

VOL. 3

NO. 20

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Sir, and it has to do with the marketing of power from the Lower Churchill, if indeed the government ever gets the Lower Churchill project launched, off the launching pad. Would the minister inform the House if it is correct that Atlantic Energy Corporation has the exclusive rights to market power, or power generated at the Lower Churchill project?

MR. BARRY: No, it is not right, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact it is the height of nonsense.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will remember that F.D. Roosevelt, Jr., and his lawyer visited Newfoundland during the Moores years, when Mr. Peckford was then Minister of Mines and Energy, and they entered into some kind of an agreement. Now would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House what that agreement was?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the gentleman referred to or any of his friends or colleagues. Whatever discussions were held between the Premier of the day and the gentleman you referred to, that is between the Premier of the day and the gentleman you referred to. But as far as this government is concerned, as far as the Premier, who

MR. BARRY: was then minister, is concerned, and as far as myself as Minister of Mines and Energy, there is nothing in the way of Order-in-Council, or a signed agreement or anything that I have ever seen that indicates in any way that there is anything that could even be remotely considered an agreement of the nature that the member refers to.

MR. NEARY: I ask a final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, do I understand now the hon. gentleman correctly when he says that Atlantic Energy Corporation does not have an oral commitment, an oral agreement, or a written agreement, with Newfoundland Hydro, with the Newfoundland government to market power from the Lower Churchill and there is no way that Mr. Roosevelt, or Atlantic Energy Corporation can take this government to court for breach of contract as was indicated in a television programme there some time ago and Mr. Roosevelt quoted in the newspaper as saying that if the government did not live up to this agreement that they would be taken to court? There is no way that that can happen, is that what the hon. gentleman is telling the House?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member could take this government to court, the gentleman that the member refers to could take this government to court, anybody can take this government to court. Winning in court is another thing. As far as I am concerned the gentleman in question does not have the remotest thing upon which to base a breach of contract action. As far as I am concerned as minister, I will never as minister recommend paying any commission

MR. BARRY:

to a middleman. That was the way a previous government and governments from 1949 to 1971 operated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: We do not operate that way.

We are our own middleman. Mr. Speaker, not only are we middlemen, we have the upper ground captured as well. And we will not, we will not agree to the payment of any commission or fee, or whatever you want to call it, of the nature that the member refers to and if anybody wants to get any money out of this government the only way they are going to do it is to take us to court and they better have a good case prepared because we are going to fight it to the distance.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman has put a new twist on the last answer he gave me kind of put a new twist on it. The hon. gentleman says that anybody could take the government to court. Well, anybody cannot take the government to court unless they have justification for it, some reason for it.

MR. THOMS: Those against the spray cannot.

MR. NEARY: Except those who oppose the spray programme and the matacil, they cannot take the government to court or any of the contractors.

MR. BARRY: Yes, they can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, they cannot. They cannot get a court injunction.

MR. BARRY: Well, that is something else.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, the hon. gentleman, he sort of playing with words in answering my last question, implied that there may be a possibility that Atlantic Energy could take the government to court because they feel they have some kind of an oral commitment or an oral agreement or a written agreement with Newfoundland Hydro or the Newfoundland government. Now could the hon. gentleman tell the House this, have Mr. Roosevelt and/or his company or any of the representatives of that company been in touch in recent months with the government to ask them to live up to their commitment that was made by Mr. Moores, the former Premier of this Province?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, anybody can go in with a half-baked court case and initiate it. Now it may be thrown out immediately as being frivolous, or it may be fought and be thrown out ultimately after the hearing of evidence when a judge brings down a decision, but anybody can commence a court action against government. And the hon. member is going to have to ask the gentleman he refers to, or the corporation he refers to, as to what his plans are to take government to court. Have him feel free, if he believes that he in some way has been wronged or has some contractual arrangement with government, have him feel free. What I am saying to the member opposite is that as far as government is concerned there is no contract, there is not even the slightest evidence upon which one could construe that there is or interpret that there might be a contract between the Atlantic Energy Corporation and government. There is nothing to it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Energy Corporation and government. There is nothing to it, Mr. Speaker. Nothing, nothing, nothing.

Now on the second part of the question was the -

MR. NEARY: Have they been back looking around?

MR. BARRY: Have they been back looking?

I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, in the last several months, in recent months. There was communication early in the life of this administration, I believe, and it was dealt with quite quickly and dismissed out of hand as being nothing but complete nonsense, the height of nonsense, as I said earlier.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment (Mr. Dawe), and it is re the development of Cat Arm in as far as the environmental aspects of the project are concerned.

MR. BARRY: You have read the act now, have you?

MR. FLIGHT: I have the Act in front of me, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister - the Act says, "The purpose of the Act is to facilitate the wise management of the natural resources of the Province and to protect the environment and quality of life of the people of the Province." And Clause (6) here says, "Every proponent - and Newfoundland Hydro in this case is the proponent - shall before proceeding with the final design of an undertaking notify the minister in writing on a prescribed form concerning the proposed undertaking" - the proposed undertaking in this case is Cat Arm River.

I would ask the minister has Newfoundland Hydro to this point in time notified the minister on the prescribed forms in writing of their

MR. FLIGHT: intentions to develop the Cat Arm River?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the Cat Arm project has been registered with our department. The prescribed forms, I am not even sure if they were available at the time the Cat Arm project began. Whether that is the case or not, my department and this government have indicated to the people of this Province, through this particular piece of legislation which the hon. member referred to, and the establishment of a Department of the Environment, its concern about developments that effect resources and how they effect the environment in this Province, and my department and the government are committed to ensuring that all necessary is done to protect both the physical environment and the social environment of this Province.

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro have submitted to our department an environmental impact statement, and it has been reviewed as per the conditions of the Environmental Assessment Act, and that process is ongoing.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the minister is not ahead of himself a little bit in the environment because what the Act says is the proponent, Newfoundland Hydro, has to notify the minister in writing. Following Clause (7) says, "The Minister shall examine or cause to be examined the information to determine whether an environmental impact statement is required, whether the environmental impact statement may not be required." What I want to ask the minister is whether or not at this point

March 30, 1981

Tape 745

PK - 3

MR. FLIGHT: based on the information that he received from Newfoundland Hydro re the Cat Arm development, has the minister indicated to Newfoundland Hydro whether or not an environmental impact statement is required?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already indicated that not only was it transmitted to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro that an environmental impact statement was required but the terms of reference were drawn up by my department and Hydro has in fact prepared that environmental impact statement. It is now a public document. It is available for anyone to see. Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro suggested what it would do and some mitigated measures that it would take as it related to the Cat Arm project. This environmental impact statement has been reviewed by an assessment committee and the report is now in to me and is just ongoing under normal circumstances.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister is making a mockery of his own legislation. All that Newfoundland Hydro, all that Newfoundland Hydro has submitted to government to this point in time, Mr. Speaker, is the summary of thirteen or fourteen preliminary, very preliminary investigations of Cat Arm and its potential for environmental damage. They have not submitted an impact study, an impact environmental assessment as is required under this act and the minister knows they have not. So, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to accept this as an environmental impact statement, then the Cat Arm development is going to go ahead without the benefit of an environmental study as required by the act.

And I want to ask the minister now Mr. Speaker, if Cat Arm, as far he is concerned, as far as his department is concerned, can the Cat Arm development now go ahead with no more environmental studies? Are they accepting, is he

MR. FLIGHT: as minister accepting the summary of the very preliminary reports, accepting that and giving the Newfoundland Hydro the go ahead on that project? Is that all he is going to require from Newfoundland Hydro by way of assurances that that project is environmentally safe and environmentally sound?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I will try to pick a question out of that. First of all, I take objection to the inference by the hon. member that the piece of legislation is a mockery or in fact that I am making a mockery of it. I have already indicated that Hydro have in fact done everything that is required under the act. The particular environmental impact statement just held up by the hon. member is the result of following the terms of reference that have been laid out by my department in order to complete that particular assessment. Whether or not that particular impact statement is acceptable to my department will be determined based on the results of the assessment committee which is now reviewing that statement. The preliminary report of that committee is in to me now and I am looking at it. Whether Hydro will be required to do an addendum to that impact statement is yet to be seen, but as soon as that whole process has been completed and I either reject or accept that particular impact statement, the

MR. DAWE: hon. member as well as all hon. members in this House, the people of Newfoundland, will be informed.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the growing intensity with respect to labour problems within the Province, and particularly as they relate to the public service, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether there have been any new developments over the weekend, or whether he has taken any initiatives or any initiatives taken by bargaining units presently negotiating with government, and I refer specifically to NAPE with respect to Workers' Compensation and the workers at the College of Trades and Technology, and teachers and nurses?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Workers' Compensation, the College of Trades and Technology, in the past week we had a communication dated the 23rd. to the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower with respect to resuming negotiations. My Deputy Minister and the Director of Labour Relations, Mr. Noseworthy, I believe as late as Friday the 27th. contacted the chief negotiator for NAPE and enquired as to what he wanted with respect to getting back to the bargaining table as was proposed in his letter. The chief negotiator for NAPE indicated at that time that he was not ready to go back to the bargaining table, that he wanted to wait for the outcome of negotiations that were ongoing, I believe at that time the Warders and the Newfoundland Farm Products worker were a couple of things that were mentioned, so we are maintaining contact on that one and waiting for a change in position of the

MR. DINN: negotiating committee for
NAPE.

With respect to the nurses,
there is a conciliation board to be set up. I believe the
union, the nurses' union is questioning the appointment of
the Treasury Board appointee to that conciliation board
and, therefore, that is being held up.

With respect to teachers,
the conciliation board report is in, both sides have it
and we will be awaiting replies, or either confirmation or
rejection of the conciliation board's report.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering
if I understood the minister correctly when he said that
NAPE rejected the offer to return to the bargaining table;
and if so, if that was the case that NAPE did reject, I am
just wondering if there were any conditions attached to the
government's offer of coming back to the bargaining table
again?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member
has difficulty putting words in his own mouth, he certainly
should not try to put them in mine. What I said with
respect to NAPE was that we received a communication dated
the 23rd. That communication talked about getting back to
the bargaining table. The Deputy Minister who received the
letter got in contact with NAPE. The Director of Labour
Relations, Mr. Noseworthy, got in contact with NAPE. The
latest communication was Friday, the 27th. at which point in
time there was a discussion

MR. J. DINN:

between the Director of Labour Relations and the chief negotiator for NAPE, I believe, and they talked about the contents of the letter and the idea of getting back to the bargaining table. It was indicated by the chief negotiator for NAPE to the Director of Labour Relations that he was not ready to get back to the bargaining table. It was not a matter of rejection, he was not ready at that point in time to get back to the bargaining table because, he said- and I cannot give a direct quote, I was not a party to the conversation, but this was related to me by Director of Labour Relations, he said in effect that he was not ready, he wanted to wait the outcome of warders' negotiations and, I believe, the Newfoundland Farm Products negotiations. That is as clear as I can put it, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it seems as though I understood the answer in the first instance. I am just wondering if the minister can give us further information with respect to the teachers. It seems to me that the conciliation board have made their report. Can the minister comment on that? Have the conciliation board made their report to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association? If so, what were some of the details of the recommendations from the conciliation board?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not want me to go through, I am sure, the conciliation board report.

MR. J. DINN: In a short half-hour Question Period, I could take up a half an hour -

MR. T. LUSH: You do not need to do that.

MR. J. DINN: - on that one. With respect to the conciliation board report on the teachers, the conciliation board report is in, it has been submitted to both sides of negotiations; I have not received a reply from either side as to whether either side has accepted or rejected the conciliation board report.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is absent from the House and the Minister of Fisheries is absent from the House, but in view of the fact that this matter is rather urgent, I would like to direct my question to the President of the Council. And it has to do with the heating up of the cod war between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Would the hon. gentleman inform the House if the government had been informed of any reprisals or retaliations or any sanctions on the part of the government of Nova Scotia with regard to Newfoundland fishermen or Newfoundlanders who go over to Nova Scotia every year to either fish or to work on draggers or work on boats or work in plants? Have there been any signs apart from what we have been hearing on the insults that are flying back and forth across the Gulf by the two ministers, has there been any signs, any indication, any communication from the government of Nova Scotia that they intend to take

MR. S. NEARY: sanctions against Newfoundland for their vicious attack on the Nova Scotian Government?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we just seen a real good example about how alleged and assumed information can be given when a question is asked. It was not a question, it was an exposition of the hon. members assessment of a particular situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in relation to that, the present status I think the hon. member is referring to are certain statements made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in relation to the taking of a large portion of the Northern cod for processing in Nova Scotia by a certain fish company. The purpose of the government's concern is not whether or not it is processed in Nova Scotia, whether it is processed in the Province of Quebec or for that matter in Tanganyika. The concern of this government is that the Northern cod stock, which has been traditionally belonging to the people of this Province continue to belong to the people of this Province, continue to be used and recognized as a basic resource of the people of Newfoundland. And the Province of Newfoundland is not turning its attention, as it were, as the hon. member likes to imply, towards other governments but towards a fishing company that is carrying on business in this Province. And we are determined that any fishing company, or any company for that matter, that is carrying on business in this Province is not going to be able to use the resources that have traditionally belonged to the people of Newfoundland and to our forefathers for another purpose. And if the hon. gentleman has objection to that, I would like to see him try to explain it.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Indeed I do have an objection to it, Mr. Speaker, because, first of all, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) did not answer my question. My question had to do with protection of Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland fishermen who travel to Nova Scotia.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, fishermen this very day, right at this moment while we are asking questions about this matter in this House, are over fishing three miles off the coast of Nova Scotia and bringing their fish back to Newfoundland. What I am asking the minister on behalf of the government is could he tell us what steps will be taken to protect the draggers and longliners from the Northeast coast and from the Southwest coast that are presently fishing in area 4T, which stretches from Cape Ray to Cape North, what protection these fishermen will be given in the even that Nova Scotia retaliates against Newfoundland, takes sanctions against Newfoundland and attempts to drive these fishermen away from the Nova Scotia coast?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is a hypothetical question. Secondly, as the hon. member well knows the fishermen in Newfoundland to whom he refers have historic rights to these fishing grounds and there has been no indication, and neither will there be any indication that these rights will be affected or, in fact, that they could be affected. Because, as I say, the fishermen to whom he refers, they and their forefathers have been fishing

MR. MARSHALL:

in those fishing grounds for many years. The nature of the stand taken by the Government of Newfoundland on the other hand with respect to the Northern cod is again to protect historic and basic rights, and these are the historic and basic rights of the fishermen and the people of this Province to the Northern cod stock and this government is determined it is going to protect these rights and we feel sure that it can be done without any interference into other basic rights which we have and we have traditionally enjoyed and which the hon. member is hoping to be able to, by inference, indicate that they might be in jeopardy because we are standing up for the people of Newfoundland and their rights.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I could take exception to that last remark about inference and ask the hon. gentleman to retract it, but I will just let it slide for the sake of saving a bit of time. The Nova Scotian government, through its Minister of Fisheries, publicly stated that they would take retaliatory action against Newfoundland if the government here continues on this disaster course that they are apparently on now, and I am asking the minister to give assurance to these fishermen, who, at this very moment, are fishing off the coast of Nova Scotia, that they are asked to move away from the coast of Nova Scotia, not to catch fish over there as Nova Scotia has every right to do - if Newfoundland has the right, Nova Scotia has the right - then what action will this government take to protect the rights of the fishermen who are now catching one million pounds of fish a day, one million pounds every twenty-

MR. NEARY: three hours, one million pounds of fish caught off the Nova Scotia coast is brought back to Newfoundland for processing? What protection do the plant owners, the plant workers and the fishermen have in case Nova Scotia retaliates, which they obviously intend to do?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is triple barrel question, repeating the questions that have been asked before. In the first place, the government is not going to draw into a dispute or an alleged dispute with the Government of Nova Scotia because of the interpretation that the hon. gentleman has put on certain statements emanating from certain people. The fact of the matter is, and I reiterate it again, as far as the government is concerned, the government's concern is with this particular company and that this particular company process the Northern cod caught in Newfoundland waters in the Province of Newfoundland. Now, the next question he asked is about alleged retaliatory measures that have been taken by the Province of Nova Scotia. We hope and we have the expectation that, despite what the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) indicates, that such retaliatory measures will not take place. But we can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the government is concerned that the fishermen to whom he refers have historic, traditional and natural rights to the fishing grounds in which they are prosecuting the fisheries

MR. MARSHALL: right now, off the Georgian Bank
in Nova Scotia, and we -

MR. NEARY: 4T is not the Georgian Bank.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, in that area.
And we, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Sidney Bight.

MR. MARSHALL: - with equal zealousness in
addition to that, Mr. Speaker , with equal zealousness will
protect the rights of the people of Newfoundland to their
traditional resource , that is, the Northern cod.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want
to follow the line of questioning with the minister for
a moment. if you would, the earlier questions in starting
the Question Period. We are obviously running out of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Which minister?

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of the Environment.
And I want to ask the minister, based on what he has seen
now, based on the fact that he has had an environmental impact
statement from Newfoundland Hydro, and based on the fact
that it is a summary of thirteen preliminary statements,
has the minister seen anything in it or is he considering
following Section 23 of the Act and asking concerned people
to write letters with regard to their concerns on the
Cat Arm development? And for the purpose of time, has the
minister seen anything in the environmental impact statements
submitted by Hydro- and one has to remember that that
statement was submitted by Hydro- the people who want to
develop Cat Arm - has he seen anything that would require him
to appoint an Environmental Assessment Board as required
under the act? At this point in time in his perusing
the report from Hydro, has he seen anything that would
have him consider appointing an Environmental Assessment Board
or asking concerned citizens if they have any interest in
the project?

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

MR. DAWE: It is nice to see that the hon. member is concerned about time. Mr. Speaker, the process is laid out in the act. It has several steps in it that are proceeded in a time sequence. The hon. member indicated that I may be ahead of myself on the assessment. Well, in this case I am proceeding as per the act and the process is that the impact statement has been submitted, it has been reviewed, the acceptability of the statement, which is not necessarily for the hon. member's benefit, an acceptance of whether it is or is not environmentally sound but an acceptance of the statement has yet to be given to Hydro one way or another. That is the next process. Once that statement is satisfactory to the department, it is evaluated and at that point in time a decision is made whether the project can go ahead based on a number of conditions or whether in fact it has enough concern about a particular item or a number of particular items to call for a public hearing process. But that decision, those decisions will be made as the process continues in its normal manner.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, a short one. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: It is only short, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate to the House, tell the House how long his department has had this impact statement from Hydro? At what point, when did the Department of the Environment and the minister receive this environmental impact statement from Newfoundland Hydro and how long have they had to determine what they are going to do about it, having regard to the act?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the exact date. If I remember correctly it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of approximately five to six weeks.

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

Before we proceed with routine matters, I want to make an apology to the Chair related to the adjournment of the Address in Reply last week, last Tuesday, in fact. The Chair understood that the hon. the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) at the time had moved adjournment of the House. In fact, in checking with Hansard - and, of course, the Chair put the motion to adjourn, which is always in order - but in checking with Hansard afterwards I found that he did, in fact, move adjournment of the debate, which was also somewhat unusual.

In any event, the matter has been discussed with the hon. the member for Humber West and he has assured me that to resolve any problem that might arise, he is prepared to indicate that he has completed his speech so that when the next time the Address in Reply is called I will recognize an hon. member to my right.

I just want to say it now rather than have it lying around my desk all afternoon.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. So we can carry on as we are doing today, yes.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2. Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt):

Order, please!

Shall the resolution

carry?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, it is only

right and proper that when the government asks the House to give it interim supply of one-third of this year's budget, over \$448 million, it is only right and proper that the government, the ministers, should give the House at least a little bit of information, give the House some information as to why they need \$448 million. And they should give the House some information on the running of their departments.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, it is an ideal time now, while we are debating interim supply, it is an ideal opportunity for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), to give us a run-down, to give us the first report, the only report that we have had in this House. We have no more idea than the man in the moon of what is happening to the petroleum

MR. NEARY: Directorate since it was established.

And here is a golden opportunity -

MR. BARRY: Flourishing and thriving.

MR. NEARY: Ah, he tells us it is flourishing and thriving. Well, according to what we can hear, Mr. Chairman, indeed that is true. The members of the Directorate are flourishing and thriving according to what we hear about the big salaries, and the big commissions, and the travelling of the Petroleum Directorate. I am sure that the strikers at the College of Trades and Technology, and the strikers down at the Workers' Compensation will be interested to learn of the salaries that are being paid to the Petroleum Directorate.

But it is a great opportunity,

Mr. Chairman, for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) to give a brief first report to this House. That Petroleum Directorate has been in place now for over a year and we are entitled, we have not had a report in this House and we are entitled to have some information on this Directorate- what it does, how many employees now make up the empire, the Petroleum Directorate empire, how much travelling they do, how many are on a contractual basis, what salaries they receive, what commissions, if any, they receive, and what they do? What indeed they do? We are entitled to have that information, Mr. Chairman, before we approve interim supply as we have to do before the deadline of tomorrow evening or tomorrow night at midnight I think the government has to have interim supply to pay its bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why do I raise this matter?

Well I raise this matter, number one, because we have never had a report on the Directorate. And number two, they seem to be doing exactly as they please. They are holding seminars whenever they feel like it.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Cabot Martin, who speaks sometimes for the Directorate and for the government, and Mr. Millan - Mr. Millan, who is a public servant, who has been enunciating the government policy, does not check with the hon. gentleman when he makes his statement.

MR. BARRY:

I run a tight shop.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman does not run a tight shop. If he does then I would like to hear him explain why it is that Mr. Millan has gone off and pioneered government policy at the speeches that he is making around various parts of Newfoundland and on the television and on the radio and in the newspapers, a public servant, The first time I suppose since Confederation, or the second time - Mr. Martin is the big culprit but Mr. Millan is equally as bad.

So they have all these seminars going, Mr. Chairman, to tell the Newfoundland people, we have had a seminar now on just about everything that you can name. A seminar on this, a seminar on that, they have had a seminar on everything except on how many times you should go to the bathroom a day. But I will tell you what gets me about the seminars, Mr. Chairman, is this; they say all the seminars are geared up - they say, "We have got to have a seminar on this so that Newfoundlanders will not change their lifestyle." I wish somebody would explain that to me.

You have these millionaires and these billionaires down at the Holiday Inn, and over at the university, telling the Newfoundland people, "We have to hold a seminar so you will not change your lifestyle." Now it is all right for them, they have their big mansions and their executive jets and they have their big, fat, expense accounts, it is all right for them to have three or four cars in their driveway, it is all right for them to have a condominium in Florida, or some other part of the world, and then they come down here and say to us, "The reason we are here is to tell you not to change your lifestyle." The reason of course, Mr. Chairman, they do not want us to change our lifestyle is that instead of some of them being millionaires they want to become billionaires. And everyone in this Province now is beginning to

MR. NEARY: realize that only a handful of people will benefit by the oil on the Grand Banks. You have Newfoundlanders now who are millionaires and are not satisfied with that, now they want to become billionaires. And they are telling us not to change our lifestyle, to make sure that they do become billionaires.

Why, Mr. Chairman, let me give the House an example. I went down to a garage recently, only about two weeks ago, and one of the salesmen in the showroom said to me, "Come out," he said, "on the ramp, come out in the garage, I want to show you something." So I went out and this car was up on the ramp and the salesman said to me, "Can you guess how much that car is worth?"

MR. BARRY: \$96,000.

MR. NEARY: And I said, "No," I said, "I could not guess how much it is worth," but just to be courteous and kind to the salesman,

MR. NEARY:

I said, "I will take a guess at it, Is it worth \$20,000?"

I had no idea what it was worth. He said, "\$20,000?"

\$20,000? That car, he said, is \$96,000."

MR. BARRY:

A Maserati, is it?

MR. NEARY:

"It is equipped with a television set, it is equipped with a bar, it is equipped with a telephone".

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about ear plugs?

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman said who got it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not me.

MR. NEARY:

I would say one of the one's who is going to benefit by the oil, not an ordinary Newfoundlander. A \$96,000 car. \$96,000 car.

MR. YOUNG:

Tell us about your big car?

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, mine was not - no, never mind, I will not take the bait. But, Mr. Chairman, a \$96,000 car; now that is an indication to me of who is going to benefit by the oil in this Province. It is not going to be the ordinary Newfoundlander. It is going to be the likes of the gentleman who owns that \$96,000 car, who is an employee of Crosbie's Offshore Services, and I would not mind it so badly, Mr. Chairman, but they are getting these \$96,000 cars out of the backs of Newfoundlanders who are working off the rigs. They are collecting \$2 an hour for every Newfoundlander who works on two or three of the oil rigs on the Grand Banks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Two dollars an hour they are getting. I raised this in the House before, another scandal.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. They have some kind of an agreement with the companies who own the rigs that they will do the hiring and they will collect \$2 an hour for every worker that they put on the oil rigs, that is Harvey's and Crosbie's.

MR. BARRY: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is right now and only proper that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) should give us some facts, give us a few details about this petroleum directorate. Tell us what they have been up to in the last twelve months or so, since we passed a bill in this House establishing the directorate: How many employees they have, how many are under contract, what kind of an empire they have built up for themselves? They seem to be developing into a law unto themselves. We have the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, which is a law unto itself. We have the Public Utilities Board, which is a law unto itself. Now we have the petroleum directorate. And, Mr. Chairman, we would like to know what they are doing. Are they merely enforcing government regulations? Do they oversee the awarding of contracts? Do they let any contracts themselves? Is there any conflict of interest on the directorate? Does the Chairman of the Directorate, for instance, still have his own private consulting company while he is under contract to the Newfoundland Government? If that is so, Mr. Chairman, would that not be a conflict of interest? Or has he relinquished his private contracting company, his private consulting company? Or does he leave whenever he feels like it and go to South America or Central America to look after the jobs that he is doing down there?

MR. NEARY: We have a right to know these things, Mr. Chairman. And I believe this is a good opportunity for the hon. gentleman to give us our first report on the petroleum directorate. And having said that I will take my seat hoping that the hon. gentleman will leap up in his place and give us a few details. Or does he expect, do the government expect us to just rubber stamp this half million dollars - a half a billion dollars, rather? A half a billion dollars, almost \$500 million, do they expect us -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: - to rubber stamp it without getting any information?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, it is pretty close to the 24th. of May now and like the trout I will rise to the bait and give the hon. member a few answers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give them the facts.

MR. BARRY: The petroleum directorate - no, I would not confuse them with facts - the petroleum directorate, Mr. Chairman, is, I believe, doing an admirable job. And not only that, it is not afraid to do its job out in the full glare of publicity. And instead of practicing the technique employed by previous Liberal Governments in this Province, where everything is done behind closed doors, we have gone so much the other way, Mr. Chairman, that we had a symposium here a couple of weeks ago. And what did we do? Did we have it behind closed doors? Did we haul in all the big-wigs from all the big oil companies and lock them in behind closed doors and make little deals with them behind the

MR. BARRY: scenes, and have all the oil sold for three mils declining to 2 mils over the next sixty years like was done with the Upper Churchill contract? No, Mr. Chairman.

What we did was we televised the entire proceedings. We invited these experts and these executives of oil companies, and supply companies, and construction

MR. L. BARRY:

companies that come in from all over the world. We charged them for the privilege of coming in - I think the fee was something in excess of \$500 apiece. And, Mr. Chairman, they came in like trout, in droves, we had to beat them away with a stick, had to close off the registration, could not handle them all who wanted to come in here, because they know that this Province has a great energy potential with respect to offshore oil and gas and they want to be where the action is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we know for that very reason that as long as we have our jurisdiction preserved and protected and our ownership claim clearly established beyond doubt - and I would ask hon. members to assist us in the process of doing that by calling off their Liberal hacks in Ottawa, calling off their dogs, their colleagues, who are trying to take this away, take this birthright away from our Newfoundland people, and get behind this government in this great fight to preserve this resource.

But, Mr. Chairman, even though members of the Opposition may not appreciate the value of this resource even though they may be prepared to get up and impede and block and criticize and try and cut down everything positive that is being done to manage that resource right here in the Province, people in other places of the world, other parts of the world know where the action is. And I think that symposium that was called and the full registration that we had there gave a little indication to these people who were involved in the oil industry and know how important it is to be on the ground floor. The fact that they came out in full force shows that we are right. The Petroleum Directorate is right in insisting upon, right from day one, proper management of this resource.

MR. L. BARRY: And, Mr. Chairman, we are not ashamed to say that we are putting in the best people we can get in that Petroleum Directorate, people who are knowledgeable about the oil industry, who do not have to take second place to anyone. And, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to say that most of them are Newfoundlanders. A lot of people find it strange that there are Newfoundlanders who have experience in the oil industry. Mr. Chairman, there are Newfoundlanders working all over the world in the oil industry, many of whom have not just a few months experience, not just one or two years but they are getting up, Mr. Chairman, into ten years experience - and a lot of them you will find have about seven or eight years experience. When we started to emphasize oil and gas in the early seventies - 1972, 1973 - although the Opposition did not pay any attention, although they just spent all their time getting up, as they are still doing and saying, 'Oh, go on, boy, go on. Stop talking about oil and gas. Talk about something else. That is not important. Only a couple of jobs, no benefits! I drove him out of the House, Mr. Chairman, I drove him out. He cannot take it. When the truth is thrown across at him, he cannot take it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, a lot of our young Newfoundlanders, even though the Opposition might not have been listening, a lot of our young Newfoundlanders were listening. And they said to themselves, 'Yes, there is going to be a future here in the oil industry'. And they went away, went to Alberta some of them, and worked in the oil industry there, and others went over to the North Sea and they worked off Norway, worked off Scotland, others went as far as Africa, Indonesia, Mr. Chairman. And a lot of these

MR. L. BARRY: are coming back now. Some of them we have working with us in the Petroleum Directorate, others you will find out on the rigs off the Grand Banks.

But, Mr. Chairman, all of this will be for naught, all of the great expertise that we have built up within this Province, all of the controls that we have put in place to make sure that Newfoundlanders are employed, all of that will go right out the window if this terrible conspiracy continues between the Opposition and the Liberals in Ottawa to take away control from this Province and have it all controlled out of Central Canada, out of Ottawa.

You will see then, Mr. Chairman, where the action is and it will not be here in this Province. The action will be taking place somewhere else, whether it will be shipments of goods out of Halifax direct to the offshore or whether it be the consulting, the research, all the high technology decisions being taken in Ottawa and all the technological spin-offs staying in Central Canada. You will not see it happen here in this Province. And that is why, Mr. Chairman, we consider it so important to have a good team right here in Newfoundland in

MR. BARRY:

the Petroleum Directorate advising our government on how to best manage that resource. And, Mr. Chairman, we take second place to no one in terms of the regulations that we have in place, in terms of the way that we are insisting that these companies supply us with information, in terms of the way we insist that they come in and get our approval before letting contracts and insisting that they have these contracts let to Newfoundlanders. If the people are there in the Province, if the businessmen are there or the workers, depending upon the type of job, who can supply what they need, we insist that it be done locally.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not running any Mickey Mouse outfit. We are running a first class operation and we recognize that in order to get first class individuals, you have to pay them. And, Mr. Chairman, we are not afraid to do that. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not locking the Province in to any long-term contracts, as hon. members were able to do when they were in government for their friends and their cronies and their buddies.

Mr. Chairman, we have contracts, yes, we have contracts. In most cases they are for one year, some cases they go for two years and, Mr. Chairman, it is working and the reason this was done on a contractual basis is that, first of all, when we started putting together the directorate we were not sure as to how much activity there was going to be and how many people we were going to need, so we did not want to build up a great bureaucracy that would be there and be unnecessary in the event that we did not get enough oil and gas, enough in the way of discoveries. We have been fortunate over the last couple of years, Mr. Chairman, it will be two years this August, and we should have a great - instead of Fourth of July Day, in

MR. BARRY: Newfoundland we should have a Twenty-fourth of August Day, or whatever the date was in August, that the Hibernia P-15 well came in. Because, Mr. Chairman, that date is every bit as significant for, not just Newfoundland but for Canada as was the date of the LeDuc well in Alberta which started the great oil and gas boom in Western Canada.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say again, we are getting good personnel, we are paying them what we have to pay them in order to attract people, good people. We have to be competitive. We have to be competitive with -

MR. NEARY: Give us the details. Do you have the details?

MR. BARRY: I do not carry around, Mr. Chairman, the names and salaries of people and -

MR. NEARY: Send and get it. We are going to want it (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - it has never been the practice of giving out individual names and individual salaries in this House. There is a block vote and there is a block vote for the Petroleum Directorate and there are the numbers of people. You can work it out, Mr. Chairman. We do not get into -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has expired.

MR. BARRY: - individuals and how much their salaries are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a constant and continual thing by the members opposite to attempt to introduce red herrings and put up smoke screens at every turn of the road. My hon. friend and colleague from LaPoile (S. Neary)

MR. LUSH: asked some very serious and some legitimate questions. But all we get, of course, is a tirade on the other side talking about offshore ownership, offshore control.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow myself to be sidetracked into that. We on this side have stated where we stand with respect to the offshore, and it is just a red herring. We want to get some answers to some very important questions, some very legitimate questions before putting through this Interim Supply measure.

Mr. Chairman, on Friday I raised a question, a very important question, a question that may not be affecting the majority of the population in this Province but one that is affecting three hundred unincorporated communities in this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. the House Leader (W. Marshall) got up and referred to the nonsense that was being raised by members opposite, members on this side, he certainly did not mention that particular point. And, Mr. Chairman, that is an important point, a point that concerns three hundred unincorporated communities in this Province, affecting

MR. LUSH: approximately 70,000 to 80,000 people, and, Mr. Chairman, I refer to a measure, I refer to an act which prevents these people from getting any of the funds that we are today or tomorrow will be giving government permission to spend. None of these communities will be able to get any of this money for fire protection, for waste disposal and for water. These three important services, Mr. Chairman, are denied these people in 300 communities in this Province, and the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) did not think that important enough to talk about or to reply to.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter when we are denying monies, when we are denying funds to 300 communities in this Province for these vital public services of fire protection, water and waste disposal areas, or garbage collection, as we refer to it in a lot of the rural Newfoundland area.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district I have had a series of major fires in the last year, and because these rules militate and restrict these people from getting these funds, we have had some fatal fires. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, a recent fire on St. Brendan's that resulted in the loss of a beautiful church, that if this happened anywhere on the Avalon Peninsula people would be talking about it yet; the loss of a beautiful church, that took the people years and years to build, because they never had the proper fire equipment. I might say that particular incident now has been taken care of. As so often is the case, of course, we look into things after they have happened, it is a matter of locking the barn door after the horse has escaped. And this is the situation in this particular St. Brendan's situation.

Recently in Bunyan's Cove we had three or four homes lost, completely demolished by

MR. LUSH: fire because these people cannot meet this regulation, and the regulation I am referring to, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to go into it in detail today, but I do want to bring it up again because it is an important matter and something that government can act on immediately, and it is a regulation which requires a majority of home owners to attend a public meeting and to vote to become a local service district. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a part of the regulations that accompany the new Municipalities Act that is discriminatory to these approximately 300 communities in Newfoundland and 70,000 to 80,000 people and prevents them from getting a part of the funds that we are allocating to the government today. These people, Mr. Chairman, are discriminated against, and it is a simple act by the government to change this particular act, a very simple thing. Well, it is a regulation that accompanies this regulation (6). It is regulation (6), Mr. Chairman, of the local service district regulations and it is a tremendous discriminatory regulation and one that will prevent a majority of communities in this Province from becoming a local service district.

And if the government want these people to become local service districts, let them change this regulation, let them change this regulation to enable the 70,000 to 80,000 people living in rural Newfoundland to be able to qualify for some of the funds from some of the public dollars of this Province that presently they cannot qualify for.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the government fail to move on this act it will show, again, their callousness and insensitivity to the people living in rural Newfoundland. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is

MR. LUSH: not here today to reply to this and to tell us when the government intend to change this regulation or why they made this stupid regulation in the first place. I think it was a matter of carelessness, I do not think the government really intended this act to be the way it is. But, Mr. Chairman, unless this act is changed, and I suggested on Friday what I thought would be an alternative to this regulation which requires the majority of homeowners to attend a meeting and to vote to become a local service district, I suggested that we should have a petition. A petition would serve the same purpose because all hon. members know the difficulty in getting 50 per cent of homeowners to attend a public meeting.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. T. LUSH: it is more complex than what I had really suggested, because I think the government is planning, in its plans to get regional government, to get four or five communities to become incorporated. Mr. Chairman, under this present regulation it is difficult enough to get one community - well, it is practically impossible to get one community let alone to talk about several communities. and it is the regulation that needs to be changed; it is discriminatory to rural Newfoundland, discriminatory to three hundred communities, discriminatory to approximately 70,000 to 80,000 people in Newfoundland at this moment and prevents them, it prevents them, Mr. Chairman, from benefitting from the services, the public services that they have a right to expect. And I would hope that the minister when rising will tell us that the government intends to change this particular regulation for the benefit of these people living in the smaller communities in rural Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, these people are the backbone of this Province, NOT because they do not form the majority of the people of this Province does not mean that we have to continually neglect people living in those areas, to deny them from the services that others have, the public services of fire fighting, fire protection, water, and garbage collection that they have a right to expect. And, Mr. Chairman, I have a hope that the government would move on this most important regulation and do something about it as quickly as possible. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know if the minister can give us some idea of what the cost of the government propaganda programme has been to promote or to indoctrinate our people about the government stand on the constitution. Because, Mr. Chairman, they have not been trying to enlighten

MR. T. LUSH: the people . What they have been doing is sending out literature to all parts of the Province indoctrinating the people to their own narrow parochial stand, a stand, Mr. Chairman, that is devisive; it is a stand, Mr. Chairman, illustrates a very narrow prospective of Canada. And I would like to know, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what all of this is costing the taxpayers of this Province, all of the propaganda literature that has been published in the last four or five months and it is all been practically the same thing. I do not know what it is called now, but the Five Year Plan Mr. Chairman, is one. There is another one - together or something, I just forget what it is, but there are three major documents all of them saying the same thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sounds like (inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: - all of them enunciating the same ideas that we got in the Throne Speech and then these little tracts, these little brochures, 'Hang Tough', and then another one that was giving the difference in revenue if we own the offshore. All of these things, Mr. Chairman, what are they costing the people of this Province? What is it costing the people of this Province to allow themselves to be indoctrinated with the constitutional gibberish that has been sent out to the people of

MR. LUSH: this Province in the last four or five months. I expect, Mr. Chairman, it is a tidy bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please! The member's time is up. Is he winding up? Time is up.

MR. LUSH: Time is up?

Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, just to keep evenness on one side and the other I thought I would have a few words at this point in time. And also there are a number of matters that have been brought up, both a bit earlier today and also on the last day that might need comment.

The last time I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I was just going to get into a subject that had been originally brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and time ran out so I would like to go back to that now if I may just for a short while.

The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) had expressed concern about alcohol abuse in the Province, and I think all members of the House are certainly concerned in that and certainly government is. Now the hon. member took the line that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation should be doing something about this in a very specific way and I think he meant some sort of educational process and that could be one way that one could deal with the matter. However, certainly it is not the only way and in my view it is not the best way. The Liquor Corporation is not orientated that way nor is it organized that way. The Liquor Corporation is essentially a vehicle for supply and for distribution. It is not particularly well organized, nor does it have the personnel on staff and so on and so forth to get into an educational programme. There are other arms of government which are much more adept at doing that type of thing

DR. COLLINS: and government has set up a group which is to evolve a plan that we hope will tackle what is an increasing problem. And the plan will involve likely the Department of Education, the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services. And I think that will be a more effective way of getting at the educational side.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not like to leave the impression that government is not doing anything about this matter. It certainly is. Before getting into what the provincial government is doing I would like to just make sure that hon. members understand that in terms of media advertising this is, certainly as far as the electronic media is concerned, this is the responsibility of CRTC. There are regulations laid down by CRTC as to what may be put forth on the electronic media in terms of advertising of alcoholic beverages and all provinces are invited to partake in that process in whatever way they wish. They can become part of a committee structure or they can give briefs or indications of how they want the thing to be handled. And we, the Province of Newfoundland, have had connections and have communications with the CRTC over this. The CRTC I do not think is doing a

DR. J. COLLINS:

particularly good job, quite honestly. One of the things that they should be doing or one of their guidelines is that the advertising of alcoholic beverages should not be done in such a way as to have a connection with youth or the connection with a desirable lifestyle, and that type of thing. And I think we can all think of advertisements which do exactly that, particularly in terms of beer advertising, and this is a point that we have made with CRTC.

Now in terms of the provincial government itself, although I do not think anyone feels that perhaps anyone is doing sufficient in this area, we are doing as good a job as most jurisdictions at this present time. And as I mentioned, we are hoping to get into a larger educational programme. But the Province supplies money, supplies funding to the Newfoundland Drug and Alcohol Addiction Society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

And that matter will be brought before the House when the Budget comes down to see if this should be continued in this coming year also.

We also supply funding for such operations as the Detoxification Centre which is connected with St. Clare's Mercy Hospital. The Liquor Licencing Board is funded by government, and this is a control mechanism. The control mechanism is very clearly followed when applications are made by individuals and companies who wish to operate lounges and that type of activity. And I might say, one of the prerequisites for an application is that the local area, though the residents in the local area and organizations in the local area such as churches and so on, that they should not raise any objections to an application.

DR. J. COLLINS: The Liquor Licencing Board does have an enforcement aspect to it. It has its own inspectors, not a great number, but it has its own inspectors who will go around and make sure that the regulations that the Board attach to applications are followed. The Board also has an arrangement with the Newfoundland Constabulary, and in areas outside of the city of St. John's with the RCMP that they also will be an enforcement and a supervisory arm for the Board.

As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone feels that sufficient has been done in this regard. Incidentally, the RCMP also, as possibly hon. members will recall and remember, the RCMP have put on a very effective programme in the last year or two to try to diminish the incidents of driving whilst under the influence of alcohol, and this has had a very beneficial effect, I think, in terms of our highway statistics related to alcohol abuse.

I would agree with the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) that this is a subject that we have to keep before us, especially - well not only because of, but perhaps more especially because of the revenues the Province gets from the sale of alcoholic beverages, and I think I can assure the House that this is a matter of concern to us and one that we will do the best we can with within the limited means at the disposal of the provincial government.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other points that came up along the way - I do not really think there are any ones of great matter and great concern - but the hon. member for

DR. COLLINS: Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) brought up the point that he had difficulty in seeing how his own district would benefit from the expenditures that are laid out in the Interim Supply Bill. Well, the hon. member, I am sure, understands that we do not keep our accounts that way, neither in the Interim Supply Bill estimates or in the main estimates. We do not budget in terms of districts, we budget in terms of departments and we budget in terms of programmes. And if the hon. member, who is not here today, unfortunately, but if the hon. member wished to get further information about his own district, I think if he approached any one of the departments concerned, especially if he had a specific question in mind, he would find that he would be able to get the information he desires with very little difficulty. But I cannot, nor would any previous Finance Minister, be able to say, 'In the district of Eagle River we are going to spend so much on transportation, so much on education, so much on health, so much on social services, and so on and so forth.' This is not the way we keep our accounts.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) indicated that the bill, the funding in the Interim Supply Bill for the Department of Education was \$114.5 million approximately, and he stated that, if I remember correctly, all or most of this was for teachers salaries and that, therefore, the amount was excessive. Well, that is not true. In actual fact approximately - or a bit less than half of that in the Interim Supply Bill is for teachers salaries, \$53.5 million, the rest is for other aspects of our educational system, including the maintenance of schools and so on.

MR. THOMS: Could I ask the hon. minister just a question relating back to your discussion on the abuse of alcohol in the Province. Something interesting for me was the distinction that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, or the licencing board puts on clubs and lounges in this Province. In this Province, for example, it is not permitted for a person under the age of nineteen to frequent a lounge. I think there are special conditions under which he can frequent a lounge, but the primary rule is that he

MR. THOMS: cannot. But a club, for example, a person of any age can go in and frequent a club that sells alcoholic beverages. Now, the hon. minister may not know the answer at this point in time but maybe you could get one for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) asked a question.

DR. COLLINS: I will certainly get some more information on that if it is required, but, I think, certainly in terms of special licencing, special licences are sometimes given out by the board to others than owners of lounges and so on, and these special licences are given for certain things that go on that are not related only to the consumption of alcohol. You know they would be given at, say, a church event or whatever. And, of course, if one excluded those below the age of nineteen, just because of alcohol being sold there, it would work to the detriment of the activity itself. That is in the case of special licences.

In terms of club licences, I suspect somewhat the same thing applies. I know of some clubs which are the fraternity types of clubs and there are many activities going on there, family activities to a large extent, where the adults, of course, can take advantage of the offering of alcoholic beverages. But there are other activities there that are orientated toward younger members of the family, and it would not be to the advantage of the community if the underaged individuals were excluded in those instances.

I am not sure that is the total answer but if there is other information to be given I will come back with it, hopefully, before the Interim Supply Bill passes through all its stages.

DR. J. COLLINS: Grade XII was mentioned, and there was criticism about the decision to go ahead with Grade XII this year, I think mainly on the basis that the educational system is under strain already and any extra funding that is available should go into the present system. I see my time has expired, Mr. Chairman. All I can say just to finish off, is that that is a judgement call. Our education system needs more than just the present system, it cannot be a static system, it must go with the times, it must do what is required for the better education of all aspects of education of our youths. And there was a judgement call and the judgement call was that at this point in time we needed to expand beyond the present structure of the educational system.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I want to come back to the question that I raised originally and that brought a response from the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), brought a political response, I might say, Mr. Chairman. The hon. minister did not give the House the facts that I asked for. I asked the hon. minister, and he should be able to give the House this information. If he does not have it in front of him, it is only a matter of making a phone call, the information can be brought into the House in connection with the offshore directorate. How many employees do they have? Table the salaries of the directorate. We are entitled to have that information. Every bit of information in connection with the directorate the House is entitled to have it, names if they want to. It is public money, the taxpayers' money is being spent, the taxpayers are entitled to have names, classifications, salaries, contracts and what have you, everything tabled in connection with the offshore directorate, Mr. Chairman, it is a fair question. And one of the answers

MR. S. NEARY: that I would like to get, that I did not get from the minister, was in connection with the Chairman of that directorate who we were told originally not only received a substantial salary from the public treasury but was also permitted to operate a private consulting firm.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not done as members know, that is just not done! That is a no, no in the public service, a no, no! And I ask the minister to tell us if Mr. Millen, who is Chairman of the Directorate, is still operating a private consulting firm. And if so, does he have any contracts with the Newfoundland Government? Does he have any contracts with the directorate? Does he have any contracts with the minister's department? We are entitled to know that, Mr. Chairman. We have to look at the possible conflict of interest here and we are entitled to have the information. And I am glad to hear that we are attracting good people! I am glad to hear that we are attracting good people but give us the salaries of these good people. Table their contracts, What other benefits do they get besides their salary? Do they get pension rights? Do they get other fringe benefits like insurance plans? Are they provided with a car? Are they given a house? I mean, we are entitled to know all of this, Mr. Chairman. And the minister got up and made the absurd statement, made the statement that we are not entitled to know the names of the people who receive money from the public treasury. We are not entitled to have it!

MR. L. BARRY: Yes, you are.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, that is not what the minister said a few minutes ago.

MR. L. BARRY: You are not entitled to have the salary and the name of the individual tied together.

MR. S. NEARY: Why are we not entitled to have it? Why are we not? We are entitled to have that information. That is taxpayers' money that is being spent.

MR. L. BARRY: It has never been done.

MR. S. NEARY: It has been done, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. BARRY: You will go out chasing after individuals then, giving them a hard time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to have that information and it has been done and it will be done! It is taxpayer money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman chose to make a political speech when he got up. Scolding the Opposition again, scolding us! Well, Mr. -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, we found out Bob Cole's salary, did we not?

MR. MOORES: That is right. And Mr. Nutbeem's.

MR. S. NEARY: No, we did not find out - we do not know yet how much Nutbeem ripped off the taxpayers for. The hon. gentleman did not tell us, when he talked about that symposium that was held, he did not tell us whether or not there is going to be a pipeline to bring the oil and gas ashore from the Grand Banks. Because the hon. gentleman knows full well that there is not going to be a pipeline. The hon. gentleman knows that the oil will be loaded at the wellhead and carried away. And the hon. gentleman also knows that the oil companies can operate under one permit, a federal permit, and they can take that oil to all parts of the world without any reference at all to this government. What do we do if they - let us say, for instance, Mr. Chairman,

March 30, 1981

Tape No. 762

DW - 4

MR. S. NEARY: that Mobil submits their pro-
duction plans to the Government of Canada and to the

MR. NEARY: provincial government, which they are doing.

MR. FLIGHT: Which they are doing now.

MR. NEARY: No, they have asked, by the way, for an extension and I would like for the minister to comment on that. They have asked for an extension of time to carry out some more drilling exploration before they submit their production plans. But let us say they have a few weeks, they submit these production plans and the Province gets into a dispute with Mobil and the Government of Canada says, 'Go ahead Mobil and start producing oil'. As I said before, do we use the Norma and Gladys and the water bombers to go out then to protect our rights on the Grand Banks? So, Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, this question of ownership the hon. gentleman raises, and every time he raises it he scolds the Opposition. Well, I am going to read now the hon. gentleman a letter so that there will never again be any doubt in the hon. gentleman's mind where I stand on offshore. I want to read a letter that I wrote the Prime Minister of Canada on March 26th., last week, in connection with the offshore. I want to put this in the public record, Mr. Chairman, so never again will the minister be able to get up and get away with his silly nonsense and his silly political games that he is playing. Because the offshore ownership question will be settled only when this government is prepared to sit down and negotiate with the Government of Canada to establish the ownership, to argue it out, and then to come to some kind of an agreement. Otherwise, the only way it will be settled, Mr. Chairman, is in the Supreme Court of Canada. One way or the other there has to be a deal. My God, I mean, are we stupid people? There has to be a deal. If there is no deal, if there is a stand-off, then the only way to resolve it is before the

MR. NEARY: Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, Mobil has threatened to take both governments to court. Well, if they go ahead the issue may be settled. But this government seems to be rather jittery and jumpy about that and a threat will cancel Mobil's -

MR. BARRY: There has just been an assassination attempt on President - .

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. BARRY: The news says there was just an assassination attempt on Reagan.

MR. NEARY: There was? Is he hurt?

MR. BARRY: His Press Secretary was killed apparently.

MR. NEARY: His Press Secretary was killed?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) is in stable condition, so I hear.

MR. BARRY: They also got the assassin.

MR. NEARY: I see.

Mr. Chairman, what we have to know now is what action if any - what is happening now? Is this government just sitting back waiting for somebody to come crawling to them to settle the offshore question? Or is this government taking the initiative to have the matter of offshore ownership resolved? Because, Mr. Chairman, I can say that we own the offshore, as I always say, the minister can say we own the offshore, all Newfoundland can say we own it, but how do we prove we own it? How do we prove it? So I am going to read this letter which I think puts the thing in its proper perspective, the minister can have a copy if he wants it: "Dear Prime Minister:

MR. BARRY: Dear Prime Minister: That reveals all.

MR. NEARY: "There continues to be some lack of understanding, a misunderstanding here, I regret to say, about the precise nature of your offer to Newfoundland in respect of the" - can I have - boys, I cannot hear myself here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shh, shh!

MR. NEARY: - "precise nature of your offer to Newfoundland in respect of the offshore resources that exist off the Newfoundland portion of Canada's Atlantic seaboard.

Newfoundlanders unanimously hope and pray that it may be found that title to those resources belongs to Newfoundland". Now, let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. minister. These are my words: "Newfoundlanders unanimously hope and pray that it may be found that the title to those resources belong to Newfoundland. But if it turns out not to be so" -

MR. BARRY: What?

MR. NEARY: - "it will be a matter of importance and urgent concern to us to know exactly what your offer is. Is it your offer that Newfoundland shall be free to collect 100 per cent of all royalties, taxes etc., from any such offshore resources that come under development precisely as if those existed not offshore but underneath the surface, or even on the surface of dry land in this Province, or even underneath any ponds, lakes, rivers within the Province just as is now the case with timber, hydro electric, oil or gas resources that exist in this Province, that your offer is for a such a period of time as may be required for Newfoundland to become 'a have' Province whereupon we would be expected to share our good fortune with the less fortunate

MR. NEARY:

provinces of Canada as up to now (and assuredly for quite a period to come) we have shared in the good fortune of Canadian provinces? So that the matter may be absolutely clear, am I right in understanding that as such large industrial concerns in this Province as Abitibi Price, Bowaters, Iron Ore Company of Canada, Advocate Mines that developed land based resources in our Province draw their profit from such development, pay taxes to the Government of Canada, pay royalties and taxes to the Government of Newfoundland so the companies developing oil and/or gas offshore would, under your offer, be required to pay federal taxes, permitted to make their profits and be obliged to pay to Newfoundland the same royalties that they would be expected to pay if they were land based? If Newfoundland decided to submit the question to the Supreme Court of Canada, who owns the offshore resources, and the Supreme Court says that Canada owns them, would your present offer be renewed to Newfoundland? Finally, Prime Minister, could I trespass further on your time to ask you to give a technical definition of the term 'have province' that you have used in your offer.

Sincerely yours."

Now, I would like to hear the minister's reaction to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased and happy to see the hon. member opposite admit that there is some ambiguity and some considerable ambiguity in this very general offer that the Prime Minister has thrown out and I am very pleased to see - and I think the member should be complimented for trying to pin down the Prime Minister on just what he is saying. And I would like to see more members opposite taking the same

MR. BARRY: constructive approach, to pin down the Prime Minister. And when you get your response back, I will be very interested in seeing it.

MR. NEARY: I will table it. I will give you (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: I hope you do because then we will pin down, first of all, what is this 100 per cent of revenue that the Prime Minister is referring to. Now, it is unfortunate that you did not go a bit further and you did not ask the Prime Minister whether he was going to be prepared to have the Province involved in deciding what price was going to be recovered for the sale of oil from Hibernia because, you see, if the Federal Government can say, 'you must sell it at such and such a price', they can make sure that there is very little in the way of economic rent or profit that is available for the Province.

So that is a very, very important involvement, that we should be involved in that decision, not that it should be our decision solely but that we should be, as a Province involved in the deciding such important questions as what is the price which will be obtained.

MR. MOORES:

That is not true.

MR. NEARY:

I have done my homework on that too.

MR. BARRY:

The member from Carbonear (R. Moores)

is saying that the Province should not be involved in that decision. Horrible, horrible, horrible. And the member is not saying a truth. Am I allowed to say that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MOORES:

No, you want world prices.

MR. BARRY:

The member is incorrect in his

statements. His statements are not factual. His statements are totally incorrect and fabricated. Am I allowed to say that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

In other words, he is lying. He

is a liar.

MR. BARRY:

No, no, no. We are not able to say

that.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, this government says that we should move in an orderly fashion over a period of time that will permit us to look out for the person on fixed income, the lower income person. We should move up to seventy-five to eighty-five per cent of the Chicago price. Mr. Chairman, members opposite may not know what the Chicago price is. They should do a little bit of reading so that they can find out what is going on in the oil industry. They should even read the submissions and the briefs that this government has presented at First Ministers' Conferences, before the National Energy Board and so on, and they will see it set out there just what it is that this Province is submitting should apply as far as the prices for Hibernia oil are concerned.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, they should take a look at the documents, the reports that we have been putting out down in the Petroleum Directorate, by these very gentlemen who the member opposite, in his not so constructive part of the speech, is

MR. BARRY: trying to attack and cut down and destroy their credibility and question their competence. It should not be done, Mr. Chairman. We should be supporting these Newfoundlanders who are doing their best to see, and are achieving a result that sees the management of that resource within this Province being as good as is happening anywhere in the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the first oversight in the letter is, unfortunately, a failure to pin the Prime Minister down as to whether this Province is going to be permitted, if he has his way, to have any say over the price which will be obtained. Because it does not matter if you will only get - you know, 100 per cent of the profit, if it is already been skimmed off by keeping the price too low, does not help us very much. And the other large gap is whether the Prime Minister would be permitted in his gracious *lese majesté*, if he has his way, to let the Province participate in decisions with respect to the rate of production. Is the Prime Minister of Canada, if he gets his way, going to see that that oil is sucked up to Central Canada as fast as possible, not used for industry here in this Province? Is he not going to give the economy of Newfoundland an opportunity to keep up with what is happening in the industry? Is he going to have the great gaping maw of Central Canada fed by this black goeey stuff from the offshore so quickly that we will not be able to train our people to get involved in the industry, to get not just the hewers of wood and drawers of water jobs, but the high technology jobs available in the industry?

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Now, these are some of the defects that are present in the member's letter. But I am happy and pleased to see him attempting to put the Prime

MR. BARRY: Minister on the spot, and I compliment him for that approach. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that he is going to be prepared to come across the House when he gets the response, which I know he is going to get from the Prime Minister, which indicates that none of these important decisions will the Prime Minister want to see taken here in this Province. And I will be welcoming him with open arms when he is ready to come across, when he receives that letter.

MR. FLIGHT: He what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I am also happy to see him refer to this terrible, terrible qualification that the Prime Minister put on, He said we are going to have 100 per cent of the revenue until we are a have Province. Now, first of all, how is it that Canada did not fall apart in the last hundred-odd years when Ontario was a have province. How is it that the Canadian nation did not self-destruct because citizens in the Province of Ontario were earning more than the national average in terms of per capita income. How is it, Mr. Chairman, that the Province did not self-destruct and the country did not self-destruct because the Government of Ontario was able to keep taxes down and so forth? Because they were doing better than the national average.

MR. STAGG: Right! Right!

MR. BARRY: Because they were allowed to be a have province. Is it our destiny to remain always at the national average or lower, and never be able to get above the national average? Is that what hon. members opposite want to see in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! That is what they want. That is it.

MR. BARRY: Do hon. members opposite want to see it be a matter of grace and courtesy by leave of the federal government that we ever achieve revenue from the offshore?

The member opposite would never say that his right to speak in this House is something that only flows by permission from government or by permission of the Chair. The hon. member has a right to get up and speak. Now, in the same way, Mr. Chairman, we say that Newfoundlanders have a right to the revenue from Hibernia and it does not have to be by grace and by God of Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. BARRY: We have a right to the revenue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province are the most generous people in the world,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: -and our government will be the most generous government in Canada when it comes to sharing our wealth, Mr. Chairman, when we get in a position of wealth with our fellow Canadians. And I happily look forward to the day when we will have that opportunity to share our wealth, Mr. Chairman. But that should be our decision. It should be up to us as to how much of our birthright we give up. Given the opportunity, there will be nobody able to criticize the people of this Province for not being willing to share with their

MR. L. BARRY: fellow Canadians but this government does not believe that it should be rammed down our throats, that when we reach the national average, bang that is it boys, we are taking your revenue away from you and we are going to distribute it out of Ottawa to your fellow Canadians'. I do not think that that is the way the people of this Province want to see offshore oil and gas developed and if members opposite continue on with their position be it at their own peril on this issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, to answer a couple of specific questions:

MR. L. BARRY: Yes, the head of the Petroleum Directorate Mr. Millen has a contract by which, we obtain his services for eleven months of the year and in that twelfth month he has the option of either going on holidays or he has the option of doing some consulting work where it does not conflict with his duties to the Province of Newfoundland and only after he obtains the permission, in writing, of the Minister of Mines and Energy, i.e. myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Chairman, if I could by leave just finish the point I am at. By leave, Okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. L. BARRY: And we find it very advantageous to have Mr. Millen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. L. BARRY: - to have his services sought down in Central America and South America because we gain, then, the experience that he has in working for governments, as he has been in Central America, where he is out getting his

MR. L. BARRY: hands dirty in the oil industry and he does not become a desk-bound bureaucrat, he is out there in the field in the mud in the oil and he brings back his very valuable experience then to this Province, once he does participate down in Central America or wherever in this consulting work. As far as salaries are concerned, Mr. Chairman, the position that has always been taken by this House, as I understand it, and by governments in this House, is that the salaries, the block vote for salaries and the classifications are supplied and the numbers are supplied and I will be happy to supply that and I will be happy to supply the names of all the people who are down there in the Directorate. But, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it has not been the practice of this House, or of previous governments or of this government of the past, to get down into identifying the salary, you know, whether a Mrs. so and so is on step three or step two of classification such and such.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. L. BARRY: That has not been the case Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of great principle with me and I am not sure there would be any great problem in doing it, but I would want to look closely at it before breaking what has been a long standing -

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible)

MR. BARRY: commercial -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: - it is more a commercial than a governmental practice, of carrying on in that fashion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

March 30, 1981

Tape No. 766

RA - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that we cannot continue in the line of debate that we just witnessed between the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the minister. Because, Mr. Chairman, the hypocrisy of this government with regards to our offshore is going to reveal itself one of these days, Mr. Chairman. And I want to talk about another hypocrisy, and that is the hypocrisy of this government in dealing with local problems, Mr. Chairman, and I want to talk particularly about this government's dealing with the Buchans situation this past five years, and maybe within this past ten or twelve days. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us just for a second trace this government's involvement with the people of Buchans. In 1974 -

MR. STAGG: (inaudible) involvement

MR. FLIGHT: - this government, Mr. Chairman, appointed a task force. The word was - as the result of an industrial inquiry, the word to the people of Buchans was that in less than five years the mine would run out; there would be a complete shut-down and the community of Buchans would have no reason to exist as a viable community. The government of the day appointed a task force and the purpose of that task force was to tell us - and Mr. Chairman, most of the ministers who were involved are still there - the purpose of the task force was to identify -

MR. FLIGHT: - for the government of the day what

MR. G. FLIGHT: could be done, what industrialization was possible, what can we do that will guarantee - what programmes can be implemented that would guarantee the future, a viable, economic and social future for the town of Buchans, three thousand people, Mr. Chairman, who for fifty years asked for nothing and got nothing and needed nothing. We paved a lot of roads around this Province, Mr. Chairman, the town of Buchans did. The town of Buchans paid a lot of welfare cheques over fifty years. We sent a lot of people to university when tuition was free but we asked for nothing, Mr. Chairman. And now suddenly our turn has come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Buchans Task Force completed its report - I have a copy of it here somewhere - and the major recommendation of that report, the one and only recommendation that would determine whether or not Buchans survived as a community was that a road to Southwest Brook be built. They recommended that the Buchans - Burgeo - Southwest Brook road be done on the basis that - there is no point in talking about anything else in Buchans, about industrialization, there is no point in talking about industrialization when you have a forty-seven mile dead end, Mr. Chairman, where you have to bring the raw materials in and bring the finished product back out over the same road. The only chance that Buchans had to survive without a mine was transportation, access roads.

Mr. Chairman, the advantages were obvious: It would open up the tourist potential development that lies between Buchans and the West Coast, with the Price acquisition of Linerboard it would open up job potential in the forest industry. There is some spin-off - there are communities in this Province today who live off nothing else except the out-of-pocket spin-off that is left by the passing public.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Chairman, it would also cut roughly 100 miles off the present Trans-Canada. Anybody moving goods from Port-aux-Basques to St. John's would have the option of doing it by a way that would be 100 miles less.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the government of the day accepted that theory. They built five miles of road in the Lloyds Lake area at the cost of almost \$1 million. And the next year, Mr. Chairman, they built another three and a half. The last mile of road on that was built, Mr. Chairman, in 1977. Now, we had a change of government - we had a change, a political change in this Province in 1978, and, Mr. Chairman, the Buchans/Burgeo road was grounded. No more Buchans/Burgeo road. I am aware of ministers who are sitting in their places in this House right now, Mr. Chairman, who believe in the concept. I am aware of people who have brought it up at Cabinet. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier goes right out of his mind at the very mention of the Buchans/Burgeo road.

Now, where is the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Mr. Chairman? The minister who is supposed - who has the responsibility, the obvious responsibility of making sure that the town of Buchans, since it exists totally now as a mining operation - and there are indications that the mining operation will curtail. As he knows these are indications that may change on a daily basis, that the work force could be seriously curtailed at any given time. And there was notification given by the operators of the mine less than two months ago pointing out a certain date, that if certain things did not happen the mine would, for all intents and purposes, close. The minister knew that, the minister knows it now. And it is only because the mining company is going back and mining little bits of ore that they left from

MR. G. FLIGHT: their highgrading days, twenty-five years ago, that is keeping it going, Mr. Chairman.

But now, Mr. Chairman, not only did this government - here is what this government thinks of Buchans and the people of Buchans - not only did they refuse to fund that road themselves - they did ten miles - they refused to put it on the shopping list to DREE, Mr. Chairman, not only did this government - and the people of Buchans could have accepted, Mr. Chairman, if the Department of Highways did not have the money to build the Buchans/Burgeo road or to make the final hook-up or to start upgrading it, we could understand that. We could understand that they built ten miles, that there are only twelve miles left, we can understand that, Mr. Chairman. But what we cannot understand is the hypocrisy of a government that says in one side of its mouth, 'We want to do everything we can do to guarantee that Buchans remains a viable community'. And on the other side of their mouths refuses to let Ottawa, refuses to let the federal government put up the money that would build the Buchans/Burgeo road. Now, the next time the minister is up -

MR. BARRY: What? What? What?

MR. G. FLIGHT: The Department of Transportation, Mr. Chairman, with the minister's knowledge, knows that the Cabinet, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) refused to have the Buchans/Southwest Brook road included in the shopping list to DREE. I have documentation, Mr. Chairman, from the various minister's office, from the Minister of DREE (Mr. P. De Bane), from our own federal minister,

MR. FLIGHT: everybody, even the ministers, Mr.Chairman, who have got nothing to lose politically. Now, Mr.Chairman, when the minister meets with the Buchans Action Committee - and over the years he has been meeting with them and telling them that we are going to do everything we can do - I would want him to explain why it is,Mr.Chairman, why it is that the Government of Newfoundland, the present administration,refuses to allow the government of Ottawa - refuses to put on the DREE shopping list the Buchans-Burgeo road for funding under a subsidiary DREE agreement?

AN HON.MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: It has been asked,Mr. Chairman. They have been specifically asked to include that road on their shopping list to DREE and they have consistently refused. Now, Mr.Chairman, if we are playing politics here,why does the Government of Newfoundland not put the road on the list? And why do they not find another way to embarrass Mr. Rompkey? Why do they not put it on the list?

MR. BARRY: We do not want to embarrass Mr. Rompkey.

MR. FLIGHT: Why do they not put it on the list and have the federal government reject the Province's request so that it can be said in Buchans that we want to build your road but the federal government refused the funding. Why do they not do that? I will tell you why they will not do it,Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARRY: We do not play politics.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the Premier knows and the Minister of Transportation (Mr.Brett) knows and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows that if that road goes on that list it is going to get all kinds of priority. It is going to get all kinds of priority. There is a possibility, a real possibility, Mr.Chairman, that that road will be funded and that road will be built

MR. FLIGHT: and that is the reason why, because the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) do not want to see that road built, Mr. Chairman. Now, there are reasons why they might not want to see it. But let us get it out in the open, Mr. Chairman, let us be honest about it and let us stop leading the people of Buchans or Central Newfoundland because there is all kinds of documentation that indicates -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT: No, the minister -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order then.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that it is customary to address the Chair. With the vigor the hon. member is addressing the Chamber to the minister, you would almost get the impression of threatening gestures which I know the hon. gentleman would not want to convey.

MR. BARRY: He would not dare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, that point of order is just as specious and spurious as the member who presented it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). One minute remaining.

MR. FLIGHT: One minute left, Mr. Chairman. I would expect now, Mr. Chairman - there are all kinds of documentation on file by all kind of organizations supporting the concept of the Buchans-Burgeo road. That road makes sense, Mr. Chairman, if Buchans were not even there. There is organization of Central Newfoundland from the West Coast - and I would expect that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) -

MR. STAGG: They can get no support from their member, that is the problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN(BUTT): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: I would expect that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will get up and support the concept of the Buchans-Southwest Brook road. Now, Mr. Chairman, to the best of my ability -

MR. STAGG: I am on the record for it.

MR. FLIGHT: So am I. To the best of my ability, Mr. Chairman, in the five years I have been here, I have done everything possible to sell the government to support the Buchans-Burgeo-Southwest Brook road. Mr. Chairman, to no avail. There is evidence now, Mr. Chairman, that the Cabinet have dug in their heels and will not build that road. But now, Mr. Chairman, the onus is on this government -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, By leave, just to finish the point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

MR. FLIGHT: The onus is now on the government of this Province, the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy, who has responsibility for Buchans, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) who is responsible for the road construction programme, to either go ahead with the Buchans-Burgeo road, go to DREE for the funding, or tell the people of Central Newfoundland, and specifically Buchans, why they are not prepared to proceed with the Buchans-Burgeo road.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to hog debate on this side of the House but the members seem determined to put questions to myself and so that it can never be said that this government is afraid to answer questions, I want to deal with them while they are still hot off the presses or hot tongues. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have seen a clear distinction drawn by the last member to speak between the philosophy of his party and the philosophy of the party on the Government side of the House. The member gets up and he suggests, he actually admits, Mr. Chairman, he admits that what he would do is play politics with the lives of these people.

MR. BARRY: he admits that if he were in power, which will never happen, if his party was in government, what he would do is he would put it on the DREE shopping list, not expecting to have the road done but to let the Federal Government turn it down, to let Mr. Rompkey, as he said, embarrass himself.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this government does not believe in stooping to playing politics with the lives of people, people who are understandably quite concerned in the community of Buchans. Because it is an unavoidable fact of life that mines run out, that mineral reserves run out. And that is what may be happening in Buchans, and I say may be happening, Mr. Chairman, because we have been putting so much pressure on the companies out there, we have been after them continuously, continuously, Mr. Chairman, to spend more money on exploration. They did spend more money on exploration as a result of our pressure, and lo and behold we found additional reserves, additional reserves, Mr. Chairman, adjacent to the existing McLean mine. Now, that is the way to keep a mining town operating. Keep the mine operating, to keep the mine operating.

And, Mr. Chairman, what else did we do? As a result of our local preference policies in the offshore oil and gas industry, because we have been exercising jurisdiction here, because we have not taken the approach of members opposite who say, 'oh, you cannot do anything with those big oil companies, you cannot do anything with the Federal Government, they can operate out of Halifax, they do not have to observe Newfoundland oil and gas regulations.' Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that they bloody well do observe Newfoundland oil and gas regulations, and they do observe our local preference regulations. And as a result of our local preference operation, yes, as a result of the operation of our local preference regulations, we have a barite industry about to

MR. BARRY: get started in Buchans and the member opposite said, 'oh, that is only thirty jobs or forty jobs'. And, Mr. Chairman, well another eight or nine little industries like that and you will see a difference in Buchans, will you not, Mr. Chairman? And that is the way, Mr. Chairman, that we will meet the concerns of the good people of Buchans, not by some mystical, fantasy road that is going to solve everybody's problems, that is going to require tens and maybe hundreds of millions of dollars to construct when you have people on the coast of Labrador who risk their lives in travelling a road now that needs to be upgraded, when you have people in just about every community who are using the Trans-Canada Highway, who take their lives in their hands when they go out with these transport trucks--and the whole Trans Canada Highway needs to be rebuilt.

And the member opposite is saying, 'oh, let us build a second Trans-Canada'. We have not even got a first Trans-Canada. And not only that, we do not have the Federal Government recognizing the obligation that they have to provide a proper Trans-Canada. If they are going to shut down the railway, if they are going to force the truckers to move over the Trans-Canada because the railway cannot handle the freight that is moving into the Province and they are going to put all these heavy transport trucks on and tear up the roads, the least they can do is see that this government has enough money to pay for the damage that they are causing. But, no, no, Mr. Chairman, instead of trying to upgrade the roads that we have, provide roads to the communities that now do not have any access in some cases, or do not have paved access or have very bad roads - go up and talk to the people in Main Brook and Roddickton and see if they are pleased with their roads. See if Mr. Rompkey is going to put the Southwest Brook road ahead of those roads on the Great Northern Peninsula. Ask Mr. Rompkey

March 30, 1981

Tape No. 769

EL - 3

MR. BARRY: if he is going to put that road ahead of doing the coastal Labrador road. Ask him that and bring back the message to this House, if you have the guts to do it -

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I got carried away. I am not sure if that - I take it back, if it-

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Yes. I would ask the minister to withdraw.

MR. BARRY: - is not parliamentary. And imagine the member saying that we should put this road on the DREE shopping list and let the Federal Government decide the priorities for road building in this Province.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, this government is not afraid to list its priorities, and this government has listed its priorities, and this government has said that the Southwest Brook road does not rank in priority to a Main Brook road, to a Roddickton road, to a coastal Labrador road. It does not rank in priority to getting our rural communities linked up where they are not linked up right now, to a proper highway system. But, Mr. Chairman, does that show lack of sensitivity for the needs of the people of Buchans? I say to you, as soon as the request came in from the companies, the mining companies, that they wanted assistance in order to get a possible development of the Tulk's mineral deposit, which is some distance down to the end of Red Indian Lake, we immediately, within days, Mr. Chairman, had an offer on the table and we said, 'You show us that you need money for a road to be able to get that deposit underway and you will have it'. And that is an offer we put on the table to the companies that unfortunately has not yet been taken up because there are metallurgical problems with the Tulk's deposit. But, Mr. Chairman, we have said that we will support a Southwest Brook road but it has to be done in conjunction with resource development, and as it is shown that a road through Buchans, across to the West coast, can be justified in terms of accessing mineral reserves, in terms of accessing forestry reserves, proper timber reserves. As soon as it can be shown that it is environmentally safe and sound to put another road cutting off the Province, then, Mr. Chairman, we have our offer on the table for money for that road, tied in with resource development but not, Mr. Chairman, not - how nonsensical and foolish is it to say the way to cure the problems of the people of Buchans is to throw \$100 million at them? Yes, you can solve the problems of most places in the world by doing that, Mr. Chairman, but is that a responsible way to handle the

MR. BARRY: taxpayers' dollars? That is the way we saw members opposite, when they were in government before, handle the taxpayers' dollars, and you saw what happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: You saw the millions and millions and tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars wasted.

'Oh, there is a problem here, a political problem, we will throw a million dollars at it. And there is another political problem there, we will throw \$10 million at that one. And there is a political problem out in Stephenville' - how many millions of dollars did they throw at that one? The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) loved it.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the explosion along side the Strait of Belle Isle to start the Lower Churchill.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: \$200 million.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, this government -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister has one minute remaining.

MR. BARRY: - this government puts itself on record, stands tall in the saddle, stands with pride of place, Mr. Chairman, in comparing its record of compassion and sympathy and understanding for the rural communities, for the communities that may be suffering some temporary, we hope, reverses with respect to employment, for the mining communities which see their mines being depleted. We

MR. BARRY: We stand second to none, Mr. Chairman, in terms of compassion and sympathy and understanding for the people of these communities, and we prove it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, that is unbelievable. Of all the speeches I have heard re Buchans in this House of Assembly, that is the speech that I intend to take out of Hansard and photostat. Now, let me -

MR. BARRY: And I hope you send it to every single household in Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: - let me ask the minister this: Where was he when the people of Buchans came in and said, 'Look, we want access to Howley. Would you give us a road to Howley? - twenty-eight miles, I think. And then we had the Hinds Lake development whereby almost two-thirds of the road was put in place anyway. But this government, the same civil servants, the same deputy ministers, the same ministers said, 'No, the Buchans - Howley road is not a consideration, we are going to build a Buchans - Southwest Brook road, that is the road that makes all the sense, that is the road which ties in with the general transportation scheme of this Province, that is the, when we look at long-term transportation, road we are going to build'. And they, Mr. Chairman, said it. They built ten miles of the road.

MR. BARRY: Who? Who?

MR. FLIGHT: The Moores administration.

MR. BARRY: Oh, the previous administration.

MR. FLIGHT: The previous administration of which the minister was proud to be a part, Mr. Chairman, until the people of Placentia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The one which made all of the mistakes.

MR. FLIGHT: - until the people of Placentia saw through the minister and sent him off to Dalhousie for four years.

MR. BARRY: They want me now. They want me now.

MR. FLIGHT: And maybe, Mr. Chairman, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. BARRY: They realize their mistake now.

MR. FLIGHT: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, maybe when the hon. minister was a professor at Dalhousie writing constitutional reports for the Government of Newfoundland, maybe those reports dealt with the Buchans-Burgeo-Southwest road.

MR. BARRY: No (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Maybe that is where the concept got off the rails. Because, Mr. Chairman, this government accepted the Buchans-Burgeo road as a priority. 'No Buchans-Howley road, we are going to build a Buchans-Southwest Brook road, and we are going to do it for two reasons', Mr. Chairman, 'one, is that all of the expert advice we have in this Province today points to that road, supports that concept, and secondly, we recognize that given the fact that Buchans has only three or four more years of mining left, in the short-term anyway, it is the

MR. FLIGHT: one thing that we can do to guarantee the future viability - to guarantee the people of Buchans have something to turn to'. As was pointed out in the Buchans Task Force Report, Mr. Chairman, and accepted by government, there were job opportunities identified with the completion of that road.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they accepted that and they built ten miles of it. Did the minister ever see the ten miles of road up by Lloyds Lake that very few Newfoundlanders have even seen, the best ten miles of gravel road in the Province today? Has the minister seen that ten miles of road?

MR. BARRY: No, I have not been down there.

MR. FLIGHT: No, Mr. Chairman, he looks down at his book and he reads.

And then, Mr. Chairman, he tells us - he called it a fantasy road, a mystical, fantasy road.

MR. MOORES: Now, there you go.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Chairman, after fifty years of non-stop mining in Buchans - there is a generation in Buchans today, Mr. Chairman, forty-four or forty-five years old, a fourth generation of Newfoundlanders. We are not looking at the close-down of an ordinary mine where somebody goes to work for ten years and the mine closes down, like is the history of mining in Canada, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at a community, we are looking at a way of life, And the people of Buchans are groping and they are trying, Mr. Chairman, they are looking for ways to continue to maintain a town, and to have a reason to live there, and to be able to live in dignity, to make a living, Mr. Chairman, and one of the solutions was the Buchans-Southwest Brook road, a road, Mr. Chairman, that will serve all of Newfoundland. As I said a few minutes ago, if Buchans disappeared, if

MR. FLIGHT: it were not there that road makes sense,
Mr. Chairman.

Now I wonder, Mr. Chairman - there has been minister upon minister in Buchans since the crisis came, since the government accepted some responsibility to the people of Buchans by the way of guaranteeing that they would do what they could do. Now, Mr. Chairman, let it be on record here that only one recommendation of the Buchans Task Force Report that was submitted to this government two or three years ago, only one of the recommendations has been acted on, Mr. Chairman, one, and that was the incorporation of the town of Buchans.

MR. MOORES: Shame.

MR. FLIGHT: A town council in the town of Buchans. The amalgamation of the two towns that existed there - the minister knows what I am talking about - and the incorporation of the town of Buchans.

MR. BAIRD: That is performance.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Chairman, we did not need an action committee and we did not need a Buchans Task Force and we did not need the Dyer Industrial Inquiry -

MR. MOORES: Government with (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - to incorporate the town of Buchans. When the company recognized, Mr. Chairman, and they recognized it, that they were on the way out of Buchans, they were very, very glad to turn over the administration of that town to a town council.

MR. MOORES: Bail out.

MR. FLIGHT:

People were talking about incorporation in Buchans fifteen years before it came about, Mr. Chairman. I tried myself, Mr. Chairman, fifteen years ago and I came close to getting flicked out of Buchans by the very people, the very people whose way of life you thought you would improve. They had it okay. And, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that if there had been another twenty years of life expectancy in that mine, if that company was going on for another twenty years, you would not have found that company so receptive to incorporation. They resisted incorporation, Mr. Chairman. But anyway I got sidetracked here. Let the record show that the only thing the Government of Newfoundland to this point in time have done by way of implementing any recommendations in the Buchans Task Force report, is the incorporation of Buchans and we now have a municipality and the Town of Buchans is now governed by a town council. That is what this government has got to its credit. And now we get a minister, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MOORES: That is something (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - Mr. Chairman, the minister accused me the other day in this House of scare tactics. Now, let me tell the minister the only thing that scares the people of Buchans. The people of Buchans could not care less, Mr. Chairman, if I stand up here and I use scare tactics for twenty-four hours a day. What they want is that the problems, the problems that are not being looked at by this government, kept in front of the government and the public of this Province. The scare tactics, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Buchans are afraid of - what scares them is the obvious lack of concern by this government as enunciated by that minister this past ten minutes with regard to the future of the Town of Buchans and with regard to the future of the people who live in Buchans. That is

MR. FLIGHT: what scares them, Mr. Chairman. It is not questions asked about the operation of the mines, how long the mine will continue. What scares them and what should scare them, Mr. Chairman, because it scares me is the policy of this government re Buchans as just enunciated by a senior minister, Mr. Chairman, by a minister, who has the responsibility to convince his colleagues in Cabinet to do what can be done. That is what scares the people of Buchans, Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - Mr. Chairman, let me say, let me say this, Mr. Chairman, the people of Buchans believed, they believed in this administration. They believed that this government was concerned about Buchans. They believed that this government would look seriously -

MR. STAGG: They had a good member once, Aubrey Senior.

MR. FLIGHT: - they believed, Mr. Chairman, that this government would look at their problems. They believed that they would build the Buchans - Burgeo road, and they looked to them, Mr. Chairman, and I could go back to Buchans today, Mr. Chairman and there is not a person in Buchans - I have stood up in the Town of Buchans and defended government policy, defended the fact they could not build the Howley road, defended the government on the basis that the Province itself could not afford to build the Buchans - Burgeo road, defended them - you know, we only spent \$15 million in highway construction in this Province last year, \$1 million a mile. Well, there are still twelve miles left to break through. But, if you want to talk about frightening, talk about scare tactics. Mr. Chairman, if the few simple questions that I asked regarding the mines were considered scare tactics, how does

MR. FLIGHT: the minister think or how do the hon. members think the people of Buchans would feel if they could have heard that speech a few minutes ago, if they could hear the minister saying, "Is the Buchans - Burgeo road as important to the people of Buchans as the Main Brook road is to the people of Main Brook?" I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that the minister could -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) one paved road.

MR. FLIGHT: - I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, the minister is so irresponsible, that he is so hypocritical. Why, Mr. Chairman, why is it that the various committees coming from Buchans - and there are records, the minutes will show, the minutes of the various meetings with the Resource Policy Committee will show that committee after committee after committee was led down the road by this government inasfar as the Buchans - Burgeo road is concerned.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) a meeting with the Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the ministers arrived in Buchans and had the people's hopes up that the Buchans - Burgeo road would, indeed, go ahead. Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the people of Buchans or Badger or Millertown or Buchans Junction to think with regard to the minister's performance here today with regard to the road?

MR. BARRY: I already told them. I told them myself.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell the people of the Buchans, tell the people of Buchans who for fifty years have worked in the mines, Mr. Chairman, who have contributed and taken nothing out. Ask them if the road in Main Brook is as important as the Buchans - Burgeo road or the Buchans - Southwest Brook road, after this government have led them on for six or seven years, led them on believing that they wanted to do something that would guarantee the viability

March 30, 1981

Tape No. 772

GS - 4

MR. FLIGHT:

of the town. The minister

says -

MR. BARRY:

I asked you to ask Mr. Rompkey.

MR. FLIGHT:

- the minister poohahed.

The minister poohahed, Mr.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Chairman. the barite, Thirty jobs, he said. Well, there were 500 when we started. There are now 330 and there is evidence that that will be cut so drastically - I refuse to use the figure here, Mr. Chairman, what it might be if certain things do not happen in the very near, near future and the minister knows that -

MR. L. BARRY: What are you trying to get to people scared (inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: - the minister knows that. Now he said, "thirty jobs in barite." Now, if we had eight or more little industries, eight or nine more little industries. What are we going to base those eight or nine little industries on, Mr. Chairman? What are we going to do? We had barite. The barite was there -

MR. L. BARRY: Get some ideas or resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Here is the idea. I will give you the idea. I will give you the idea, Mr. Chairman. The idea is the idea that this ministry is too bull-headed, too political to accept.

MR. L. BARRY: You have not had an idea in your life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: And that is the concept of the Buchans/Burgeo road. Build the Buchans/Burgeo road -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I wish to remind the hon. member his time is up.

MR. FLIGHT: The Buchans-Burgeo road is the idea.

MR. BARRY: One on the airport as well.

MR. FLIGHT: Of course. We have one in there by the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments which are as related to this bill as the comments of other hon. members. They deal with resource development in this Province and the difference in philosophy we have between this government and this side of the House and that side of the House and their cohorts in Ottawa.

Now yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I attended a meeting in Piccadilly in the district of Port au Port. There were approximately 500 fishermen at the meeting. Now, there are supposed to be no fishermen in the Bay St. George area yet I attended a meeting yesterday in which there were 500 of them. And they were angry fishermen and I must say they told the officials who were there, Mr. Cowley was there and Mr. Jack Marshall the Western regional representative of Federal Fisheries, he was there, and Mr. Burry from Small Craft Harbours. Well, they let these people know in no uncertain terms what they think of the licensing policy of the federal government, the licensing policy that has been agreed to and ballyhooed by hon. members opposite as the way of the future for the fishery in this Province.

I am quite concerned that the traditional way of life of our people in this Province is being changed irrevocably by the licensing system of the federal government. Over in our area we are quite concerned about the herring licenses, the herring permits. I will just give you an example of the management of the resource that has been carried on by the Federal Department of Fisheries in 1980 and 1981. In November of 1980, the fishermen throughout Newfoundland got an application form which indicated that they could make application for

MR. F. STAGG: their 1981 licenses. On that application form it indicated that if you fished a certain species in 1980, you would be permitted to fish that same species in 1981. However, if you disapproved of your designation as a full-time or part-time fishermen, you should appeal before December 15th. Well, in keeping with the system that has evolved over the past thirty-three years, the notices did not get out to the fishermen until well into December so that was changed to January 15th, you had until January 15th. to lodge your appeal. Unbeknownst to the fishermen on the West Coast, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc), down here at a meeting of the Fishermen's Union on November 12th., 1980, indicated that part-time fishermen for the 1981 season would not be allowed to catch herring. Now the herring fishery has been a lucrative fishery on the West Coast of Newfoundland for the past three or four years, with the price of herring going from about two cents a pound in 1976, up to fourteen cents a pound last year, and many fishermen were able to make

MR. STAGG:

a significant portion of their income from that. The system of designating people as part-time or full-time fishermen was never adequately revealed to the fishermen. Many fishermen consider themselves to be part-time fishermen because they do not fish for twelve months of the year. So they take a literal interpretation of the application and say, 'I am part-time'. However, the sinister aspect of this is that despite what the application form indicated, when it got down into practice if you were designated as a part-time fishermen you would not be allowed to fish herring in 1981. So what happened? Well, the appeal period was extended to January 15th. Most people got their appeals in when they should have gone in. Then it was indicated from the minister's office that if you lost your appeal and you were designated as part-time, that you would still not be able to fish herring. It later changed saying if you missed your appeal and you filed another appeal with the regional office, then you could get a herring fishing permit. So there is total confusion among the people in the Department of Fisheries.

I called in this morning. I was in Stephenville this morning. A fellow from St. George's comes into my office and he says, 'I have this problem'. I call into federal fisheries, talk to a fine person, obviously a person well intentioned. He says, 'No. That person if the person is designated as part-time cannot get a license.' I said, "Hold it right there, you are wrong". He put me on hold, checked with other people and 'You are not wrong, you are right'. 'Oh, my! Well, that is very good'. I call in because this person happens to seek me out and consequently that person will now be able to fish for herring and make \$10,000

MR. STAGG: or \$12,000 perhaps or make x number of dollars that they would not be otherwise able to make. Because they came into a politician's office, the politician makes a phone call, gets hold of the person, asks the right questions and so on, that is what is called management of the resource.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of thing that I deplore. The Gulf Management Zone is the next solution, or a proposed solution to the fishing problems on the West Coast. Mr. Cowley yesterday at a meeting indicated that the Gulf was previously managed from St. John's and it was a mess because they could not handle the Gulf from St. John's. Well, I said to Mr. Cowley when I got up to speak, I said, "You were the manager in St. John's. You could not handle it. Now you are the manager in Moncton. It gives me no cause for jubilation", that sort of thing and I -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: That is what the man said and indeed I was quite upset by it. And I am sure that he did not take too kindly to my remarks indicating that I was questioning his competence. But that is the way it is. He could not handle it from St. John's. 'Why could you not handle it from St. John's?', there is the -

MR. BARRY: Your usual diplomatic manner.

MR. STAGG: Yes, in my usual diplomatic manner I pointed it out, right.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that we are encountering, a problem of trying to get control of our resources. This is why we come before the House of Assembly with a bill looking for \$448 million, interim supply, practically all of it spent already. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) he is going to spend \$103 million out of this. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is going

MR. STAGG: to spend \$114 million. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) is going to spend \$62 million. Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) \$23 million. All of these things are just to maintain the status quo in this Province. No chance to move ahead while control of our vital resources and control of our destiny is in the hands of somebody else. Now, we are going to continue saying it. I am going to continue saying it. It may be looked upon by some people as being needlessly repetitious but we are going to say it. And I say to hon. members here that it is inevitable. There is an inevitability about this, that we are going to get control of our fisheries, we are going to control our fisheries in approximately the same manner that Quebec controls its fisheries.

I was surprised, delighted and chagrined at the same time last week when I found out at the fisheries conference that was held here by the Conception Bay west development association that Quebec has actually had control of its fisheries since 1927. You do not hear any problems coming out of Quebec about the management of their resource. That is because the resource is managed by people who are actually dealing with people. The resource is managed by the provincial government. In Newfoundland the fishermen are in a state of near apoplexy in our area. They do not have any confidence in the handling of the resource

MR. STAGG:

as has been done in the past year or so.

Now what about this fellow Parzival Copes. Those of us who were at Memorial University in the early 1960s, I mean, what sort of a character was he? I remember him walking around at the University looking very professorial, but apparently he was the architect of the resettlement programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Lo and behold he resurrects himself in 1980, out in Simon Fraser University now, but as a consultant for the federal government in bringing about a licencing policy for Newfoundland. Now this accusation has been made by people other than myself. I do not know if it is accurate, but I have said it enough times and nobody has refuted me so I will continue to say it, Parzival Copes is a person who would like to have approximately 250,000 people living in Newfoundland and they would be living in growth centres and you would have people living in geometric designs on certain streets and you would do away with your rural way of life. That is the sort of fellow he is, he is geometrically minded. And that is not the way we Newfoundlanders are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pythagoras.

MR. STAGG: And we have - yes, Pythagoras. He would have been a great fan of Pythagoras.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) important.

MR. STAGG: And several of these other Greeks. Now, that is the sort of sinister gray eminence that there is behind these federal government policies, the new licencing system. The fishermen of

MR. STAGG: Newfoundland have had practically no input into this new licencing system, they all oppose it. The Fishermen's Union opposes it in major areas, the Province opposes it, the fishermen oppose it, and we as legislators on this side of the House oppose it. Now, we do not oppose the principle. The principle is okay, the principle of designating part-time and full-time fishermen in trying to get people into a fishery so that they actually make a reasonable wage in it. But if in the implementation of it you destroy the creativity, and you destroy a person's emergence from poverty to self-reliance, which is what is happening on the West Coast, if you do that sort of thing along the way, then you should abolish the thing.

And I have suggested to Mr. LeBlanc on a new of occasions, both through the media and through telegrams and letters and whatever, that as far as the licencing system is concerned, there are certain areas of the Province where there is a developing fishery, such as in our area, the Bay St. George area, and there may be other areas in the Province, but I speak of the area I know best, that the licencing system should be wiped out, and they should go back to the drawing board and try it again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suspect I have about eight minutes left, am I right?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): You have about eight seconds left hon. member.

MR. STAGG: Eight seconds left. Well, I was going to talk about the Buchans-Southwest Brook road and support it completion. And I was going to have a bash at DREE, and the concept of DREE as espoused by hon. members and as espoused by myself, but I will save that for another time. That gives me fodder for another go at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It looks like we are going to be here for a long time on interim supply. My understanding of interim supply is that it gives members in the Opposition an opportunity to cross-examine ministers. Now, the situation seems to be developing where backbenchers, where lackies on the government backbenches are up making political speeches -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. NEARY: - that have absolutely nothing to do with interim supply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Completely irrelevant, Mr. Chairman. And, of course, if this continues we will be here until we use up our seventy-five hours on interim supply, unless the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can control the members on his side of the House.

MR. STAGG: We are not allowed to speak are we?

MR. NEARY: No. You are allowed to speak if you are relevant to the matter under discussion, which is interim supply. The government is asking for a half billion dollars interim supply, and the Opposition is trying to get some information from the ministers. And as an example of the kind of information we are trying to get, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) earlier this afternoon to give us a progress report on the petroleum directorate. Tell us how many employees are working at the Petroleum Directorate, what they are doing?

AN HON. MEMBER: All thirty of them.

MR. NEARY: The salaries of the members of the Petroleum Directorate, what fringe benefits they are getting, how many are under contract, what their salaries are, what benefits they get in addition to their salaries like insurance and cars and houses and the like? And the minister completely evaded -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Try again. Try again.

MR. NEARY: - the minister completely evaded the questions that I put to him. I asked him about Mr. Millen, if he was still operating a private consulting firm and if that firm did any business with the government. He

I never asked the question and got up and made a political speech, rambled on for ten minutes.

MR. BARRY: I answered that. You must have been outside.

MR. NEARY: No, no, the minister did not answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, you did not.

MR. MOORES: You said he was allowed thirty days a year to go on holidays and do whatever he likes.

MR. BARRY: Or consult. Go on vacation or consult.

MR. NEARY: Thirty days a year -

MR. MOORES: You did not answer the question that my colleague asked you.

MR. NEARY: I asked it about an hour ago, and the question was, is Mr. Millen, Chairman of the Petroleum Directorate - first of all tell us if he is under contract or if he is getting a salary -

MR. BARRY: He is under contract.

MR. NEARY: - what fringe - well, how much is his contract and how long a term is the contract?

MR. BARRY: I think it is about two years.

MR. NEARY: Two-year contract, how much a year?

MR. MOORES: \$50,000, \$53 something.

MR. NEARY: No, more than that.

MR. BARRY: No, it is fifty something.

MR. MOORES: Fifty-three something.

MR. BARRY: Fifty-three something, I do not remember the exact -

MR. NEARY: Any fringe benefits?

MR. BARRY: He is entitled to take one month off either holiday or go work somewhere else.

MR. NEARY: One month to operate his private consulting firm?

MR. BARRY: If he has my permission to do a specific contract.

MR. NEARY: Well, does his consulting firm do any business with this government?

MR. BARRY: He had some work on the go before he came to work with us down in some of the Central American countries.

MR. NEARY: But now he has no -

MR. BARRY: He has been finishing that up but none other that I am aware of and nothing to do with any company that the government is operating -

MR. NEARY: And is he bidding on any contracts?

MR. BARRY: Not allowed.

MR. NEARY: He is not allowed to bid?

MR. BARRY: Anything that government is involved with he is not allowed to bid.

MR. NEARY: Well, all right, how many employees now are in the Petroleum Directorate?

MR. BARRY: In the area of thirty.

MR. NEARY: Thirty. How many are under contract and how many are -

MR. BARRY: Just about all of them are under contract.

MR. NEARY: Just about all of them are under contract. Well, would the minister care to get us the information about the contracts?

MR. BARRY: What information?

MR. NEARY: Well, get us the amount of the contracts, the term of the contracts, any fringe benefits other than what they get paid under contract.

MR. NEARY: Do they get a car?

MR. BARRY: No car.

MR. NEARY: Do they get a pension plan?

Do they get an insurance policy? Do they get travelling allowances? I mean, we are entitled to have this information.

MR. BARRY: They are paid the normal travel that a civil servant would get.

MR. NEARY: And how often do they travel and where do they travel and what are their duties?

I mean, you know, it would be a handy thing to have, and it is only a matter of the minister going out and making a phone call, getting us all the information I am asking for, lay it on the Table of the House so that we can all have a look at it. Now, that is the way interim supply should work.

MR. BARRY: I really did not think you were serious.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. BARRY: I really did not think you were serious.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am dead serious because we have not -

MR. BARRY: You are dead politically.

MR. NEARY: - we have not had a report yet in this House on the Petroleum Directorate.

MR. BARRY: Sure why do you not wait for my Estimates and I will give it all to you?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am an impatient fellow, I would like to have it now and we are entitled to have it now. And if the hon. gentleman stonewalls and refuses to get the information, there is not much I can do about it except wait for the Estimates and then we can use up our seventy-five hours and we may still not get a report on the Petroleum Directorate. There is nothing like giving the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman an opportunity now, when we are doing interim supply, to give us all the information -

MR. BARRY: I will take it as notice for my Estimates, eh?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. BARRY: Do it that way?

MR. NEARY: Take it as notice now.

We are going to be a long time on interim supply. We may use up our seventy-five hours on interim supply, so perhaps the minister would like to take that matter under advisement and see if he can get the information for the House for tomorrow. I am interested in this, I would like to know how it is working out. We have managed to squeeze a few bits and pieces -

MR. BARRY: I will see what I can get for you tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: That will be fine. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. That is the kind of information that we are looking for.

Now, let me go back to a general statement - and I am going to get off of this, then, about the offshore ownership question - and that is, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I can see the government now - well, they have bungled the situation so badly, they have made such an incredible mess of the offshore, Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to wonder if we will ever get out of the jungle again. This government has built up the expectations and the hopes of the business community in this Province so greatly, so highly, Mr. Chairman, that the business people have mortgaged their grandmothers' gold teeth. They are mortgaged right up to their ears

MR. NEARY: and, Mr. Chairman, they are getting very concerned because their investment is not paying off. So far all we have heard is wind. So far all we have heard is rhetoric and all these companies, all these investors that went out because the government said, 'There is going to be a bonanza', these speculators and so forth, are now on the brink of bankruptcy. And unless there is action soon, unless the oil, unless the Hybernia gets into production soon you will have to line up in this Province to commit suicide. You will have to line up if you want to jump off a building because you have become so disillusioned and depressed and discouraged you will have to line up to jump off the top of the building. Mr. Chairman, that is how serious the situation is. And now even the business community in St. John's, in great Tory St. John's, are beginning to have doubts and concerns about the policies that this government is following. Now the Board of Trade, who speak for the business community, the St. John's business establishments, are saying, 'Well hold on now there, Mr. Government, forget this confrontation, forget this silly nonsense, this childishness you are getting off with, sit down and negotiate'. Because after all, Mr. Chairman, even a kindergarten student knows that this government cannot sit back, the Government of Canada cannot sit back forever and say they own the resource, this government saying they own it, the Government of Canada saying they own it. How do you decide it? When the crunch comes, Mr. Chairman, how is the decision made? It is either done by entering into a deal, two governments get together and make a deal, or you put it to the Supreme Court of Canada. Now, it is just as simple as that. And it is just as well to face it. And as I said earlier and I said in my letter to the Prime Minister, I think it would be the unanimous decision of Newfoundlanders - I know I am one - to say that

MR. NEARY: we own the resource. But who am I do say we own if we cannot prove we own it. These are just pious words. I can play the political game too. I can say, 'Yes, it is ours' every day. I could take to the radio and television saying we own the resource, we own it because I happen to think we own it. And I hope we have a strong case. But when it comes to the crunch, Mr. Chairman, how can I prove we own it? Can I say traditionally it is ours, when we went into Confederation we were a Dominion, we had Dominion status, blah-blah-blah. I can go through the litany of reasons why we own the offshore but it will not resolve a thing. All it is is wind and rhetoric. And so we have to get down to brass tacks and we have to settle this question quickly. And the only way it can be settled is through negotiations, common sense, people sitting down, level-headed people sitting down, forget the confrontation, forget the political game playing, sit down, common sense, work out an agreement, a political settlement. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, put it to the Supreme Court of Canada and have the decision made.

Now, when the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was over at Dalhousie lecturing to the law students, he also had a little job on the side for which he was paid seventy-five or one hundred dollars an hour plus travelling, a little sideline he had paid out of the public treasury of this Province. I believe -

MR. CARTER: That is dirt.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not dirt because the hon. gentleman probably earned it. The hon. gentleman probably earned it but one of the ways that he earned it, Mr. Chairman, was doing research for Newfoundland's case on the offshore.

MR. CARTER: Is that wrong?

MR. NEARY: No, nothing wrong with it.

MR. BARRY: We have a good case too.

MR. NEARY: All right. This is exactly what I am getting at. No doubt in my mind the minister did a good job and the minister thinks we have a strong case. Well, there is nobody in a better position in this House to tell us why we have not gone to the Supreme Court to resolve this matter than the hon. gentleman who helped prepare the case, who says we have a strong case. I hope we have a strong case and I hope we will win. But, Mr. Chairman, we just cannot sit back and let nature take its course.

MR. MARSHALL: Give it away?

MR. NEARY: No, not give it away. Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) always uses the argument, our great grandchildren will never forgive us. Well, our great grandchildren will be ashamed of us if we cannot make a deal, if we cannot resolve this problem of ownership, they will never forgive us. We are going to let the water from the Lower Churchill flow into the Atlantic forever because our grandchildren would not like for us to develop it. We are going to leave the oil out there and sit on it, as the minister says, until hell freezes over because we cannot come to any agreement. Mr. Chairman, if this crowd cannot make a deal, if they cannot resolve this problem then the

MR. S. NEARY: honourable thing for them to do is to step aside and let a government get elected in this Province who can develop these resources.

MR. CARTER: Give it away like (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: No, give nothing away. I have to laugh, Mr. Chairman, you talk about giving things away. They jump over ten years of the Moores administration in this Province to get back at Smallwood. Now, you look at this side of the House, they say, 'That crowd over there gave it away'. Was my hon. friend ever in a government in this Province? Was my hon. colleague ever in a government? Was anybody ever in a government in this Province to have an opportunity to give something away?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You were.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I was not in the government at the particular period of time. Neither was I in a government that set off two little explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle that cost the people of this Province \$200 million, to start the development of the Lower Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Neither was I associated with corruption of the worst kind in this Province, in the Moores administration and skulduggery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. S. NEARY: Will somebody get up so I can have another go at it?

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

MR. R. MOORES: I will yield to my colleague for LaPoile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, you cannot do that.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, you can.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: On a point of order, you know, you cannot do that. I mean, there are speaking orders, ten minutes, I do not know ten or fifteen minutes -

MR. MOORES: Ten minutes, yes.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Ten minutes. And you just cannot get up and yield. Because when you get up and yield, as the hon. gentleman did, Mr. Chairman, he is saying, 'I have nothing to say, I really have nothing to say at the present time, so let the other man continue on'. It really is an abuse of the rules, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we did not think that any of the ministers were going to respond or answer questions. And we believe in back and forth across the House, Mr. Chairman, so, therefore, I mean, there is no point of order because none of us - if the minister wants to respond he will have every opportunity to do so. But I hope he sticks to the questions and answers the questions that we put to him.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, of course I am going to stick to the questions and to the main points. I think one of the main points that was raised by that exhibition is that we saw the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores), he did not have one word in his mouth to criticize the estimates of the department at this point in time, that as of 5:41.50 p.m. on March 30th., 1981, let the record show that the hon. member for Carbonear is totally satisfied -

MR. DINN: And the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. L. BARRY: - and the member for Terra Nova, they both did not have a question in their mouths -

MR. T. LUSH: I was not recognized.

MR. L. BARRY: - they were totally satisfied with the information that has been presented by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on these estimates. And let the record show that all questions from now on from those hon. members should stem from 5:41.50 p.m. on March 30th., 1981.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is making an incorrect statement. My colleague rose because I asked him to rise. As Your Honour knows we can only speak for ten minutes and as I had the momentum going -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - in this vicious attack that I was making on the government, I asked my colleague if he would stand and speak for thirty seconds so that I could get back on my feet. So that is why my colleague stood. It was not because he did not have anything to say, he has a lot to say and we will be hearing a lot on the Interim Supply Bill between now and the middle of April from my hon. friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

There is obviously no point of order but a difference of opinion.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, we see that the philosophy and the position of the member's opposite on the offshore minerals case has still not changed despite what I thought was a glimmer of light on the part of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he wrote the letter to the Prime Minister to pressure him into clearing up his offer, I thought that he was coming around. But he is back to the same old tactics saying, 'Go to court, go to court, go to court as quickly as possible!'

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to take hon. member's opposite off the hook that quickly. Before this Province goes to court, if we have to go to court, and that is a decision of some magnitude, the timing of which must be for the government of this Province and not decided by some foreign multi-national oil company or, I submit, by the federal government, that we should make the decision if it is necessary to go to court and when we should go to court. But, Mr. Chairman, we have seen this Province get within a hair's breadth of having all uncertainties relating to our

MR. BARRY:

legal position, however slim they might be, removed through the political process. Mr. Chairman, we saw at the last First Minister's Conference Prime Minister Trudeau who is still Prime Minister, agree to have the offshore mineral question as one of the twelve items around the table put forth for negotiation. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have not yet gotten the position of the Prime Minister on offshore mineral resources. We know he has made certain decisions to go, with respect to the constitution to the United Kingdom, with the Bill of Rights and so forth, but, Mr. Chairman, we are still waiting in expectation for that negotiation that he is going to commence with respect to offshore minerals as one of the twelve items on that list around the table of First Ministers. And for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to suggest that we should forego the possibility of a political settlement, give up the idea of putting our case before the Canadian Government and before the Canadian people and demanding that there be an equitable political settlement for this, for the hon. member to say that our elected representatives in Ottawa will force this Province to be dragged through the courts in order to settle this issue is irresponsible to say the least.

Mr. Chairman, if it becomes necessary to protect this Province's interest that we have to resort to the courts, we have a certain amount of homework done and we will hold our own, Mr. Chairman, if it comes down to that. Well, a court case, as the hon. member knows, is an all or nothing proposition. And, Mr. Speaker, any wise lawyer in advising a client would say, 'Better a bad settlement than a good court case'. In other words, be prepared to give up a little bit if there is a chance for a political settlement.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Chairman, you never give up on matters of principle. And what the federal government to date has requested the Province to do is to give up any claim to ownership, to the rightful inheritance of our people, our birthright here in this Province. Now, that we will never do. But when it comes to negotiations with respect to the way in which oil pricing will be resolved, the rate of production and so forth, the involvement of Petro-Canada, all of these items are items on which we are open to constructive discussion and we would anticipate the same negotiations taking place as now are taking place with Alberta and the federal government. We see Mr. Lalonde requesting his provincial counterpart to go back to the bargaining table.

MR. FLIGHT: That is when the heat comes on.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are here very reasonable, determined that we will not give on this basic right that we have to ownership of offshore mineral resources -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - but being prepared to listen to constructive ideas which the federal government might have as a way of resolving the matter. But, Mr. Chairman, if the federal government continues to be obstinate, objurgate, and obfuscatory on this issue, we have no choice but to say to them, Mr. Chairman, 'Over our dead bodies will be permit you to take the resources of our Province, sock them away to central Canada, get rid of them as quickly as possible and leave us with nothing but empty holes out there and high inflation rates, poor social conditions, environmental damage and so forth. We want to be, we insist that we be involved in the management of this resource! And, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be. As sure as the sun rises

MR. BARRY: and sets, this Province is going to win its claim to offshore mineral resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And it will happen sooner rather than later, if members opposite would get up and denounce the present Prime Minister and the position that he has taken on the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Now, let us see members rise on the other side of the House. Let us see them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - let us see if they have the faith of their convictions. Let us see if they really have the interest of this Province at heart. Let us see what they put first. Let us see do they put politics first-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - or do they put the interests of their Province first?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House we put the interest of the people first and politics second.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: I cannot yield this time. I have to take the bait, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Listen. Listen. When was the last time you spoke in this debate, Mr. Minister?

MR. MOORES: Ironically -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh'

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Ironically that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) should stand up and say, that the member for Carbonear has nothing to say. Ironically.

MR. STAGG: Now, tell us all about what you have to say.

MR. MOORES: Because when Bill 17 comes before the House, as soon as I can get a chance to get at the minister, we will see whose face will turn red in this House.

MR. BARRY: What is Bill 17?

MR. MOORES: Bill 17 comes before this Legislature for debate. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but paradoxically after my speech here the other day which would -

MR. STAGG: Did you get on TV?

MR. MOORES: - have been Friday morning, I believe -

MR. BARRY: You have to be joking.

MR. MOORES: - one of the foremost broadcasters in this Province, a man whom I do not know, a man whom I do not think I ever met in my life, came down from the gallery and through the page called me out into the corridor and he said, 'My boy,' he said, 'that is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard'. I do not know the man. He is not a constituent of mine. I do not believe I ever met him in my life.

MR. BARRY: Are his initials, AN?

MR. MOORES: But I do know -

MR. BARRY: Are his initials, AN?

MR. MOORES: - that he is one of the most renown and respected broadcasters in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: And that speaks for itself, Mr.

Chairman. That speaks for itself.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: I need not say another single word, that speaks for itself.

MR. CARTER: They are all shook up.

MR. MOORES: But there are a few words that have to be said about what the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has been getting on with in this House today, and they relate, Mr. Chairman, primarily to the offshore oil issue -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) do pretty good.

MR. MOORES: - and what the stand of the government and what the stand of the Opposition has been since this issue was artifiically surfaced in the last couple of years.

MR. STAGG: He does not stand, he yields.

He yields. They do not stand.

MR. MOORES: Now, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) says that the Opposition does not have a position on this very important issue. And the fact of the matter is, is that in one of the best speeches made in this House on the issue, the hon. member for Carbonear forced, by making good debating points, forced the Premier of this Province to take out of his speech a full page that he was going to present to this House in the last session, forced the Premier of this Province to take from a speech that he was going to make to the House, a full page of his points.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: And I believe, Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctly, my points were at that time that the Opposition of this Province cannot be anything else but in favour of ownership of our resources.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will not.

MR. MOORES: But at the same time we cannot stand up in this House and say that the policy of this government, which is one of confrontation with Ottawa, we cannot say we are in favour of that when it is costing us millions of dollars and thousands of jobs, and that it is stagnating and stymieing the development of offshore oil. Why should we agree with that type of procedure? Why should we agree with an unsubstantive policy such as that, one that is causing impediment and obstruction rather than progress and development? Where do you draw the line?

Well, you draw the line, Mr. Chairman, between emotion and rationality, a rational free-thinking person in this House, whether he be the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Premier, would agree that to obstruct the development of offshore oil is of no

MR. MOORES: good to this Province. It does not contribute anything to its people or to its economy. The minister stood up in the House and he said that the Government of Newfoundland is in favour of bringing oil from Hibernia to 75 per cent of world prices, or the Chicago price. That is absolute nonsense.

MR. BARRY: Why?

MR. MOORES: The Premier of this Province has repeated on at least a dozen occasions that

MR. MOORES: he wants nothing but world prices for Hibernia oil. And he goes on to argue that he wants that price by saying that, even with world prices Newfoundland's economy will only be in a 'have' position for two or three years. And when the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the learned man that he is, gets up and feeds this garbage to the members of this House and expects us to take it without protesting, then he is just as foolish as he sounds. Mr. Chairman, a very important issue such as this, one would think that the people of this Province are all in favour of the government. One would think that from Nain to Port aux Basques, all over this Province, that they are in support of the government, that Newfoundlanders are falling over themselves telling the government how proud they are that this Province is standing up for our offshore oil. But the fact of the matter is that it is not true. The people of this Province right now are fed up to the two ears with the issue of Hibernia and all the confusion and all the inconsistent and contradictory statements that they have been hearing, and the government is aware of this because the Premier of this Province and his government have commissioned at least one poll, at least one, that has indicated that the Premier had best be advised to get off the issues of Hibernia and constitution. And that is why, on his second anniversary, his second anniversary as Premier of the Province, as Leader of the Tory party, and as well in the Throne Speech this year, the emphasis was on jobs and job creation and economic development. The Premier did not change the emphasis because he thought it was good for his health, he changed the emphasis because he thought it was good for his political health and I am beginning to believe, Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to believe that the Opposition, the Opposition in this Province is correct in taking the stand that it has taken.

MR. STAGG:

What stand is that?

MR. MOORES: And that stand is very simply that we own the resources when we can prove it.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: If the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), for instance, owns a piece of land in Stephenville and has proper, legal conveyance and deeds, then what right is it of mine to come and say it is mine unless I can prove otherwise? And the solution to offshore ownership is just as simple as the ownership of a piece of land, no different at all.

I believe now, Mr. Chairman, I should yield the floor to my hon. colleague from Windsor - Buchans. Thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Chairman of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Yield the floor? It is nearly six o'clock now, Mr. Chairman. I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: I am in Your Honour's hands in this particular matter now. I mean, what happens - is it necessary for the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to move that the Committee rise -

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - and have the Speaker come back in the Chair or can Your Honour just leave the Chair and the House automatically adjourns, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MARSHALL: No. The Committee has to report Progress Mr. Chairman. You know, this is a motion that is a standard motion.

MR. MARSHALL: to report progress and ask leave to sit again. It is not a debatable motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): There has been a motion made so I must ask the question now. Is the House ready for the question on the motion?

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

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

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move 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, March 31, 1981, at 3:00 p.m.