.

MR. LUSH: All right.

MR. MOORES: He has been ducking out for the last three weeks or a month.

MR. LUSH: Well my question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is, I wonder if he can specifically indicate to the House the criteria which was used by his department in allocating funds for its 1981-82 Capital Works Programme? In other words, can the minister specify the criteria

MR. LUSH: that was used in the areas that were named in this document passed to us a couple of weeks ago? What criteria was used?

MR. MOORES: Now that is appropriate enough.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the criteria of course has two main components, the first one being need and the other is how effectively the individual members from different ridings presented the case of their constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Terra Nova, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: That is pretty low politics. How childish and how foolish can you get!

MR. MORGAN: You can heave it out, but you cannot take it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Having said that, Mr. Speaker, given that answer, I would ask the minister whether or not the minister submitted to Cabinet a brief that was submitted to him from the Port Blandford to Winter Brook Rural Development Association, a brief putting forth their case why their road should have been paved? Did the minister submit that brief before Cabinet? - without the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) prompting.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of petitions presented to my department from time to time and I do not feel a need on all occasions to bring them to the attention of my colleagues in Cabinet. If I consider it a need I will do so.

MR. BARRY: That is telling them.

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

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

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) having briefs presented and Hansard will reveal, Mr. Speaker, who has been doing the work.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: Sure if you think he is so bad why do you not run against him.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is not a member who has put forward more representations -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - more petitions for the pavement of roads in his area than the member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUSH: And I am the member for Terra Nova and the minister can go through the records and find it out.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: So the minister now, Mr. Speaker, has come forward with two criterias.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: Well take him on.

June 19, 1981

Tape No. 2658

NM - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra

Nova has the floor.

MR. MOORES:

Let her go 'Tom', boy, let

her go.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has identified now two criteria. I am asking now whether they have - and the two criteria were needed, Mr. Speaker, and of course the representation by the individual M.H.A. , or the kind of effort that he put into it, neither of which was identified in the government blueprint, that great blueprint, which said that the primary criteria will be for resource development. Now I am asking the minister, have the scrapped that?

MR. LUSH: Has his department scrapped that criteria now for resource development - paving roads, doing roads to help develop resources. Have they now scrapped that one?

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

MR. NEARY: Boy, I will tell you you have got it coming. You would not win fourteen seats right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Have you got a poll?

MR. NEARY: I can show you a poll. Put it to the test.

MR. BARRY: Poor boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. Minister of Transportation has the floor.

MR. NEARY: The truth hurts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to whisper maybe so we can hear what the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is saying.

MR. NEARY: How about the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: And the Premier, too, yes.

MR. MOORES: Our Brian is ready to go.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it is the objective of this government -

MR. MOORES: We are going to send him to Alberta when we give him the flick.

MR. DAWE: - to always develop the resources of this Province for the benefit of the residents of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: And unless DREE has changed part of their mandate to help develop the resources in the economic base of individual areas of Canada, perhaps they should be spoken to about their withdrawal of funding for various road projects that have been submitted by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: I think that was an amazing play by the minister this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Two questions that I asked the minister that he just completely disregarded.

MR. MOOREFS: That is the worst display we have seen by a minister. You asked for it.

MR. LUSH: I want to ask the minister whether or not he submitted the brief that was submitted to him by the Rural Development Committee from Port Blandford to Winter Brook, whether that brief was submitted to Cabinet and, secondly, whether the government have now discarded that criteria that was put forward by the blueprint for development, namely that the roads would be paved in those areas with resource potential? Is the minister now scrapping that and did he present the brief presented to him by the Port

MR. LUSH: Blandford to Winter Brook Rural Development Association for pavement of roads in that area?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I have already that this government is in favour of resource development and roads are a primary objective in that development.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, what goes on in Cabinet is -

MR. MOORES: None of our business.

MR. DAWE: Exactly. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. LUSH: The people of Terra Nova, when they get the Hansard they will know what they have over there. When they get the Hansard, they will know what they got for ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. LUSH: They will know what they got for ministers. They will know how concerned they are for the Terra Nova district.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will ask the hon. Deputy House Leader to restrain himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, approximately three months ago during the Bellevue campaign, a gentleman from Hodge's Cove announced that there would be an expansion to the Boy's Home at Whitbourne. And if I can get the attention of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) for a moment, I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services what will be the nature of that expansion which was announced approximately three months ago by the gentleman from Hodge's Cove? What will be the nature of the expansion to the Boy's Home at Whitbourne and how soon can we expect a tender call on that particular project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question under advisement (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), he is always out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There was an answer there, I believe.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that - we assume at least that that was an empty political promise, that it will be a promise that will be kept like the promise to the people down in Southwest Arm regarding their roads, that there will be an expansion to the Boy's Home at Whitbourne - I want to ask the Minister of Social Services does this mean that there will be a turnaround as pertains to thinking regarding the Boy's Home? A while ago the staff was being cut back there and so on. Can we expect an upgrading of the facilities and the staff at the Boy's Home at Whitbourne?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my department has already -

MR. NEARY: Where did you stow Peddle away?

MR. MORGAN: Down in (inaudible) near Panama.

MR. NEARY: That is a long way from Panama.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Order, please! I must ask the hon. member for LaPoile to restrain himself. There are other people here in the House who have to talk and we cannot hear a word they are saying.

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: In response to the hon. gentleman's question, my department is always making changes and improvements in our overall policy with regards to various programmes, programmes pertaining to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - corrections are certainly no exception. We have expanded a number of areas in terms of community based services -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - (inaudible) homes of one kind or another. Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: This is a disgrace.

MR. T. HICKEY: - there are changes taking place at the federal level with regards to the Young Offenders Act, which is in the House of Commons on the Order Paper, I understand. And the coming on of that new legislation, the Young Offenders Act, has all kinds of ramifications pertaining to institutions and institutional care. It is not known yet exactly what role and what the future of Whitbourne might be. But certainly the coming on of the Young Offenders Act is a matter which will have to be gone into and the institution at Whitbourne certainly would be one that would be taken into account. So I will have to get some further detail with regards to the specific question.

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

MR. D. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). In his absence I probably could direct it to the Premier or otherwise.

MR. S. NEARY: He is over there looking out the window.

MR. TULK: He is coming! He is coming!

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the question is since you so kindly open the curtains and the sun has come out, it reminds me of a very important issue to a lot of people in this Province right now. It is concerning calcium chloride. I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation if the supply of calcium chloride for the Province this year has arrived in the Province? If it has, has it been distributed to the depots, and if it has been distributed to the depots when will it be spread?

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

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the contract for the calcium chloride was in two parts, one for the Eastern section of the Province. That was a liquid calcium and that has already been put in most areas, if not all areas now with an application in the built up regions where they have dirt roads. The second portion is what is known as a flake. It has about the consistency of salt and it is applied to the roads in the Western section of the Province. That supply should be in the Province at Botwood, stored there in the depot, by the end of this month.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, a quick supplementary. The minister referred to the Eastern section and the Western. Is there a central section or which section does the Burin and Bonavista peninsulas come under?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. R. DAWE: It is included in the Eastern section.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion 1. Committee of Ways and Means, the Budget Debate. Yesterday we were debating the amendment which was proposed by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for St. John's North, who has about fourteen minutes remaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I used the few minutes I had to prove conclusively that the Prime Minister of Canada is a snake, and that would make the hon. gentlemen opposite, I guess, snake charmers. In fact, the chief snake charmer is seldom in his seat, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) who sits on the corner there. He obviously does not take much interest in his district, spends most of his time downtown making money. I suppose that is his prerogative. He is certainly in a profession that allows him to make a great deal of money, and I suppose he prefers that to representing a district. Why he bothers to represent a district - he does not live there, he seldom goes there and he shows no interest there; there is none of his family who have any connection there. I find it very hard to understand why he would even bother to represent that district. Perhaps he is just keeping the seat warm for some other Liberal, I do not know. Anyway, that is all beside the point.

The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) made a very penetrating point here the other day. He said that most of the members opposite are absentee members, they do not live in their districts, they have no interest in their districts; they only go there for quarterly visits; they have no family connection

MR. CARTER: with their districts. They are carpetbaggers in every sense of the word.

MR. LUSH: Who are you talking about?

MR. CARTER: Most of the hon. members opposite. Most of them.

MR. LUSH: I know more of my constituents than the hon. member will ever know of his, on a first name basis.

MR. CARTER: Well, I would ask the hon. gentleman, does he know their last names?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT: Name them!

MR. CARTER: Yes, name them! I would gladly take my seat while he names the handful of his constituents that he knows.

MR. LUSH: That is so ridiculous!

MR. CARTER: If the hon. member would like to name the constituents that he knows, first names or last names, I will gladly take my seat for the few seconds that it would take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: As I say, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) made a very good point.

MR. LUSH: Sit down, boy.

MR. CARTER: He made the point. There is no need for me to repeat it, I am just referring to it in passing.

MR. LUSH: What arrogance! What tripe and arrogance.

MR. CARTER: But it is absolutely true, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to drive home the point, but I could go from district to district. The hon. members have very little interest in their districts. Now, perhaps if they played musical chairs, perhaps if those who actually lived in one of the districts that is represented

MR. CARTER: by some other Liberal were to exchange - and I wonder would it be possible by leave for members to change districts without going through the formality of an election? Perhaps if the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) were to represent - I cannot think where he could represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Try it! Why do you not try it?

MR. CARTER: I do not know if it is within the competence of this Legislature to permit such rearrangement, but it might call for better district representation.

However, this is the Budget Debate and I have been sidetracked by dishonourable members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: There are a number of points that should be made.

A columnist for whom I have a great deal of respect has put it in a nutshell saying that we can always do a little bit better. And he is right. I do not think any of us can come up with some instant solutions to our problems, except to say that if we work a

MR. CARTER: little harder we can perhaps do a little bit better. Members of the Opposition, if they tried they could harangue a little bit more, they could be a little more obstructive; they could be a little more abusive if they tried - although I wonder if they could; they have been doing pretty well in that department.

And it has been proven, shown beyond any shadow of a doubt, that economic power does not have to be concentrated in order for the economy to work. And by the same token I would like to suggest that political power does not have to be concentrated for our political system to work, and in that respect I would like to just sow this seed among hon. members - I would like for them to consider the possibility of a county system for Newfoundland along the same lines as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Now I realize they have a longer tradition -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Peter Worthington.

MR. CARTER: Peter Worthington? What is this about Peter Worthington?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) in reverse this morning.

MR. CARTER: So I would just like members to think in terms of what a county system would do if it was introduced into Newfoundland. I do not suggest that the counties have the same boundaries as the electoral district, I think this would be a mistake.

MR. CALLAN: How about the ward system in St. John's?

MR. CARTER: I think any ward system that had the same boundaries as the electoral boundaries would be a mistake because you just have two tiers competing with each other, or three tiers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CARTER: But the burning question that I find when I am going around out in the streets is not the

MR. CARTER: economy, is not the Constitution; the burning question on many people's minds - it is addressed to me time and time again - they say, 'Tell me once and for all, does the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) have or not have the manners of a pig?' And this is the question. I find that very hard to answer.

MR. BARRETT: There is no problem to answer that one. Yes, a resounding yes.

MR. CARTER: Some people say yes, some people say no. The question has not yet been resolved.

So on that happy note, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I oppose the amendment and I certainly support the government's budgetary proposals.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that so-called speech made by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) started yesterday and finished this morning is a kind of speech that does not do any service to this hon. House or to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE: It is a shameful display of personal attacks going from the Prime Minister of Canada to hon. members on this side of the House of Assembly. Now I challenge the Premier of this Province to publish the Hansard, the speech made by the member for St. John's North in defense of his administration on a vote of non-confidence. And the people of Newfoundland will really see what the

MR. F. ROWE: government side is made up of. It was a shocking, shocking half hour, Mr. Speaker, and did nothing for the decorum of this House or to gain the respect of the people in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will not come as any surprise to hon. members opposite to know that I will be supporting whole-heartedly the amendment introduced by my colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), which essentially says this, that we are calling for a vote of non-confidence in this administration for the simple fact that the provincial debt controls the actions of this

MR. F. ROWE:

provincial government. There is one big factor, one big item, one big thing that is behind every decision made by this government, that is controlling the actions of this government, and that is the magnitude of the provincial debt.

The provincial government itself has lost control over the provincial debt, and in fact the provincial debt is controlling the actions of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious situation and one that hon. members on both sides of the House should speak to very, very seriously, not in the jocular joking, silly, foolish manner that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) spoke to it, because it is a very serious amendment.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we have a debt in the order of \$3.2 billion in this Province at the present time. Now the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) yesterday related back to the terribly difficult times that they had back in 1972 when they had to deal with the strangulation debt that they inherited from the Liberal Government at that time.

The President of the Council, Mr. Speaker, in making that statement proved the seriousness and the gravity of this amendment that has been moved by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). If the debt in 1972 was \$750 million, less than \$1 billion, if that was the debt in 1972, and the Province, according to the President of the Council, was on the verge of bankruptcy then, and the PC Administration had a strangulation debt to contend with, as he described it, what kind of a situation must we be in today with a \$3.2 billion debt? We must be past the point of bankruptcy. We must be completely strangulated. And this

MR. F. ROWE: is why the member for LaPoile
(Mr. Neary) brought this particular amendment in.

MR. HANCOCK: That is a fact. That is no bull.

MR. F. ROWE: If a government was defeated
partially because of the size of the debt in 1971-1972 -

MR. HANCOCK: I would hate for an election to
be called now.

MR. F. ROWE: - what would happen if an election
were called today, Mr. Speaker? And why is it that we brought
this particular amendment in as a vote of non-confidence in
the government? It is for that particular reason.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in a situation
where this administration is on the verge of having to
borrow money, having to borrow money for the purpose of servicing
the debt that now exists.

DR. COLLINS: No, it is not true.

MR. F. ROWE: 'No, it is not true.' Well
I hope I will heard from the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
when he gets up to speak on the amendment, and on the main
motion.

DR. COLLINS: I have already spoken.

MR. F. ROWE: Well probably the hon. Minister of
Finance can educate one of his other colleagues over there
to correct me if I am wrong.

But, Mr. Speaker, I again go
back to 1972 and Messrs. Crosbie and Company were going around
this Province making the very same accusation, "We are on the
verge of bankruptcy. The Province is now on the verge of
borrowing money in order to service the debt." And he said
at that time that any business or any household in that
particular situation that has to borrow money to pay the
interest on their debt is in fact bankrupt.

Well, if that was the

MR. F. ROWE: situation in 1972 with a \$750 million debt. What must be the situation now in 1981 with a \$3.2 billion debt? It is a very serious situation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) yesterday used the foolish, silly argument, an argument completely lacking in logic, that this vote of confidence, non-confidence in the government is a vote against hospitals, roads and that sort of a thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is so lacking in logic it is hardly worth bringing up as a subject of debate here this morning. Need I remind the President of the Council, Mr. Speaker, that in 1971 we had a newly elected administration, the P.C. administration, who came before this House with the Throne Speech televised for all of the people of this Province, presented the Throne Speech in this Chamber, and via the T.V.'s and radios to every person in this Province, and the Throne Speech was defined by the President of the Council a number of years ago as the most important document that a can present because it lays out the year's programme, the year's programme for the government. And what did the government do then, Mr. Speaker? They turned around - they did not even debate it in the House of Assembly - they turned around and dissolved the House of Assembly and went before the electorate. Now that is far worse than what the President of the Council was trying to indicate yesterday, that a vote of non-confidence is a vote against hospitals, roads, etcetera.

No such thing, Mr. Speaker. This is a device-as all hon. members know in this House about a vote of non-confidence- for hon. members to get up and point out the weaknesses in the government's strategies and plans and lack of action. It gives hon. members on both sides of

MR. F. ROWE: the House an opportunity to debate it and then vote accordingly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest indicators of the fact that the provincial government actions is being controlled by the provincial debt in this Province is what is going on in the field of education, what is going on in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech of 1974, seven years ago, one of the big items in that Throne Speech was that a new polytechnical institute would begin construction immediately. A polytechnical institute, Mr. Speaker, seven years ago was promised for the people of this Province. And that was a legitimate and a good aim, a good policy statement for the government to make, particularly when one realizes that this Province could become highly industrialized as a result of offshore exploration, then the developmental stage and then the production stage with respect to oil and gas, with respect to the harnessing of the lower rivers in Labrador and then the spin-off industries, such as aluminum plants and what have you, that one could attract to this Province as a result

MR. F. ROWE: of these particular resource developments. A polytechnical institute was an absolute prerequisite, was an absolute necessity for this Province, for our young people to become trained in the various technologies that were required so that we could have true Newfoundland job preference by a natural occurrence instead of this silly declaration of Newfoundland preference for jobs when we have a true Canadianism where Newfoundlanders in the thousands, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity to cross borders in this nation of ours, go to Alberta, go to British Columbia, go to Manitoba, go to any part of this great nation of ours and seek employment if they cannot get employment here in Newfoundland, which they cannot.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest part of Newfoundland's work force is working outside of this Province because we are a nation. But here in Newfoundland we have a declared Newfoundland job preference which is making Newfoundlanders ashamed throughout this nation. We would not need such a job preference policy, Mr. Speaker, if we had in this Province what was promised by this administration seven years ago, a polytechnical institute in order to train our young Newfoundlanders and educate our young Newfoundlanders to go into the types of jobs that are springing up in this Province now. But it goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the government debt is controlling the actions or lack of actions of this government. We do not have a polytechnical institute, Mr. Speaker. Why not? Because the administration has allowed the provincial debt to close to quadruple in half the time that it took the previous Liberal administration to increase its debt. We go to another thing, Mr. Speaker. We can remember in 1975, another Throne Speech, that it was promised by this administration that work would begin on residences for the College of Trades and Technology

MR. F. ROWE: and polytechnical institute. No such thing has occurred in the last six years, Mr. Speaker. We still do not have these residences for the College of Trades and Technology and the polytechnical institute. We do not even have the polytechnical institute, another indication, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial debt is controlling the actions of this administration.

Educational television systems were going to be introduced into the Province, Mr. Speaker, subsidies for teachers in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, regional colleges all over the Province, Mr. Speaker. None of these things have been forthcoming. And what do we have, Mr. Speaker? Instead of these new institutions and residences and new systems of education being introduced in the Province, we have actually had a retrenchment as far as education is concerned in this Province.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the situation at the university this year. The university did not get the vote from this administration that they had counted on. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, they are having to cut back not only in new programmes being developed, they had to cut back in some of the existing courses, they had to cut back in the

MR. F. ROWE:

care and maintenance of the university. They are not re-hiring staff who are leaving for other universities. They are pruning back in the area of administration.

Mr. Speaker, this university, which was dreamed of by the previous Liberal administration as being one of the top and best universities in Canada, the only university in Newfoundland and Labrador, the aim was to make this university one of the best, amongst the best in all of this nation. It is slowly becoming, because of the government's policy and lack of money and support of our university, this university is slowly becoming not only a second-class university, Mr. Speaker, but a university for the elite, a university for only the students whose parents can afford to send them to university.

Mr. Speaker, how many thousands of young students do we have graduating from our high schools this year, from all over Newfoundland and Labrador who are dreaming and wanting and desiring to go to our university? And the only way they can get there, Mr. Speaker, some of them and many of them, they can qualify as far as their results are concerned, they can qualify as far as their brains are concerned, they can qualify as far as their education, formal and self-education is concerned but they are disqualified, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack and the size of their wallets. They have to put themselves into terrible debt if they wish to go to university.

It is a shocking situation, Mr Speaker, when twenty-one years after the opening of our new university - I am sorry - the new campus, it was not in 1960, it was in - the new campus was built in 1962 or 1963 - was it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Opened.

MR. F. ROWE:

Opened; yes.

Just about twenty years after, the building of our great new campus, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have thousands of students who want to go to university not being able to go this year because of the high tuition fees and the high residence fees.

The people who live in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, and who happen to be sons and daughters of well-to-do people are at a tremendous advantage as far as going to university is concerned. And that is only one aspect of it, Mr. Speaker.

Let us look at the more important aspect of this whole situation. The university, Mr. Speaker, the university is not the only institution of higher education that is made available to people leaving high school. There are very many other important institutions: The Fisheries College, which I hope I will get an opportunity to talk to, the College of Trades and Technology, the Vocational Schools, the Nursing Schools, the regional colleges, the community colleges and other forms of education. But, the university, Mr. Speaker, is the most important centre in any state, or in any province with regard to the articulation of the educational system and the policy and the direction of a province.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, when we have tremendous developments in offshore oil and gas or potential great developments, when we have potential great developments in spin-off industries, when we have the possibility

MR. F. ROWE: of great things in Labrador with respect to hydro-electricity. And some day we will be able to mine the rich uranium deposits in Labrador when uranium becomes more economically feasible to mine than now because of the long distances up there.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, requires scientists, technical people, engineers, but not only that, Mr. Speaker, it requires sociologists, educators, doctors, dentists, teachers, people who can lead in the various communities of rural Newfoundland and urban Newfoundland when you have these great sociological, technical changes occurring in the Province. And this is the greatest weakness, Mr. Speaker, the greatest sadness, the greatest disappointment that our Newfoundland people are being subjected to today, that these things are not ongoing. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the provincial debt has complete control and a stranglehold on the actions of this administration, the administration, Mr. Speaker, which was going to solve the provincial debt.

MR. CARTER: That was Joey's fault.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, yes, Joey's fault! Joey Smallwood, Mr. Speaker, in twenty-three years, managed to build a debt of \$750 million. In half that time, Mr. Speaker, the present administration has a debt almost four times as much, \$3.2 billion and going up. And what is the basic difference, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CARTER: It is the inflation we have.

MR. F. ROWE: Inflation applies to everything, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the member for St. John's North will just keep quiet for one second, why we have that small little debt being built up. We had hundreds of fish plants opened in this Province with government subsidies, we had hundreds of new schools built in this Province, we had hundreds of

MR. F. ROWE: new hospital beds opening up in this Province, we had highways being built, we had roads being reconstructed, we had teachers' salaries going up, we had vocational schools being built, we had a new university campus, industries were being opened, Mr. Speaker. Some of the industries failed, some of them were successful, but, Mr. Speaker, things were being done. What has this administration done? Not one new industry since they took over, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: We have the spectacle today, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) going out to Conception Bay to officiate

MR. F. ROWE: at a great new opening ceremony, an opening ceremony, Mr. Speaker. Guess what it is?

MR. CALLAN: No, what?

MR. F. ROWE: They are going to open up an open-pit incinerator employing three people. And we are going to have a Minister of the Crown officiating at this great opening.

MR. CALLAN: Two. Two ministers.

MR. F. ROWE: Two ministers of the Crown going out there, Mr. Speaker. What other great progress did we see, Mr. Speaker, by this administration? I forgot to mention another great development on the part - another new thing this administration has opened up in this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: No new industries.

MR. F. ROWE: A couple of new jails, Mr. Speaker, a couple of new jails. So open-pit incinerators and a couple of jails is about the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that this government has increased besides the provincial debt. It has increased the provincial debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed, absolutely amazed when the Premier of this Province, when he gets on his constitutional kick, starts pleading with the people of Canada and propogandizing with the people of this Province about the need of provincial equality, and how Newfoundland is not getting its fair share in Canadianism.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier better look a little more closely at home, a little more closely at home when we talk about equality. There are regions of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that are far from equal

MR. F. ROWE: to other regions of this Province. There are school tax areas, for example, that do not have the economic base so that the school taxes can be collected at the same magnitude as other school tax jurisdictions. For example, how can one compare the collection of school taxes on the Great Northern Peninsula where there is a tremendous amount of unemployment, where the economic base is not the same as in more industrialized centres such as St. John's - not industrialized centres exactly, but economically higher profile centres - or even Corner Brook, or even Grand Falls, or even Stephenville now that it is coming into its own?

There is no comparison. There is massive inequality throughout this Province, Mr. Speaker. There are school boards, Mr. Speaker, that have schools under their jurisdiction that are simply not fit to go into, simply not fit to go into, Mr. Speaker. And there are other school boards, Mr. Speaker, that have beautiful schools that are a pride to the teachers, a pride to the parents, and a pride to the students.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is if the Premier of this Province is going to go around making a fool of himself on the Mainland about us getting the gears by Ottawa, when in fact we are not, us not getting our fair share from Ottawa, Newfoundland and Labrador not being treated equally in this Canadianism, he had better first look at home and look at the inequalities that exist within our own Province, from one school tax authority to the other, from one school board to the other

MR. F. ROWE: from one municipality to another. My friend and colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) yesterday pointed out how one of his municipalities is being treated compared to others in this Province. Was that an example of government equality, government fairness, Mr. Speaker? Of course it was not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Premier wants to talk about more provincial control, let us extend that piece of logic just one step further.

The Premier says that the federal government has too much control, too much power and some of that power and control should be handed over to the provinces. Well, there is a certain element of truth in that except that the hon. Premier exaggerates it and becomes narrow-minded about it and looks in the eyes of other Canadians to me mean about it and grasping for something that we do not yet have. But, Mr. Speaker, if that logic was to be extended to its natural conclusion, that is a move more federal control to provincial control, would it not seem logical, Mr. Speaker, to transfer some of the provincial control to local government control, to the municipalities throughout this Province? It would seem to me that that would be a natural trend. If we are going to move more federal control to provincial control, why not move more provincial control to the local government control? And that is where the Premier's logic ends, Mr. Speaker. Because this administration have been doing things, bringing legislation into this House, such as the Regional Government Bill, property taxes, have brought this kind of thing into this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, without proper consultation with the municipalities, without giving the municipalities more control, more responsibility, yes, more responsibility to collect taxes for the government. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, hon. members shouted from across the way, 'Sure,

MR. F. ROWE: the municipalities are accepting the property tax. They are going along with it, They are agreeing with it'. They have no choice, Mr. Speaker, Because if a local government, if a council is to get one red copper from the government it has to send a declaration to the government that they are prepared to and agree with the implementation of the property tax. That is the only way a municipality can get one cent from the government. So, Mr. Speaker, what would you expect councils to do? Sure they are going to try to implement the property tax against their will, because they have no other choice. That is an example, Mr. Speaker, of too much provincial government control and not giving local government the opportunity to be the architects of their own destiny as far as the local level is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more that I can say, particularly in the field of education, with respect to how -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - this amendment is probably one of the most serious amendments to a Budget Speech that has ever been brought into this House, Mr. Speaker. It

MR. F. ROWE:

states very clearly - and this is what the amendment means - that this administration no longer has control over the provincial debt, the provincial debt has control over the actions of the administration. That is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, particularly when we have a situation in this Province where very little is being done in increasing the rate of expenditure in the area of public services, where we are seeing very little in the way of the opening up of new industries for the purpose of jobs and employment, where the only thing the Premier is hanging his hat on is if the oil companies and the governments at all levels are successful in uncovering economically viable gas and oil wells off our Province. We sincerely hope that that will happen, Mr. Speaker, but that in itself will not save this Province. And I would ask hon. members opposite to probably speak a heck of a lot - I implore them to speak a lot more seriously than the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) just spoke because this is a very serious matter and this amendment should not be the subject of irresponsible, silly jokes coming from hon. members opposite such as we saw from the member for St. John's North who would be only entertaining if he took up Ray Guy's position in writing columns. That is his only shining characteristic, that he would make a good replacement for Ray Guy if Ray Guy ever departed this particular Province, Mr. Speaker.

So I will be supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that hon. members opposite, if they thought about it seriously, would think very seriously of supporting it themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, seeing that we are not going to be ready for the question I might as well have a few words on this non-confidence motion which is, I guess, almost an automatic thing to expect from the Opposition, to put forward a non-confidence motion in what the government is doing or not doing and with regard to their policies and programmes. Unfortunately, the Opposition that we have today in the House of Assembly, whether it is misguidance or-what the reasons are is, I guess, not important. But it seems that the Opposition are always, at all times, negative in their criticism of government. And I have talked to many prominent Liberals around the Province in my travels and they say, 'Well, look there must be something you fellows are doing which is good for the Province. There must be something you are doing. Because no matter what you people say or do and put forward as policies, whether it be in fisheries, in forestry, in supplying roads and water and sewer services, no matter what it is you are doing or what you put forward, the Opposition always criticizes. They never have any good word or give any credit to what you are doing as a government.' And the question is why not? Why not? Surely, the Opposition, if they are going to be sincere - as I mentioned a couple of days-in their representations on behalf of their own constituents, they must recognize the things that are good and criticize the things that are bad. I am sure the people of Newfoundland are not in agreement that everything this government has done in the last two or three years is bad for our Province. In fact, it is the very opposite

MR. MORGAN:

So it would be much more beneficial to the Opposition in their attempt to gain more seats in the next general election - I do not know, maybe we should not be giving them any ideas because they may very well take them in a serious way - but it would be much more beneficial out in the rural parts of our Province to one day be able to say publicly, Well, the Minister of Fisheries, or the Minister of Forestry, or the Minister of Tourism, or the Minister of Transportation did something that we are pleased with. And if they did that, they would have more credibility in the eyes of their constituents than in always standing up condemning ministers on this side of the House. Because all of us cannot be that bad. So, I mean, when I go this Summer and travel in the ridings of these Opposition members and look at the fishing issues - and I will be doing that this Summer, I will be doing it extensively the same as I did last Summer. I will be travelling throughout the Province whenever this House closes, meeting fishermen's committees, meeting organizations, sitting down discussing with them the problems they have in their respective regions. And I have no objection to having members sit in on the meetings, no objection whatsoever. They are the official representatives elected by the people, and they deserve to be in on what is going on in their own areas. I am not saying I am going to take them with me in my travels because I would not be out there campaigning for them, naturally. I am going to be out there doing some campaigning for our own party, and rightly so; the same as I now see the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) here politicking to the very utmost with his colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) and with his colleague, the M.P. for the Humber - St. George's area. And rightly so. Why not? Why should

MR. MORGAN: he not be here politicking? He is a politician. How often do we hear statements in the House today, 'Oh, well, that is political trickery, that is political activity'? Well, what do you expect from politicians? What do you expect from politicians but political activity? We are all here for our own survival as politicians. If I am doing a job as an engineer, if I do not do it well I will not be there very long. If I am doing a job as a fishermen and I do not do it very well, I will not survive. If I am doing a job as a politician and I do not do it well, I will not survive. It is the same thing over and over. I mean, we have to be political if we are politicians. And it is fine for members to stand in this House yesterday and today and talk about the roads programme for our Province and say, well, certain members got more funds than others. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) this morning was complaining he had no money for Terra Nova district. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was complaining yesterday there was no money for water and sewer for his district. And I talked to my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and I said, 'Colleague, how often has the member for LaPoile been in your office to talk about problems in Burnt Island?' And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? That gentleman from LaPoile, who yesterday was so concerned about the Burnt Island problems, the water and sewer, has yet to put his nose into the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, has yet to go in and sit down and say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and her deputy, 'Look, I have a problem on Burnt Island.'

MR. MORGAN: Now, some hon. gentlemen over there, I agree, are doing their jobs, they are working hard, they bring in - I have had them in my office - representations from Fogo; the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) has been in on a number of occasions. I recall the member for Twillingate came in a little while ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - and he sat down in my office with a delegation from Twillingate, talking about roads. And his main point was - he came to see me. He said, 'Mr. Minister, you are representing the fishing industry, and down in the Twillingate area, in Herring Neck, there is a little fish plant. And there is a gravel road and we have to transport fish every day over that road. Can you help us get something done?' Now, that is what I find a very reasonable manner of representation. That man does not stand in the House and criticize the ministers with stupid, silly little questions

MR. MORGAN: and call names across the House as I saw taking place today.

MR. CARTER: It is shocking.

MR. MORGAN: Personal names, personal attacks, I saw that today. My colleague who was referred to, he will get back at the hon. gentleman for that. I am sure he will. But he does not do that. He comes in the office and sits down with the minister in a reasonable way and says, "Mr. Minister, I have a problem here, can you help me out?" What happened to that? I will tell you what happened. There was no money in the Terra Nova district but there is money for the Twillingate area. That gentleman got some money for his road, this year, down to Herring Neck. Not because he is a Liberal member we should not give him anything, no. He came in and sat down and worked out the situation and we gave him some funds to get the problem resolved in Herring Neck. But the members of the Opposition want to always score little political points and in scoring these little political points all they are doing is hurting their own constituents.

Now, the hon. gentleman from down in Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) I must say I find him to be a gentleman. We all know he does not get on with personal attacks in the House and he never did. I have not heard him yet. And every time I have talked to him about the fisheries he is always genuinely sincere, he is talking in a genuine, sincere way.

MR. CARTER: That is Marystown.

MR. MORGAN: Marystown I mean. Marystown.

MR. CARTER: Burin.

MR. MORGAN: Burin - Marystown. Yes. And the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is also a pretty reasonable man when it comes to - he realizes the fishing

MR. MORGAN: industry is so important to his riding and we sit down and talk about the things that involve the fishery. But I mean yesterday was an example. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is actually tearing down the Liberal party. And the sooner that Mr. Stirling - he is not in the House today and I cannot refer to him by name -but the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), the sooner that he realizes that if he does not do something to control that member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) the same thing is going to happen to him as leader as happened to two previous leaders.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: Two previous leaders. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) who was the leader of the party was destroyed and the member for the St. Anthony area, the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), at the time was leader and he was destroyed by the same member. The fact is we do not mind. Why should we mind? We do not care if there is a Liberal party but we do want an opposition. Premier Peckford is going to win the next election sweeping, there is no question in my mind. He is going to win the next election sweeping. He will have more seats than is over here now. But listen, to have an effective administration in the Province you have to have an effective opposition. If you do not have an effective opposition it destroys the whole means of politics. And we do not want to see four or five members in the Opposition, we want to see some of those frontbenchers, the more qualified fellows who have been around for a long time, come back again. I hear rumblings that somebody is going to quit their caucus, they are going to quit the party over there and resign and go into private life. I say do not do that. You may

June 19,1981

Tape No. 2673

ah-3

MR. MORGAN: be disgruntled with you leader,
disgruntled with the way the member for LaPoile (Mr.Neary)
is controllng things and running things, but hang in there
and give us -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - some constructive opposition,
do not be always standing up in the House of Assembly
and criticizing like the member for LaPoile, yesterday
(Mr. Neary). He thought he was awfully smart by talking
about something he thought I did not know anything about,
sharks.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: He thought that was a major scoring point. Now, if he was genuinely concerned about getting a little industry going for LaPoile he would have called me down to the office and said, "Jim, I have a little proposal for you now. There is a possibility of getting a shark industry going over in LaPoile." And I, being politically sure, I would not say to him, "No, now, because you are in a Liberal district I am going to cut off the fishermen."

MR. HOLLETT: No sharks allowed.

MR. NEARY: I would not say no sharks allowed.

But, Mr. Speaker, to be serious for a little while before my time is up on this debate. The fact is that what we are doing today as a Province is for the benefit of all constituents of all members. And all we are trying to do is to ride out, - to ride out a very tough period in the history of our Province. We have a limited revenue. We have .5 million people here. They have not got the services they need, and that is obvious from the requests put forward to Municipal Affairs this year for - what? - \$110 million worth of water and sewer. We could only come forward with \$31 million. We cannot supply all the needs of the people. We cannot supply all the monies required for the paving of roads, whether it be in Bellevue district, or Terra Nova, or Twillingate or anywhere else.

We have \$21 million for roads this year - \$21 million - \$31 million for water and sewer. But we have not got the necessary funds. Why is it that we have not got the necessary funds? It is because we have not got the economic base to get the source of revenue required to do the things we need to do for our Province.

MR. NEARY: And all we are saying now is let us work together in the proper management of the resources we have. And seriously, we do have some good resources. And if we had the kind of jurisdiction - there is nobody who can tell me that if the Province today had jurisdiction over the fisheries - irrespective of what the Opposition think of me as a minister, irrespective, totally irrespective, we have a Department of Fisheries provincially, we have the most qualified Deputy Minister, the most knowledgeable man in fisheries anywhere in Canada. Seventeen, eighteen years with the federal government and now for the last eight years with us as a deputy minister. Totally qualified, totally qualified, the most knowledgeable man in the fishing industry. We need him and we have an Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Ray Andrews. First there is the Deputy, Gordon Slade; then there is the Assistant Deputy, Ray Andrews. Ray Andrews served, again, for sixteen, seventeen years with the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Totally, fully knowledgeable of what needs to be done in the fishing industry.

MR. TULK: You are the problem, the minister.

MR. MORGAN: Then we have - beneath that again we have a second ADM, a young Newfoundlander who came from Trinity Bay, Les Dean.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

A good worker.

MR. MORGAN: Excellent - his qualifications, there is no question. Then you go on, there is another ADM, Mr. Herb Goudie. Herb Goudie was with the federal government years ago, came

MR. MORGAN:

came with the Province, and he is an engineer, knows all about the need for facilities and the kind of facilities required, etc. and I can go on. The provincial Department of Fisheries -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is the best minister since Confederation.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Irrespective of the views of the Opposition of the minister, ministers come and go, politicians come and go but nobody but nobody -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - can tell me today that if we had the jurisdiction over this Province's most important industry, if we had the jurisdiction that we are asking for, that we would be able to develop that industry in a way that fishermen would be able to make a good living at fishing, that fish plants would be able to survive and make a reasonable return on their investments and we have a good buoyant industry in the fishing industry. But the problem is, as Mr. Etchegary said a few days ago, it is rather difficult to do that and to have that kind of an environment in the fishing industry if you have one sector going out in one direction, another sector going in some other direction and you have a government in Ottawa going in one direction and we here, after consultation with all concerned which we feel is the most important thing -

MR. TULK: You do not get together though.

MR. MORGAN: - the hon. gentleman said, 'We do not get together'. I have met with Mr. LeBlanc, since I have been Minister of Fisheries, I think it is five times. I recall sitting down in a hotel room with Mr. LeBlanc one afternoon, him and his officials, for five hours; sat down and went over

MR. MORGAN: all the issues. I recall sitting down shortly after that with Mr. Cashin there and the Fishermen's Union, again with Mr. LeBlanc, in a meeting, and people like Alec Moores, Mr. Etchegary and the Fish Trades, Bill Wells and these people, all knowledgeable people in the fishing industry. And again it is not the point of sitting down; we sit down and we discuss and we talk and we discuss and we talk. But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part is that somebody up in Ottawa, whether it is the advisors to the federal ministers, whether it is senior staff or whether it is the minister himself I do not know, I just do not know what the problem is, but you talk to anybody today in the fishing industry - the Economic Council of Canada just said it quite clearly in a report across Canada, they just said it quite clearly what is happening, the federal government is not listening to the provinces, this present federal government. And because Premier Peckford has taken such a firm stand on the constitutional changes that Mr. Trudeau wants to bring into this country, and because of the confrontation he had in the public eye of the country where this Premier of our Province, this young Premier - one of the brightest in Canada today - took on this great intelligent, knowledgeable Prime Minister of the country, took him on in the eye of the public at the Constitutional Conference and won, and whipped them in the eye of the public, that, Mr. Speaker, is the prime reason why that man in Ottawa is so vindictive,

MR. MORGAN: and I say vindictive.

MR. AYLWARD: Right on!

MR. MORGAN: That is why - and to answer Mr. Ed Roberts' comments this morning -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: To answer the member for the Strait (E. Roberts) this morning in a front page article in The Daily News condemning this government for not getting money from DREE, condemning this government for not getting - why does he not call a spade a spade and say the reason why we are not getting money from Ottawa is because they are penalizing Newfoundland, penalizing the Premier and his government here because he is standing up for the rights of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

MR. THOMS: The traitor speaks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: That is the only reason why.

MR. THOMS: A traitorous speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Traitorous. Treachery.

MR. MORGAN: So, you see, Mr. Speaker, if

MR. NEARY: Oh, oh. (Inaudible) Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, you already called order this morning to the member for LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the problem is that when these members stand up as they did this morning and criticize the government, this government here, the people down in the areas know differently, they know that the real

MR. MORGAN: problem is the Federal Government is refusing to put the money in to help us out. And you know the reason why they are not doing it? Mr. Speaker, the reason why they are not doing it is this, the Federal Government wants to keep this Province depending on Ottawa. It is like us tomorrow going into a community where there are lots of welfare recipients and instead of us taking some kind of initiatives as a government to help these people get off welfare, make their own living, no longer depend on government, no longer depend on the Social Assistance programmes -

MR. THOMS: We are going to be here all weekend.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: -Mr. Speaker, we go into a community and we say to these people, 'Now, we want you people not to be independant, we want you always to be dependant so that we can control what you get and what you can do in your community. You get X amount for your accomodations, X amount for your food, X amount for your survival. Now, that is exactly the Federal Government's philosophy and policy towards the poorer regions of our country today.

MR. HOUSE: That is a Liberal policy.

MR. MORGAN: They want to keep us down -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tory lies.

MR. MORGAN: So as we will always -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tory lies.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - so that we will always have to depend on Ottawa to help us with fishing facilities in Labrador, to help us pave the roads across Labrador, to help us pave the roads to some of these peninsular areas of the Province, these secondary roads, to help us out in other things because we

MR. MORGAN: have not got the necessary revenue, as I mentioned earlier, that we need to do the things we want to do for our people. But they want to keep us down. That is the philosophy. That is the philosophy.

MR. HOUSE: The Liberal philosophy.

MR. MORGAN: That is the philosophy in Ottawa. Instead of coming along and saying to Premier Peckford, look, Mr. Peckford -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the reason why you (inaudible) separatists.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please.

MR. MORGAN: 'Mr. Premier, we are going, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, please this gentleman who just walked into the House (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will ask the hon. members to my right to restrain themselves, please. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) has the floor.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, instead of that, what they should be doing is the Prime Minister should be saying to the Premier of this Province and his Cabinet, 'we are going to do everything possible to help you develop the resources you have so that you no longer will

MR. MORGAN:

have to come to Ottawa looking for fishing facilities for Labrador, no longer looking for the paving of roads in Labrador, no longer looking for the paving of roads in different areas of the Province, no longer looking for money to upgrade the Trans-Canada Highway which is desperately needed, no question about that, you have to have a four-lane highway! And I can go on. But what happens? The members of the Opposition stand up and say, "Oh, you are begging Ottawa to get something done, things under provincial jurisdiction."

MR. HANCOCK:

Stop being so stupid, boy.

Stop being so stupid.

MR. MORGAN:

That is what the Opposition member was saying a little while ago. "You are up in Ottawa begging to get things done that are under provincial jurisdiction."

MR. HANCOCK:

Stop being so stupid.

MR. MORGAN:

The fact is that we know we cannot do all of the things -

MR. HANCOCK:

Stop being so stupid.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

The member of the Opposition, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) last week -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Talk about being stupid,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

- the hon. gentleman is the prime example of that kind of mentality.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER:

A quorum call.

Call in the members.

June 19, 1981

Tape NO. 2677

NM - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

I ask the Clerk to count the members.

We have a quorum.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker - oh, the games people

play. The fact is we have a motion on the floor -

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, we have a motion

on the floor and the motion was put there by an Opposition member. If the Opposition members are not interested enough to stay in the House and take part in debate on their own motion, a vote of non-confidence, the people of Newfoundland should know what is going on in the House of Assembly. The fact is that the motion is before the House today, on a Friday morning. With the sun shining out there so beautifully today, we could be out doing all kinds of things. I could be out meeting with fishermen in some part of the Province. But we are in here debating -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. MORGAN:

- I am going to say to you,

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) interrupts anymore, I am going to have to ask you to name that hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

He is interrupting continuously.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is every

member's right to be heard in silence in this House and I would ask hon. members to restrain themselves.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, so the hon. members of the Opposition, it is their motion, if they want to play silly games like calling quorum calls on a Friday morning when we are debating their motion, that is up to them. The fact is, surely you do not expect for them to get up and two or three members speak and nobody from our side speak. We are debating a motion and I am saying the motion is more or less a formality and nothing else - that is the only reason why it is there - a formality of the Opposition Party to always put a motion of non-confidence in what the government is doing or not doing. And that is all it is. So it is on the Order Paper. It is there, so we have to debate it and hopefully deal with it this morning and carry on with the other business of the House.

Now, the hon. gentleman for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) interrupted me so I am going to respond to him. He talked about "Do not be so stupid." All right, do not be so stupid. Well, let us talk about some stupid things that are going on down in St. Mary's - The Capes where I see right now a rather potentially disastrous situation for quite a number of fishermen, where there are - if the whales come back in like last year and destroy the gear in St. Vincent's -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) you do not even know about, boy.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is again interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) Harbour

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

Order, please! I ask the hon. -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: And the hon. -

June 19, 1981

Tape No. 2677

NM - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

I ask the hon. member for

St. Mary's - The Capes to restrain himself. The Chair is trying to keep order.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, that is a potentially dangerous situation. I would say

June 19th., 1981

Tape No. 2678

DW - 1

MR. J. MORGAN:

I have written Mr. LeBlanc at least a good ten times on that problem. I would say that Mr. Slade, my deputy minister has called Mr. Art May, Mr. Tansley, the senior officials in the federal government at least ten times on the same problem. I understand the member for the area has been doing his job, he has been writing and phoning as well to the federal minister who is responsible. He understands that he is responsible and the hon. gentleman is doing the best he can to help those fishermen. But do not ever go back down in the area and give the impression to those fishermen that, 'Look, this is a matter which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in St. John's, this fellow 'Morgan' should look after'. Do not ever do that because it would be hypocritical and be very deceptive.

MR. HANCOCK:

I never, ever said that! Never ever said it!

MR. J. MORGAN:

The fact is that right now we have the man who is responsible for these kinds of - or responsible for possible resolutions to the problem in the Province. He is in the Province to help out his colleague, Brian Tobin, who is in political trouble on the Western part of the Province. And he is trying to bail out Bill Rompkey who has every single fisherman turned off! He has got every single fisherman turned off in our Province, Bill Rompkey. Oh, does he ever! I had calls from people the other night, 'Bill Rompkey would not come where we are'. I said, "Where are you?" 'Oh, in Bill Rompkey's district on the Labrador coast. He will not come near us, he knows better than that, where we have fishermen going into bankruptcy. I have been saying it over and over again.

MR. J. MORGAN: I recall last Fall I was saying it. But, 'Oh, there goes 'Morgan' again trying to get his name in the media and what he is talking about is all nonsense. Then, suddenly, who comes on the scene? George Baker, one of the most outspoken M.P.'s in Ottawa, stands up for his constituents, stands up for them everytime. He is going to get re-elected again, there is no question about, although he is a Liberal! Stands up for them! That was two months ago, George Baker came out publicly. A little less than a month ago Mr. Cashin who was head of the Fishermen's Union comes on the scene and says, 'I want those audits called off'. In other words what he was saying was, 'Jim Morgan was right last Fall, what he was saying'. That is two. Now, out of the blue, there is a third fellow on the scene, a third fellow, a third member - well, I guess we can call him a member. I suppose he is a member. It is doubtful these days what his status is up in Ottawa, we hear so many court cases against him etcetera. But he is an M.P. -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) alone now.

Leave him alone now.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: I was just quoting the facts, that is all. Now, Mr. Speaker, he is an M.P. and now he is on the bandwagon, no less than two or three days ago, condemning the federal government, his own government, his own caucus he is a part of, for the way they are treating the fishermen of this Province.

Now, so on she goes. So what I was saying and what I was doing on behalf of the fishermen of our Province last Fall, is now clearly home to roost. Home to roost where? Right on the shoulders, Mr. Speaker, of one man, the man who happens to be Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet, the man who,

MR. J. MORGAN: unfortunately or otherwise, became Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey). And the first major act to be taken by that minister was to carry out a special audit. Into what? Now, maybe it is the big business world. No! Maybe the lawyers. No! Maybe the doctors. No! But guess who? Those poor, lowly fishermen who, for the first time ever in the Province, are now making a reasonable dollar.

 So he had to go out and arrange a special audit which is going to place many of these fishermen in bankruptcy. There is no question about that. I am saying this now in June

MR. MORGAN: and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that by the Fall of this year, unless they have a bumper year and I mean an extremely bumper year at the fishery, by this Fall we are going to see fishermen with forty-five foot boats and above declare bankruptcy, because the federal revenue taxation officials are placing them in bankruptcy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: There is a federal subsidy reduction and other things, but the federal government is going to place them in bankruptcy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is irrespective of what the Opposition members want to do, if they want to say, 'Yes, Mr. Rompkey, what you are doing is right, carry on doing it' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Now, let me be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker - because I have not heard one member of the Opposition stand up in this House or outside the House and condemn what is happening to their fishermen in their ridings - and it is happening in Fogo, it is happening in Grand Bank, it is happening in the Marystown area, it is happening in St. Mary's - The Capes, it is happening out in Terra Nova - who else is in the House here, - in Bellevue, it is happening that the fishermen are going right now, the last few days, to welfare offices. For what? To get a few dollars to keep their families alive because half of what they sold - a fisherman sells - what? - \$150 a week to a plant, Revenue Canada takes \$75 automatically off the top. If he sells \$300 they take \$150 off the top. By the time he pays his bill on his truck and he pays his other little bills he has to pay to the fish plant, he does not have enough left, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: You have five minutes left.

MR. MORGAN: I have five minutes - good, fine. - to keep his family alive, not enough to get groceries.

MR. MORGAN: Now, that is simply inhumane action on the part of no matter what department it is. And I would say this morning, and I think it has to be said, I have to speak my mind as to what is accurate, what is true, I am not going to blame Bill Rompkey. I think Bill Rompkey is being taken in in a very bad way by his senior staff. Bill Rompkey, I sat down with him last night, talked to him, he is a Newfoundlander, he has humane feelings as well, he does not want to see a fisherman forced to go into a welfare office to get enough money to keep his family going while he is fishing. I know from talking to him, he does not want to see that. He has feelings for his own people because

he stood up a little while ago, less than two months ago, and said, 'No, I am not going to allow the fishermen to be treated unfairly, I am not going to allow this kind of treatment that I have seen to date, of our fishermen, being carried out'. Now, as Minister of Revenue, that was a very major step. I do not think there was ever before a Minister of Revenue who sort of challenged what his officials were doing. Because these officials work by the book, right by the book, right by the guideline. They get their good little books out, go out around the bay and they say, 'Now, you either have to have the money this morning or this afternoon, if you cannot we will -

MR. BARRY: I do not mind them working by the book but it is when they start throwing the book, that is the problem.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. In this case they are throwing the book at these fishermen.

MR. BARRY: Right.

MR. MORGAN: But now he gave instructions to these people, 'Be fair with the fishermen'.

MR. MORGAN: And I will tell you, in my district - because I was the man who raised the issue. And what I am saying this morning is going to be controversial in the next four or five days.

I have examples now - because I raised the issue publicly, because I raised the issue in a major way with Mr. Rompkey, and because Mr. Rompkey raised the issue in a major way with his officials, I now have fishermen in my district penalized because of my stand.

MR. BARRY: No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: And I think there is a member on the other side - I will not mention any names, they can speak for themselves - a member on the other side who has been making quiet representation about the same matter. And as a result of that the news is now that they are going to go into his riding and audit every fisherman.

MR. BARRY: Do we have a dictatorship? What is going on? What is happening?

MR. MORGAN: And I would say that Mr. Rompkey tomorrow would be a hero if he said, 'I am not going to allow you fellows to do it.' In fact, I would like to see him tomorrow morning remove at least three, from this Province, of the senior staff. I can name them, but I will not because it is not fair to attack them.

MR. BARRY: Who is running the department?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: If he cannot control his department, if he cannot control the activities of his officials - if I could not control the activities of my officials and they were hurting fishermen, I should not be Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Rompkey, if he cannot control his officials, if they will not listen to his guidance and his policies and his direction as minister, he has two choices, he either has to resign himself or give these people the flick out of his department. And I am saying right now, I would rather see Mr. Rompkey stay and the officials go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left and I will say before I sit down that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. BARRY: It is almost as good as his sharks yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying at the opening of my remarks this morning, it is important for all of us - we know that, as I mentioned, we have to play politics if we are going to survive in politics as politicians. If you do not do your job in the career or role you are in, you are not going to survive there, you have to move on to something else. I do not want to see any members of the Opposition move on. They may be disgruntled by what is going on in their own party, I know that is the case right now, but they should hang in there, they should not get out, And they should never be ashamed to do the kind of thing that I see George Baker do every second week; in fact, I saw Dave Rooney - we all saw him do it yesterday - stand up and say, 'I am against my party with regard to the measures being taken in unemployment insurance.' Now, why was there not a question this morning from the Opposition members if they were sincerely concerned for their constituents? Who would be addressed? The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) could have been addressed. They could put the question: 'Is it true Mr. Axworthy is going

MR. MORGAN: to increase the number of weeks required to qualify for unemployment insurance as Mr. Rooney is saying?' That is a major issue. 'Is it true they are going to reduce the number of weeks where they get benefits when they do qualify?' These are major questions which the minister should have been asked by the Opposition this morning. Get on to Mr. Axworthy, go up and meet with him, stop him from doing this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing that we should be hearing from the Opposition. And when the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) talks about the stupid things that are going on, I mean, it is true what we are saying, they are not stupid because he is aware and I am aware that something has got to be done for his fishermen, something has got to be done for the fishermen in LaPoile regarding the drift-net salmon fishermen who cannot fish anymore, something has got to be done for the fishermen down in the Straits and on we go around the Province. There are problems that need the attention of the federal people. And it is not good enough for the federal officials, whether it be a minister, an official, or at the level of the Prime Minister, to ever look at us and try to penalize the Newfoundland government because of the stand we are taking on behalf of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are we ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) gave a lot of information. I must say, some of his speech I enjoyed but unfortunately he fell down in certain areas. But generally his speech was well taken and there were some things in it that I could certainly agree with. It is amazing though the idea, or the concept that hon. members opposite have of a good politician. It is absolutely amazing! Yesterday the

MR. LUSH: member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) held up the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) as being the ideal politician to follow and today the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Marshall) says its the Hon. George Baker, the member for the federal riding of Gander-Twilllingate. But they like members who stand up against their party, their own party. That is rather strange. I do not see to many members on the other side stand up against their own party.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh,oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. LUSH: But these are the kinds of members that make good members. If you stand up against your own party well, then, you make a good member. And then the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, of asking provincial ministers here questions that come under federal jurisdiction. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has to be the biggest joke of all time because the provincial ministers cannot even answer questions that come under their own jurisdiction. And for me to get up and ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) questions relating to federal Labour and Manpower, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a frosty Friday when I do that. But with respect to speaking out against these policies, if the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) were really listening to what is happening in politics today, he would have heard me several times, a year ago, first when this idea came up

MR. LUSH: to change the entrance qualifications for unemployment insurance. Many times I spoke out against them, when they increased it to ten weeks, and that was then a Liberal government. We do not want to see those things.

And Mr. Speaker, I will speak out all the time when it is against Newfoundland, when they are policies against Newfoundland, be it the Liberals or be it the PC's. And we have done it continuously, not only me, but all members on this side. Every member in the House of Assembly, I expect, be they on that side or on this side, will speak out when the policies are against Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do it.

But it is sickening to hear hon. members twist everything around regardless of what the debate is, regardless of what the discussion is, to hear them twist it around to the constitution, and that all our problems will be solved if only we owned the offshore, all our problems would be solved if only we could transmit our hydroelectricity across Quebec. These are the two things, Mr. Speaker, that would solve all our problems. Well, I will get back to that.

MR. THOMS: And control of the fisheries.
And control the fisheries is another thing.

MR. LUSH: Yes, control of the fisheries - I will get back to that in a moment and see what the Economic Council of Canada says about owning our offshore. I will get back to that, and talk about what APEC said about that in their report, The Atlantic Vision to 1990, we will talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: But first of all, I want to talk about some things, not of high profile, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, but things that are of deep concern to me and to point out again how wrong the minister was, the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), when he was advising us how we should represent our districts. Mr. Speaker, in trying to undermine in the lowest way possible, trying to undermine members on this side, the Minister of Fisheries mentioned that the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) had never been into the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H. Newhook) to talk with her, to discuss the problem for Burnt Island. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, of course, that that is not the only way, by going into the office. You know, there are other means of communication. There is the telephone today, one can write, so one does not have to call into the office. But I am sorry that so many members from the other side have now left because they could hear verified this morning how many times I have been at their offices, how many personal visits I have made to the offices of the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe) who here this morning tried to undermine me, Mr. Speaker, who tried to suggest that I was not representing the district; that low-down kind of an approach, Mr. Speaker, the kind of an approach that does nothing, the kind of an approach that does nothing to enhance political life in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, what a low-down attack. And if the previous Minister of Transportation was here, a man for whom I have great respect, a man who saw me many times when he was the Minister of Transportation, and a man who has answered many questions that I have thrown at him, but not at that low level that the present minister answered them.

And let me assure hon. members,
and let it be recorded that that hon. member, that will be

MR. LUSH: the sorriest remark that ever he made in this House of Assembly, to try and undermine the present member that he was not doing his work. That will be a remark that he will live to regret that he made. He will regret it, Mr. Speaker, he will regret it. It will be the sorriest remark that ever he made, because I have the plans and the strategies laid out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And it will be the sorriest remark that he ever made. He will get down to his knees and pray to God that he never, ever made that remark. It will be the sorriest remark that ever he made. Because hon. members, they can say anything about this hon. member but never, never, never try to make the suggestion that he is not working. Never, never make the suggestion that he is not representing his district. Never, never, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: But as I said, he will live to regret it. He will live to regret it. He will live to regret the remark.

MR. J. CARTER: Do you have no ties with your district at all?

MR. LUSH: No ties with the district? No ties - I made the ties. And I challenge any member, I challenge any member, Mr. Speaker, to - I was going to be boastful but I will leave it alone. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this hon. House, there is nobody in this hon. House, who knows their district more than I do, who know the members by their first name and by their last names, and by all other kinds of names, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Middle names?

MR. LUSH: I will tell the hon. member, people get awfully brave here from time to time and challenge people to come and run against them, well, I would not get engaged in that kind of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. I would not get engaged in that kind of nonsense. But let the hon. members know that it will be a frosty Friday - it will be a frosty Friday when some Tory, or when some NDP can come in and knock the hon. member out of Terra Nova. It will be a frosty Friday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: It will be a frosty Friday either in nomination or in a general election either.

AN HON. MEMBER: We heard you were not even running.

MR. LUSH: I might not. I might not run.

But that does not change the statement. I might not.

But, Mr. Speaker, that minister who would bow down to that kind of low-level tactic -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)..

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. LUSH: What it is, Mr. Speaker, of course -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) dogs in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. LUSH: What it is, Mr. Speaker, is simply a facade to cover up for the man's ignorance, that he knows nothing about the department. He was not able to answer the question, and this is the low-level tactic that he takes, Mr. Speaker. And, of course, that is a well-known fact, that people do dip to that kind of low-level tactic when they do not have the knowledge, when they do not have the knowledge. When they cannot display their knowledge well, then, they dip to low-level tactics like the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) when he talks about statistics and says that, "The hon. member," referring to me at one time, "asked something to the effect, when there were 9,000 more jobs this year than last year, whether they were new jobs." And in his pompous style, of course, it was, "Were they new jobs?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Sticking out the chest, "Imagine the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked were they new jobs?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Showing how ignorant I am about statistics. Well, I have forgotten more about statistics than the hon. member will ever know. I have forgotten more about statistics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: I have forgotten more about statistics. Let me set the record straight. What I was doing,

MR. LUSH: and the hon. member of course was too stupid to understand it, what I was doing, Mr. Speaker, because statistics say a lot of things you see, and what I was trying to point out was whether the jobs created were indeed jobs that the government had created. Because if there are 9,000 jobs, you see, they could have been created by private enterprise, they could have been created just because of the market place, or they could have been created purely on government's initiative.

Then, of course, the other question is what does the government mean when they say that they are creating 40,500 jobs? What do they mean by this? Do they mean by this that they are creating the jobs directly because of government initiatives? Does it mean that they are creating the climate conducive to creating jobs? Or does it mean, just as the minister believes it does, does it mean that he comes in and reads the statistics every month and looks at it and says, "Oh, how was that now for last month? Oh, that means we are up 9,000. Man, that is 9,000 more jobs we have got, we have created." But I am afraid it means a lot more than that.

So when I was asking the minister whether they were new jobs, you see, it was

MR. LUSH:

in that context of trying to find out what jobs the government really had created. And the other thing is - and I should not tell the minister this at all because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: And it was in this general context of trying to make him understand all the ramifications of statistics, that the statistics do not measure, they do not measure jobs at all. Now, is that not something? They do not measure jobs at all, what they measure is the number of people employed. Now, quite understandably there is some relation between the number of people employed and the number of jobs. Hence if there are 9,000 more people working this month than there were last month, obviously it has some reflection on the number of jobs that were created. But not always, because they do not measure jobs per se, they measure people. And, as a matter of fact, there could be more jobs - I should not tell the minister this - there could be more than 9,000 because people could be involved in two or three jobs and the statistics do not show that. All they say is the number of people employed. So anyway what I was doing - and the minister again -

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) and multiply it by one and a half

MR. LUSH: - of course, it is only taken by those ministers, as I say, who lack the knowledge and they want to try and play upon a weak point.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) new jobs.

MR. LUSH: Yes, I know about the new jobs, Mr. Speaker, I know everything about the statistics, and, as I have said before, I have forgotten more about it than the hon. minister knows and I expect will ever know. I have spent time studying statistics when the minister was out basking in the sun.

So, Mr. Speaker, nobody will attempt

MR. LUSH: to make these low kinds of remarks on this side of the House and think they are going to get away with them. But, Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened to this government; the arrogance that has set in is unbelievable, absolutely unbelievable and it has infiltrated junior and new ministers and backbenchers to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Assembly is just a joke with them, debating is just a joke with them and Question Period, of course, is taken up, as the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) did this morning, in trying to give smart alecky statements, just trying to give smart alecky responses. The answers, Mr. Speaker, are quite irrelevant, just trying to be smart alecky. And the speech, of course, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) gave was the most ridiculous thing I ever heard in this hon. House of Assembly, the most ridiculous thing - getting up again and trying to undermine the kind of representation that members are giving, Mr. Speaker, which, as I have said, does nothing to enhance political life in this Province. What a low level kind of performance, Mr. Speaker, to try and undermine the representation of a member on either side of the House - absolutely ridiculous! And what he has made this forum, Mr. Speaker, and what he has made this House of Assembly is absolutely ridiculous, unthinkable, incredible, unbelievable!

And the people of the Terra Nova district, of course, will get some idea of the arrogance of ministers when a copy of Hansard is sent this morning to them, of the Question Period, when I was asking the minister about why the roads in Terra Nova were not paved. Now, Mr. Speaker, they will get some idea of the buffoonery and the lack of seriousness with which ministers take this hon. House. Well, Mr. Speaker, they will see it.

June 19th., 1981

Tape No. 2685

DW - 1

MR. T. LUSH:

They will see it and it will be done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was talking about how we can get monies, going in and talking to the ministers. Well, the Minister of Fisheries is now leaving but he knows I had been in to talk to him when he was the Minister of Transportation. I was in, as I have said, to the previous Minister of Transportation. And more correspondence has come in from the Terra Nova district to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) re paving of roads than, I would say, from any single district in this Province. More correspondence! More phone call! More representation by myself than by any single member in this House of Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have been in to see all of these, every Minister of Transportation ever there was. As a matter of fact, I go through it all again once I get a new minister, I start right from scratch again. And that has been a lot of work with Transportation, because there was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the now Senator Doody - so, Mr. Speaker, there were all of these ministers. So obviously what the Minister of Fisheries said, that is a lot of hogwash! Go in and see the minister - Oh, and I went to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he was Minister of Transportation. I went to see him!

AN HON. MEMBER:

One time.

MR. T. LUSH:

One time. Mr. Speaker, I went to see him and brought it up here in the House of Assembly so many times. So there is not a Minister of Transportation that I have not gone to see, not a Minister of Municipal Affairs and for what? What happened this time around? What happened? Well, Mr. Speaker, it was said

MR. T. LUSH: \$50,000 for roads but that was not correct! That was not correct! That was money to finish up the overpass in Glovertown, the great overpass which was the federal government's dollars really. So that was being repaired last year. That was just monies left over. There was nothing done! \$50,000 to finish up the overpass. So that was - actually that was all spent last year. There might be \$5,000 or \$10,000 to be spent this year. So there was no money on secondary roads. That is what I am fighting for, secondary roads in my district. So there was no money spent on that, none! And not only this year but last year, the year before and the year before!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) said if we would average it out over the next ten years we will find out that our money was spent equally. Well, I hope that that is a commitment. I hope that that is a promise, because if that is so I can look forward to money next year and the next year and the next year, so the Terra Nova district will equal out with other districts. Water and sewer; What did the hon. member get this year in his district? \$25,000! Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: \$25,000, that is what I got, Mr. Speaker. So I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, This is the government that goes to Ottawa, this is the government, represented by the Premier, that goes to Ottawa singing out for equal treatment, crying out for equal treatment. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe they should practice that policy at home.

MR. T. LUSH: And listen to this, Mr. Speaker, I am about now to make, probably, one of most important points ever made in this session, one of the most important points, Mr. Speaker, ever made in this session. There was a time, back in 1972, when this government put together all of the motherhood statements that ever could be put together and came up with a great policy and a great platform. One of the big tenets of that philosophy was equal treatment, equal treatment to all of the areas of Newfoundland. Well, as I have said, that is the Premier's swan song these days, wanting the federal government to treat us as equals. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a news story here - this is the Daily News, May 3rd., 1981 and the headlines are, 'Peckford Says Ottawa Wants Him Out'

MR. LUSH:

It says, 'Premier Brian Peckford says' - and this is none of the bile that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) reads out, I mean, this is pure political stuff such as the Fisheries Minister (Mr. Morgan) was talking about. The only difference with this was - and I want to make that point - when the Fisheries Minister was talking he said it was only natural that politicians be political, that was only natural. But the unnatural part about it was that he only wanted it one way, he wanted for them to play it and us not, because he mentioned that he was going to go out touring the districts and he was going to take us along with him to those areas that we represented, but on the same side he was saying that we were making - and he was not going to take us everywhere, only in the districts, naturally, that we were representing, because it was politics and he could not take us around campaigning, but he was going to be out politicking and that was right. And on the other side of his mouth he said that we were making politics out of the roads programme. So it was right for him but wrong for us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is politics I am talking about here, not the kind of diatribe that the member for St. John's North read. And it says: 'Premier Brian Peckford says the federal Liberal Government apparently is hoping to make things so tough for Newfoundland that voters will turn him out of office in the next general election.' 'But,' he says, 'it will not work.' That is what the Premier said, 'It will not work.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the question - this could have been the same headlines but it could have been 'Lush for Terra Nova': 'The Terra Nova M.H.A. says that the Tory Government apparently is hoping to make things so tough for the Terra Nova district that

MR. LUSH: voters will turn him out of office.
But it will not work.' It will not work, Mr. Speaker,
it will not work!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) come over
across the floor you are going to (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: It will not work, Mr. Speaker, it
will not work! Well, when the Premier starts practicing
what he is preaching then, of course, he might gain some
credibility. Once he starts practicing this principle of
equality. Once he starts practicing that principle,
Mr. Speaker, then the people of Newfoundland might accept
this equal treatment. Because I hear it time and time
again. The same thing the Premier is saying, what he wants
done by the national government, that is what is happening
on the local level, the same thing. That is what the people
of Fogo are saying who did not get any money for their
roads; that is what the people in the Strait of Belle Isle
are saying who did not get any money for their roads;
that is what the people in Grand Bank are saying who
did not get any money for their roads.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: They voted in the member for
Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and they voted in the member for
Placentia (Mr. Patterson), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, this idea of
preaching equality abroad, you would think that the Premier
was the greatest believer in the world of equal treatment,
but back in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that is not
practiced. And the people of the Terra Nova district know
it and the people of the Grand Bank district know it and
all over Newfoundland and Labrador people know that they

MR. LUSH:

are not being treated equally.

So when the Premier goes abroad preaching that philosophy, he had better realize that every day he is talking about this equal treatment he is losing more credibility at home.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated earlier, regardless of what

MR. LUSH:

the debate, regardless of the discussion in this hon. House, it comes back to the constitutional debate and it comes back to these three big issues of ownership of our offshore resources, of controlling our fisheries, of getting the right to transmit the power across Quebec. And for some reason or other the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) indulges in it more than any other. He would like nothing more than for the Liberals over here to say, We do not believe in those things. He would love that, Mr. Speaker. He would love that. And then we tell him, of course, that we subscribe to all of those things but to paint us further into the corner he says, you know, 'Why do you not send off telegrams to the federal government, why do you not get on the public airways and say that you are fighting for this?' It is not sufficient to say it in this hon. House, it is not sufficient to say it day after day, it is not sufficient to say it time after time, it is not sufficient to say it every time one speaks, it is not sufficient. But he has got to get up there and say, 'Hon. members there opposite would do better if they would support us on our offshore ownership claim. They would do better if they would support us in our fight to get transmission of hydro electric power across Quebec. Hon. members would do better if they would support us in gaining control of the fishery.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Hon. members have done that consistently on this side of the House. Consistently! And let it be heard, Mr. Speaker, and let it go right throughout this Province that hon. members on this side support the government in their offshore ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: That it is a fact that we support them in trying to get hydro power across Quebec. We support that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: So do not ever attempt, Mr. Speaker, - but that is not the way it is. That is not the way it is. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) would love for me to get up here today and say that we do not support the government, that we do not believe in offshore ownership.

MR. MARSHALL: I am afraid the hon. member is going to fall over the desk.

MR. LUSH: No way. The hon. member is going to fall over nothing. Now, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have put these three issues under the rug for all times, that we, Mr. Speaker - but the difference is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, not only that - and again hon. members only hear what they want to hear - not only that, I had in the beginning - when I say in the beginning, I do not think there is any beginning to it, but as nearly as I can recall, when it came on the scene, or when I came on the scene and the government was talking about local preference, even at that time, publicly, I supported them. But then, Mr. Speaker, they became so arrogant

MR.LUSH:

they went out like Martin Luther and started nailing it on the doors of Canadians in other provinces and then I could not agree with it. I could not then agree with it. I agree with the principle but this going up and nailing it on the doors of our sister provinces, what a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and prating about it all day long. Talking about 800 jobs, Mr. Speaker, something that we have thrown down the throats of 22 million Canadians because it is going to give us 800 jobs as deckhands and all kinds of menial tasks. And they are going to go preaching about it. No, Mr. Speaker, I support its principles. I support the principle of it, Mr. Speaker, but not the approach.

And it is the same thing all along. The idea of offshore ownership, support the principle but the approach of this government, no. I cannot support it, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the approach.

Now, the hon. member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) and the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) who just spoke, gave us the impression, Mr. Speaker, that our public debt - that services in this Province would all improve, public services, we would get all kinds of jobs and we would wipe out the public debt if only we could get control of the offshore. If we could get control of that and we could get out power across Quebec, if we could get all of that, then we would wipe out the public debt. We would wipe out this \$3.2 billion - an astronomical figure, a figure that most - not most but everybody - a figure that all hon. members just cannot grasp the significance of. \$3.2 billion, we cannot grasp the significance of it. We cannot grasp the significance of it.

MR. LUSH: As a matter of fact, most hon. members, and I would put myself in that boat, cannot even grasp the significance of a million dollars. We cannot grasp the significance of a million dollars and to be talking about \$3.2 billion, Mr. Speaker - well, the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) and the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) have given us the impression that if we owned the offshore oil, we had shared jurisdiction with the fishery - over the fisheries, I should say - and if we could get our power across Quebec, that we would wipe out that public debt, we would wipe that out and that we would create all kinds of jobs and that we would naturally become a have province.

Well, let me tell you - let us read what APEC says, Mr. Speaker, about the jobs, about the future prospects of this Province. I do not like doing that. I do not like being a prophet of gloom and doom as does the federal member for St. John's West (J. Crosbie), always announcing gloom and doom, getting federal leaks, that are gloom and doom like the UIC thing, always announcing gloom and doom. I do not like doing that but sometimes maybe - because hon. members there opposite do not read too much, I am sure, they just take what the Premier says. Just watch them bring their feet down on the ground, bring them down from cloud nine

MR. LUSH: and see what it says about our prospects for unemployment into the future, 1990. It says - and they talk about, here, owning our offshore - Mr. Speaker, I have only got a few minutes left - owning our offshore - just listen to this - they talk about owning our offshore, getting power across Quebec with the most optimistic view we can get. All right? The most economic optimistic view we can have. And what do they say about the future of Newfoundland? They say that by 1990 we will create - the creation of a total of 66,500 jobs, and what will that do? What will that do in terms of reducing the unemployment? It will still leave a severe gap of 41.9 per cent between the utilized and potential employment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not something? That is owning our offshore. That is owning our oil and gas. That is owning and controlling it, owning and controlling it. Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker. And with the most optimistic economic view we can have, that they could muster up, it says, "The creation of a total of 66,500 jobs is what we will be able to do." That is what we will do. "But that will still leave a severe gap of 41.9 per cent between the utilized and potential employment.

"Obviously, even being optimistic about the primary and secondary developments and utilizing known technology, economic activity will not be sufficient to meet Newfoundland's population potential unless a new strategy is instigated."

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what

the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. HOLLETT: By leave.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on this very important debate as it relates to an amendment to the non-confidence motion before we put the question. Because it is important for things to be put in perspective on that. I was very interested in what the hon. member had to say. I am glad that finally on this side of the House we were able to stir the hon. member so that at least he would make a speech to the House, and at least make one with some spirit and some gumption in it. And if we have done nothing else in the last couple of days in response to questions at least we have - and we have got to do it. I know we have got to do it because they just cannot do it themselves. They are obviously not self-starters, we have got to help them. So if by responding to some of the questions on the other side we can spur them to at least come alive over there, then we have done a great service to this House and done a great service to the Province. And in that regard, then, I thank the hon. member for his speech. Because at least we got him excited about the Province and about the budget and about things that go on in this hon. House. And we have not seen so much excitement for weeks and weeks as it relates

PREMIER PECKFORD: to the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us just put a few things in perspective talking about non-confidence motions and budgets and so on. Have any of the hon. members opposite looked at the budgets of the provinces nearest us this year? Has anybody bothered to look at what is happening in the great Province of Nova Scotia or the great Province of New Brunswick, two that are sister provinces of ours as it relates to population and budget and so on? Would it amaze the hon. members opposite if I was to suggest to them that the Province of Nova Scotia this year on current account has a deficit of about \$155 million, on current account, and that this Province is predicting a surplus of \$10 million on current account.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That will give you an idea of financial management. That is the difference. The Province of New Brunswick - \$50 million deficit on current account as opposed to the \$10 million. Last year we had a surplus on current account of \$26 million. A \$26 million surplus in the last fiscal year. That is what I call performance, Mr. Speaker, and what we call sound, responsible financial management of the affairs of this Province. And nobody can challenge those figures, that as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia goes in one direction negatively, we are going in another direction positively. And that is what is important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let me suggest another fact that hon. members opposite, in the debate, did not bring out at all, did not bother to talk about. The Liberal administration of this Province from 1949 to 1972 did not have the intestinal fortitude, even though they were told by their fiscal agents and others, did not have the intestinal fortitude to be financial managers of this Province to the extent that they

PREMIER PECKFORD: would start contributing to a pension fund. They took all the pension contributions that came in from all their employees and spent it. And it took this administration to begin pension funding so that we could protect those people who are going to be coming off the active roles of government and getting pensions. It was one of the most damning indictments of the Liberal administration for twenty-three years that nobody talks about any more, that nobody is supposed to talk about, that they allowed this situation to continue for twenty-three years without taking one solitary action to be responsible. It was a disgrace to the people of Newfoundland, and to the people of Canada, and to the bond markets. And it took this administration to bring in sound pension funding which is one of the hallmarks of saying whether a province or a jurisdiction is going to be treated fairly in the bond market, or fairly when it talks about borrowing money. It is a very, very disastrous policy for any administration to take, and that administration took it for twenty-three solitary years and it is incredible. That is fact number two, Mr. Speaker, when one talks about dealing responsibly with a budget

PREMIER PECKFORD: and to try to ensure that we are doing things which are in best interest of the Province and protecting our credit rating and ensure that we can get on with the job that has to be done. I find it absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker, listening to a number of hon. members over there in the last couple of days and to read some of their speeches, to think of, just as the hon. member who just sat down said again, 'The flip-flops that they make'. Trying to have their cake and eat it too. Absolute flip-flops that they make. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) the other day getting up in this hon. House and attacking an affirmative action programme on local preference. Then the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) getting up two minutes later and asking for local preference on the Cat Arm project. Trying to have their cake and eat it too, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Look, the people of Newfoundland listen carefully to what goes on, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador know that the Liberal Party has been squirming for twenty-four months! Squirming politically for twenty-four months! Nobody knows where they stand on the offshore! Nobody knows where they stand on hydro transmission! Go get a big project going! That is the answer to it, get a big project going! We want another Upper Churchill! We want another Come by Chance! We want another Long Harbour! We want something else! Give it away, Mr. Speaker! That is the answer the Liberal Party proved in twenty-three years, give it away! Give it away!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let us go for the short-term!
Let us go for the short-term! Let us go for the short-term, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And right now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Long Harbour?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will tell the hon. member about Long Harbour -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and in a couple of months he will eat his words on Come by Chance, Mr. Speaker. In a couple of months he will eat his words on Come by Chance. Let there be no doubt about that! And while we are talking about Come by Chance and affirmative action programmes, how about 704 jobs this day, Newfoundlanders working on the offshore? That is two Come by Chance refineries, 704 jobs! Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the great Newfoundlanders that they are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

PREMIER PECKFORD: Can I have order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for St. Mary's -
The Capes (Mr. Hancock) knows full well that shouting is certainly not permitted in the Legislature. I would ask him please to consider that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the great Newfoundlanders that they are, the great Newfoundlanders that they are quoting the Montreal Gazettee and quoting APEC. Why do they not quote the documents that we have published, that the Petroleum Directorate has published? Find any fault with those! Find any fault with those! And if there was any argument for ownership and control, at the same time as the hon. member says, 'Oh, you know, we are in favour of ownership and control he quotes APEC to show how bad it is for us to have ownership and control'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, boy, sure, tell me something else the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)! You got excited did you? You got excited today the hon. member for Terra Nova! Well, he had better get a lot more excited the next day so that we can iron out those inconsistencies that the hon. member wants to bring forward. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party and the Liberal spokesman better start getting their act in order, better start getting their act in order, if

PREMIER PECKFORD:

that is the best they can do, get up and stand up and quote a policy out of APEC. I challenge any hon. member opposite, I will challenge the Liberal party and I challenge the NDP party, like I did two years ago, I challenge them to show the fault in our position. I challenge them on the five year plan. I challenge them on the documents that we have released on the constitution. I challenge them on what the petroleum directorate has released on Hibernia development. I challenge them on all those issues. And do you know something, Mr. Speaker, what a vacuum there is in this Province, what a vacuum, because there is no agency, no organization, no political party that has come forward to challenge those basic, fundamental positions that this party and this government has put forward. Not one agency, not one party can challenge it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Where is the individual and

where is the party, in the last two years, that have effectively challenged our positions? Where are they? There is a void and a vacuum in this Province like you would not believe, it is an abyss because nobody has come forward to challenge those positions. And the reason they have not come forward, Mr. Speaker, is because they are sound, well-thought-out positions that cannot be challenged intellectually, because they are sound and reasonable and rational. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, as we have taken those positions, we have developed a budgetary system and a five year plan that can stand in stark contrast to a lot of other jurisdictions around this world. We can stand on our documents. We can stand on our plans and we can stand on our positions. And let me tell you something, Mr.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Speaker, we will not stand we will run. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, two years ago yesterday, the Liberal party went to a little garden party down in Swift Current and they came up with a roads programme, and they came up with pharmacare, and they came up with subsidizing hydro rates, and it was publicized all over the Province. Bring Don back home - and he came back home and he went all over the Province with this fantastic Liberal platform and it was destroyed. And it will be destroyed again when they go to the electorate. Because we have developed sound positions which are unchallengeable, intellectually, politically, economically, culturally and socially in this Province. And if the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) does not like it and gets excited because of it, that means that we are right. That means that we are right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So the Opposition now, on their non-confidence motions, can cry all they like, they can cry all they like. Until they get their act in order the tears will continue to flow. The Leader of the Opposition can go around the Province as often as he likes and he will just be laughed and laughed and laughed at.

MR. MARSHALL: They like that. Oh, they like that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Until he decides that there has to be some equality in this country, that if you sign a contract in 1949, as the Supreme Court of Newfoundland said - just imagine, the hon. members on the opposite side of the House have the audacity, the gall to question the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where are your Newfoundland rights? Where is your Newfoundland common sense -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that suddenly the Liberal Party had the audacity and gall to come out and say what the Supreme Court of Newfoundland says means nothing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ho, ho! Ho, ho! All of a sudden the Liberal Party, in its desire to be as sacred as the Federal Liberal Party, wants to counteract a decision by the highest court in this land. Oh, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: Adjourn the debate now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I adjourn the debate gladly, to continue next day the demolition,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL: I did not hear you, Mr. Speaker, because of the people on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it will be after one o'clock and nobody will get out of here.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, June 23, 1981 at 3:00 p. m.