

VOL. 3

NO. 6

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for St. Mary's -
the Capes.

MR.HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we get into our regular meeting or whatever we have, Mr.Speaker, I move that this House of Assembly send letters of congratulations to Paula Kelly on being named female athlete of the year, she has really put this Island on the map as far as swimming goes, and also the MUN volleyball team, they did such an excellent job all year. Glen Tobin of the Burin Peninsula Summer Games, did an excellent job also on being named executive of the year- and Mel Fitzgerald, and those two gentlemen come from the district which I represent. I think that award even exceeds the Vanier Award, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for this House to send out letters of congratulations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion,
Aye, contrary, nay.

Motion carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering while we are sending out letters of congratulations, I think it would probably be appropriate for this House to send a letter of congratulations as well to an outstanding Canadian athlete who is an example to all the children who are involved in sports in this nation and who himself was awarded the Vanier Award just recently and I am referring, of course, to Mr. Wayne Gretzky.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion,
aye, contrary, nay.

Motion carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I am wondering if the Premier would inform the House of Assembly what the status of the court action, or the fact that the act, the Water Reversion Act, the Churchill Falls Act, that was debated in this House and passed through this House before Christmas, before we broke for Christmas and referred to the courts for it to be considered by the courts - what exactly now is the status? I recall in the debate that the Premier indicated that this should be done and the Province should know whether or not that legislation was legal in six months - it is now three - what is the status of the court case re the legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (G. Flight) brings up a time period of six months. I do not think that was the time period mentioned when we talked about the bill when it was introduced and passed in this Legislature. The fact of the matter now is that that bill has been referred to the appropriate court, which is the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the highest court in the Province, and they will in due course set a date at which hearings will be held and then a decision rendered. At the present moment the appeal court has just heard the constitutional reference on which it is now, I guess, forming an opinion or judgment, and in due course, in the not too distant

PREMIER PECKFORD:

future, no doubt, they will set a date for the hearing of the Water Reversion Act at which time all sides will get an opportunity to debate it and put their points of view before the court. We had indicated somewhat of a timetable which saw the Act being adjudicated upon by the highest court in Newfoundland this year, hopefully, and then into the Supreme Court of Newfoundland next year, so that within a two year time frame we would have the highest court in the country having ruled upon it after which time, then, we could act in the hope, of course, that the adjudication was in our favour.

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

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has been said in this House by the minister, by the Premier and possibly by other people in the House in debating the Upper Churchill or the Lower Churchill developments, that the outcome of the court judgement on the legislation, on the reversion act legislation, would have a bearing on the development of the Lower Churchill sites, Gull Island and Muskrat, there has been some indication that that would have to be settled, the legality of that legislation would have to be settled before we could go into the development of the Lower Churchill sites.

So in view of that possibility, Mr. Speaker, could the Premier indicate to the House when he would expect, knowing what is happening, knowing the status of the legislation right now, when would he put a deadline on when this Province could expect to get a ruling from the Appeals Court of Newfoundland on the legality of that legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have answered the question, Mr. Speaker, in the first answer I gave, when I expected an adjudication from the Appeal Court of Newfoundland. And I have also gone out of my way to give an opinion on when we would expect an adjudication by the Supreme Court of Canada. So I have already answered the question that the hon. member talks about. His interchange on the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill is news to me. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation has reported, the Government of Newfoundland has taken a particular stand that in order to keep the lights on after late 1984 and early 1985 we will need another generating source. And we already have that available on the Lower Churchill River so there is not necessarily an overlap between the two.

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

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Would the Premier indicate to the House whether or not there is any connection between the legislation on the Upper Churchill and the development of the Lower Churchill power sites? Is the development of the Lower Churchill power sites in any way dependent on the outcome of the judgement of the Appeal Court as to the legality of that legislation? Does that legislation have any bearing at all on the development of the Lower Churchill sites?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is not necessarily any connection at all. The fact of the matter is that we need to make a decision this year and very soon about an additional generation source to provide electricity which will be needed in late 1984 or early 1985 to just take care of the domestic increases

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and demand for electrical power in late '84, early '85. Besides which, we would like to be able to close down the thermal generation station, or to reduce it substantially so it is only used for peaking, at Holyrood to provide more stable electrical rates for the people of the Province. So that, therefore, we can use a fair amount of power come late '84, '85, both what is going to be needed for the natural increases between now and then plus the reduction in the amount we will need as basic power from thermal generation.

We are also looking at trying to see that the same rights apply to the transmission of electricity through neighbouring provinces as now applies to the transmission of oil and gas. Given that that decision is needed now, this year, then the alternative has to be to try to get a green light on one of the projects on the Lower Churchill River, preferably Gull Island, if in fact we can either get the transmission principle recognized in time or alternatively provide power for industrial enterprises that would be located in Labrador for that surplus power.

If during or after that time that the decision was made on the Lower Churchill there was a decision favourable to the Government of Newfoundland as it relates to the Upper Churchill Reversion Act and so on, then we would be in a position to hopefully have additional cheap power available for the customers of Newfoundland, sell the surplus to the Province's need West, because then the transmission principle has been recognized and at the same time with all that power, provide jobs for the people of Newfoundland with the development of Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final, final supplementary.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows that the LCP Corporation recommended to the Province in June of 1980 that we go now with the - go then, in June of 1980 - with the development of the Muskrat, that there was no surplus power involved, no transmission difficulties other than a scale crossing, The Premier just said, I thought I heard him say, that we are waiting for a green light. Well, I understand the Province got the green light; number one, by the recommendation from the LCDC; number two, by equity funding that Ottawa came up with in the last budget and a commitment for credit support. So there is no reason why Muskrat cannot be proceeded with. Gull cannot be proceeded with because of the surplus. So would the Premier indicate why it is, since we know we are going to be in a deficit position in a couple of years, why it is we are not going with the Muskrat Falls development as recommended by LCDC?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has not given the go-ahead to any site on the Lower Churchill River. That is number one, there has not been any go-ahead. There has been an indication that they are willing to provide some money but there has been no final approval by the federal government for any site, Muskrat or Gull Island, on the Lower Churchill River.

Secondly, the hon. member for Windsor-

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Buchans (Mr. Flight) and his party I hope, represented on the other side of the House, do not want the people of Newfoundland to pay higher electrical bills in 1985 than they have to pay. If the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans does not want the people of Newfoundland to pay higher electrical bills than they need pay, then he will support, and his party will support, the government of this Province which prefers the Gull Island site over the Muskrat Falls site because it will mean lower electrical rates in 1985 for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador than if we go with Muskrat.

The only reason why the Lower Churchill Development Corporation recommended Muskrat over Gull Island at the time was because there was no resolution of the transmission idea. Now, the Government of Newfoundland therefore takes the position that as a result of the report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation from a very businesslike basis, and not being politicians or involved in the political business of Canada, they had to recommend the Muskrat Falls site over the Gull Island site, But they went on to say in their report that the Gull Island site was preferred from the business of lower electrical rates.

We have therefore taken the position as a government that to protect the consumer of electricity in Newfoundland, we must go with the cheaper site, the site that will give the cheapest electrical rates to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And to make that possible, to make that probable, to make that a reality, all is needed is that Newfoundland and Labrador as a province be treated in the transmission of its energy products the same way other

PREMIER PECKFORD: provinces are now treated in the transmission of their energy products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). The inquiry now into the spending practices of the Department of Public Works has been, I believe - now is into its fourth year. I was wondering if the minister has received the report of the Mahoney inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received it. The last time I was speaking with the Royal Commissioner, it is a one person commission, yes, I passed along then the information I had from him, but the date indicated then, obviously,

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

is past. I have not received it. I certainly could ask the commissioner again for a new date, for his latest contemplated date, which I will do.

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett).

In view of the fact that we have had such a mild Winter, thank goodness - I think we have enjoyed the Winter instead of being snowed in half the year - in view of the short season we have had for snowclearing, and in view of the minister's cutback substantially on staff and every other form of expenditure, it seems, in his department, would the minister at this time be able to find some money to upgrade and make the roads passable in my district in the communities of Castor River, Bartletts Harbour, New Ferolle, Shoal Cove and Reef's Harbour? These roads, Mr. Speaker, are in the most deplorable condition. You need a tractor practically to get over them. Would the minister like to comment, please?

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

MR. BRETT: I guess, Mr. Speaker, we will have to wait for the Budget to see what money is available and when the whole programme is considered, I am sure that these roads will be considered along with all the others.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, the people in that area picketed the roads and they were led to believe that that upcoming year if money could be made available - and there is always that 'if' in there - but in 1979, these people were led to believe that they would have that road

MR. BENNETT: upgraded. This is two years later and apparently no consideration again. And I am having substantive complaints from that area. I am wondering now if the minister would confirm or deny that there is little or no effort being made to have monies into the Budget to accommodate such roads as these, and especially those that need it so badly.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting complaints from his district and I suppose every other member in the House is getting the same kinds of complaints. I can only repeat what I said in the first place, Mr. Speaker, and that is that when the roads programme - or when the amount of money that is available is known to us then, you know, these roads will be considered. You know, we are getting letters in the department every day and everybody wants a commitment from the minister that the road is going to be done tomorrow or this Summer, and it is very difficult. I have said on many occasions in this House - and I am afraid I sound like a parrot sometimes - but, you know, we do have 2000 miles of road and we are doing the best that we can. It is going to take time. Somebody is going to have to be first and somebody is going to have to be last. And I do not know if these roads will be done this Summer or not, but everybody is in the same boat, Mr. Speaker, and we are doing the best that we can.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) mentioned the Budget. I would like to direct a supplementary, if I could, to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and ask if there is any truth to the rumour that the Budget is going to be delayed this year and, also, when he expects the Budget to be brought down?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Delayed compared to what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: And it will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Could not the Minister of Finance be more specific as to when he expects the Budget? I mean, it is not a laughing matter, I have roads in my district - I am waiting to see what the Capital Works programme for this year is. There is nothing funny to the people of Lord's Cove and Lawn who have got to go over that road, Mr. Minister of Finance, nothing very funny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: I would like to know when the Budget is coming down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member thinks that the members of Treasury Board think budgeting is a laughing matter he should come in on Sunday nights when we are going at the Budget or Saturday mornings or other times after hours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: Give us an
answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) if there is
any method and any way that we, like members -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - who represent people, if there
is any way you can help us, or can we help you in deciding your
priorities?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: Because surely goodness there
must -

MR. THOMS: Why do you not call an election?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - be a priority somewhere.
And the roads that I have spoken of -

MR. THOMS: Next session, call one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - the roads that I have referred
to are practically impossible for heavy dump trucks to move
over and we expect school buses and sick people and ambulances
and everything else to move over them. They are only very
short sections of road and there is nothing on these roads, Mr.
Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - to be graded off. So I am
wondering if the minister could not find some interim financing

MR. BENNETT: to carry this on so we can get into our fishing season in some reasonable form?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, honestly, I do not know how to answer that type of question. I have already answered that same question at least twice today and I suppose I answer it every single day that questions of that nature are asked.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I have driven over these particular roads or not. I think I must have because I have been on just about every mile of gravel road in the Province and I seem to recall that there are roads in the Province

MR. BRETT:

that are much worse than the ones that the hon. gentleman is talking about. And everybody keeps asking about priorities.

It is difficult to establish priorities when there are so many miles involved. I repeat to the hon. gentleman that we are doing the best that we can.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: I would challenge the minister that he is not doing the best that he can. He said earlier that he was, but I say that he is not. I requested last week - and the Premier was not here and I hope he takes note - I asked the minister if any of the road programmes in my district were included in the cost-sharing programme between the Federal and the Provincial Government and the reply from the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) was no. I would ask him, over the weekend did he reconsider this and will he reconsider putting any of the roads in my district on a cost-shared programme between Ottawa and the Province?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the hon. member that we have all kinds of requests in Ottawa now, some have been up there two or three years and have not been looked at. The latest roads programme for DREE went up only six or eight months ago, I do not know exactly how long, and we have not heard one word from the Federal Government. We do not know if they are going to give us five cents or five million or five hundred million. We do not know what the cost-sharing is going to be.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Pepin, for some reason, refuses to talk to me, much less come down and see me. So we do not see much sense in putting forward another list when apparently, I say apparently, they are not even prepared to discuss the list that we have up there.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Would the minister be prepared to include those roads if someone else could do the negotiations for him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, we are not about to pass over our responsibilities as a government to anybody, not now or not at any time in the future-

MR. HANCOCK: You are not looking after your responsibilities, if you were you would not be up there begging for money.

MR. BRETT: - that will be decided two or three years hence. But I doubt very much, if the experience that I had with an MP just before Christmas is any indication of what happens when somebody else negotiates, I doubt if we will be prepared to pass that over right now.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Justice in his capacity as watchman over consumer affairs in this Province now that the Premier has disbanded the Department of Consumer Affairs. The nation is rather concerned, and this Province also, with the large multi-nationals overcharging Canadian consumers by twelve billion dollars. This House, through the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and

MR. HISCOCK: the Minister of Consumer Affairs at the time brought in a study concerning the pricing of oil products here in this Province and in that study it recommended, because the prices were so high in Labrador, a further study and this study has not taken place. The minister himself said that one study always recommends another study and another study recommends another study therefore we were not going to go into the study on the products oil and gas down in Labrador. In Hopedale, the price is \$1.30-

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

If the hon. member has a question I believe he has had a fair amount of preamble, maybe he should ask the question.

MR. E. HISCOCK: The price in Hopedale is \$1.30 for gasoline and in Port Hope Simpson and other areas along the coast and in Cartwright, it is up to \$1.93. Could the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) please inform this House whether this study is now going to be taking place with the view of the large multi-nationals overcharging the Canadian taxpayer?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, just a minor correction.

I do not want to confuse any hon. members with the facts but there was absolutely no disbanding of anything, the entire corpus of Consumer Affairs report now to the Minister of Justice instead of another minister. There was no disbanding, they have their own assistant deputy minister, everybody there in the insurance inspection, in the rent, landlord-tenant area and in the consumer affairs, strictly speaking area, all of that, everybody is in tact, the same place even the same desk and the same chair to the best of my knowledge. So there was no disbanding. There was an administrative change reporting to one minister instead of another minister.

With respect to the operative part of the hon. gentleman's question, as he says, sometimes one study leads to another and that unfortunately does happen at times. But obviously, facts have to be ascertained and to be ascertained with as much accuracy and consistency as is possible before possible remedies can be explored and we are still in the area of ascertaining the facts and making comparison between various facts coming in at various times.

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

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the difference of sixty cents in the price of gasoline along the Labrador coast, and when you consider the person, the product is brought in in the same boat that there are communities five miles or six miles from each other that have a difference of twenty cents at times, the consumers find it very hard down there with the provincial government saying they need more facts. The facts speak for themselves. And particularly the rates of electricity are higher, twice as high down on the Labrador coast because this fuel is used also for generating electricity. Can the minister inform us whether we will have a study done on the Labrador coast or whether this study will just be ignored, the recommendation of that study?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated one and three quarter minutes ago, that further data is being examined and various options are being examined, right? I mean, in terms of electricity pricing and certain utility pricing, you know, there is a mechanism through the Public Utilities Board. You know, there are various possible mechanisms, but I am not in a position to state at this time what is the appropriate mechanism to endeavour to control-monitor prices because to control them means a price control system. I am not in a position at this particular time to indicate what the mechanism is. If the hon. gentleman has suggestions what the mechanism - what he thinks it should be, we would be glad to hear from him.

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

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the problem

MR. HISCOCK:

with the police force and the lockup and various other problems the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is having, and now in Consumer Affairs, I am beginning to wonder if Consumer Affairs is having as high a profile in his department as it should have and in this regard could the Minister of Justice please inform this House whether he is going to have some people going into the district to monitor the prices and what form can the consumers down in that part of our Province expect from this government to have some investigation into the high prices of fuel?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is with some difficulty that I have traced the connection between the lockup in St. John's and the cost of fuel in -

MR. THOMS: The lockup is -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Wait now. The hon. gentleman behind asked the question. I am sure his colleague behind him would feel grossly insulted because the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) can certainly fend for himself in a very dynamic and aggressive manner.

So in connection with the hon. gentleman from Eagle River's question I, you know, would not want to trace the connection between those matters because I think that would be beyond my limited capacity. However, the hon. gentleman -

MR. HISCOCK: Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member wishes an answer I presume.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the people now want an answer.

As I was saying, I was not able to fully draw the connection between the hon. gentleman's reference

MR. OTTENHEIMER: reference to the lockup and the cost of energy products in Labrador but there may be one which escapes my analysis. However, I would assure the hon. gentleman that both I, and indeed the officials of the department, the officials in Consumer Affairs, are quite conscious of the problem, are examining it closely and looking at various mechanisms to see which would be preferable to endeavour to alleviate the situation.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) and it concerns this year's spray programme. I wonder if the minister is in a position to identify areas that he is going to spray this year and the communities closely affected. I wonder if he could also tell the House how close to certain communities in this Province that spray will be? And will he be sticking to the 1.5 kilometer buffer zone in all the municipalities that are affected - I understand that is what was recommended by the commission - or will he indeed be handling that buffer zone in some areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the actual details of the blocks to be sprayed are just now being finalized between the companies, and obviously their harvesting plans come into play, and between our officials of the department and will be referred to government, to Cabinet very shortly and then to the Pesticide Advisory Board for eventual consideration by them and then to be announced to the public.

We will be sticking to the

MR. POWER: buffer zones as recommended by the Royal Commission.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Commission also, I believe, stated that the government may use, and I use the word 'may', Bt in environmentally sensitive areas. And given the fact that the minister is, I believe, going to spray areas close to communities, will the minister now be using Bt in those sensitive areas around watersheds and around communities? If not, will he tell the House why not? And if he is using Bt, will he be using the same equipment for Bt as he is going to use for Matacil?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I say the spray blocks have not been finalized, and therefore, it has not yet been decided whether there will be blocks close to communities or whether, therefore, there will be a necessity for a certain amount of Bt being sprayed. However, we as a government intend to use Bt in our spray programme for two reasons; one, because it is environmentally safer around water bodies and around communities. And second, as a part of government's ongoing intent to find alternate ways to chemical sprays, therefore we will be using Bt in that sense, but as an experimental and as a safeguard around water bodies. We will certainly be using every environmental consideration that is possible, both by the federal environmental agencies and the provincials, to make sure that the spray programme carried out between Bt on the one hand and the chemicals on the other is absolutely safe and secure.

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

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

MR. TULK: One of the concerns of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, was the problem of insecticide spray drift. They suggested in their report that a great deal of research was needed in this area, as little is known about what happens to the spray drift. And the question to the minister is, will the minister, either of his own accord or in conjunction with the Department of the Environment, be carrying out any such research during this year's spray programme? If not, I would like for him to tell the House why not? If he will, then could he give us the details, perhaps, of how that research is to be carried out and by whom?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it is important that every person in this hon. House is fully aware of government's intention to take every precaution that is available to any government agency in this world, that we intend to follow every environmental monitoring procedure that is laid down by our Provincial Department of the Environment, that we are going to follow every regulation laid down by the Federal Department of the Environment and the licencing authority for the chemicals that we are using.

The environmental block somewhere Southwest, Southeast of Gander, where the Environmental Provincial Department of Environment has a monitoring block set up, we will be continuing to monitor in every way the environmental ramifications of a chemical spray programme, and all safeguards are going to be taken that are deemed necessary and acceptable to the public of Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's answer but, in fact, he did not answer my question. The question was this: Will he this year be doing any research on insecticide spray drift? If so, who will be doing that research? Will it be his department or the Department of the Environment? And how much of it will he be doing and where?

MR. WARREN: Several questions.

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, we will not be experimenting with spray drifts. We have the regulations as laid down by the federal and provincial agencies. We have the Environmental Board, the Pesticide Review Board, we have our own departmental agencies, we had the recommendations of the Royal Commission. We will be following all of those and we do not intend to experiment with drift because we understand, Mr. Speaker, that we will follow the regulations and that the drift problem -

MR. TULK: Research on the spray drift.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, our department will not be doing research on spray drift. We will follow the regulations as laid down by every agency that controls chemical insecticide sprays. Our provincial Department of the Environment, as the minister can easily tell the House or anyone else, will be monitoring the spray drift and other aspects of the spray programme as has been done in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, could we revert to -

MR. SPEAKER: Reverting to Reports by Standing
and Special Committees?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. I would like to table
Newfoundland Legal Aid Commission financial statements up to
31 March, 1979, and some correspondence I undertook to table
last Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer
a question asked verbally by the hon. the member for Eagle
River (Mr. Hiscock) concerning a building in Happy Valley.
We leased the building from St. Andrew's Parish Hall at \$6.00
a square foot for 2,521 square feet. The current lease is
to expire in February, 1982. We are holding off alternate
use of the premises until the Department of Rural, Agricultural
and Northern Development completes an assessment for the use
of the building and the need for the facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member
for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) asked me on Friday or Thursday a question
with respect to making public the schedule of police patrolling
in St. John's and the area for a period of four, five or six
months ago rather than current. I said at the time that as
he knew and as the House knew, it was not our policy to make
current patrolling shifts available for obvious reasons.
I did consider his request going back a four, five or six month

MR. OTTENHEIMER: period, but I am of the opinion, on the best information I can get and exercising my own judgement, that to do so would run the very serious risk of having the same objective as making public the current one. It is not that they are the same, but obviously, there could or could not be patterns and it is something that I do not think would be appropriate for me to do.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers to questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Lodge Bay, Labrador. The prayer of the petition is, Mr. Speaker: "We, the residents of Lodge Bay, would like to impress upon the provincial Minister of Fisheries, the provincial government and the Premier to ratify an injustice done to the fishermen of Southern Labrador. We applied for a boat bounty in November, 1979 or earlier, and in some cases later. We did not hear from the provincial Loan Board since sometime in June, 1980, asking for more information. Whereas these boats had to be replaced because of age, etc., the fishermen had no other choice but to commence with the building of their boats in the months of March, April or May. Because of trying to reorganize the mixed up Fisheries Loan Board, we, the fishermen, did not receive our boat bounty as we did in other years. The advertising requiring new regulations were in larger provincial papers. We, the residents of Eagle River, were not aware of the change of regulations. Also, we would like to point out that the total boat bounty is around \$100,000, which is not even the price of one-third of a longliner, yet over 180 fishermen in the Northern cod stock zone are involved with the building of these smaller boats, and we call upon the House of Assembly

March 9, 1981

Tape 205

EC - 4

MR. HISCOCK: of Newfoundland and Labrador
to be compassionate and award the boat bounties to these
fishermen who applied for them last year."

Mr. Speaker, they applied in
1979 and they did not hear until

MR. E. HISCOCK:

several months later, in 1980, because of the mix-up in the Loan Board. And, Mr. Speaker, some of these boat bounties have been given but those over twenty-five feet have not received their boat bounties. Many of the officials in the Department of Fisheries have gone back to them and asked for more information and more requirements, so much so now that the new boat bounties on speedboats - for example, you have to have specifications and plans, and the people in the district do not even want to build a speedboat now according to the regulations that the Department of Fisheries have brought in because they are too stringent and the boats would be too heavy.

So here we have a government that wants to get into the Northern cod stock zone and help the fishermen and here we have over 180 fishermen affected by not getting the boat bounties because of the mix-up in the Loan Board. By the time it was straightened out, they gave a carte blanche letter to all the fishermen in my district saying, 'Please provide us with more information', and of course they knew what the information was, that the fishermen went and built their boats like they always did other years. Now, of course, they have a change and they realize it.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are twenty names on this petition from Lodge Bay and I hope when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) rises he will not only tell that some of the people got these boat bounties but all of them who applied for them, Mr. Speaker, should also get the boat bounties.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Any further Petitions.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: To comment on the petition from fishermen on the Southern Labrador Coast; there was a problem back in the '79 season with regards to bounties, In fact, there was a change in regulations and as a result of a communications problem along that part of our Province, we did agree to take a second look at the bounty applications whereby I arranged to have officials go in and meet with all the fishermen concerned. And as a result of special meetings over and above the other cases around the Island portion of the Province, we were successful in arranging to have the majority - in fact, I think there are only about four or five left that have not been processed successfully to the satisfaction of all fishermen concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1
Address in Reply.
The hon. member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
First of all I would whole-heartedly support the aim and the ultimate goal of this government, as was outlined in the Speech for the Throne, which goal is to improve the lot of all of our people. I recognize the shortfalls that exist in many areas of this Province and indeed there are quite a number of them albeit that this administration has made significant progress towards the lessening of many of these deficiencies and hardships.

We, as a Province, started out some thirty years ago with the biggest 'have not' attitude, to a great extent justified, that has ever existed in any other provincial jurisdiction. This 'have not' attitude has prevailed

MR. BARRETT: . . . unrelentingly for almost all of that thirty years. Many efforts were made, sincere efforts, by previous administrations to help us try to catch up with Canada. This has almost entirely been in the upgrading and providing of basic services to our people.

One very important point that seems to have been missed in this whole catch up with Canada campaign of previous administrations, is the fundamental and most important concern of all, which is for the administration to be concerned with changing the attitude of Newfoundlanders. This concerns having Newfoundlanders being proud of their heritage, Newfoundlanders being contributors to Canada in a real and economic sense, Newfoundlanders who feel they can be more than a recipient of federal government hand-outs in equalization grants, Newfoundlanders who are not a welfare society, Newfoundlanders who are equal to all other Canadians.

This changing of the attitude of Newfoundlanders is very paramount as a result of this administration's programme. Of particular significance is the position taken to stand up for the basic rights of Newfoundland, basic rights that have been exploited by others in the past leaving nothing behind but an attitude of total

MR. BARRETT:

dependence on support from outside our own Province, an attitude which all too often is exemplified by members opposite, of 'let us give it away, Let us not hold out for our rights, Let us take the immediate short-term gain at the expense of far greater long-term benefits. Let us remain dependent. Let us stay a have-not society.' The Federal Government's view, apparently shared by some members, is do not show some independence, 'do not stand up for your rights, do not have an independent attitude.' Surely to stand up for these things in the minds of some is to be anti-Canadian. It is anti-Canadian because we want to lower unemployment. It is anti-Canadian because we want to have shared federal fisheries jurisdiction. It is anti-Canadian because we want to transmit our hydro resource across Canada freely and without obstruction. It is anti-Canadian because we want acknowledgement of our ownership and control over offshore oil and gas.

I think it is a good thing at this point in time that we have a leader and an administration that is making a dramatic attempt to change the attitude of Newfoundlanders, an attitude of equality, of participation in our own development, to share our resources. not give them away, an attitude of pride in being a Newfoundlander and a contribution to the Canadian federation we joined in 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to touch on a couple of issues that are very important and of great concern to the people of the district of St. John's West.

MR. FLIGHT:

Room (inaudible).

Oh, I thought it was Spanish

MR. BARRETT: I would think that the Spanish Room is probably a much more important issue to some of the members representing that area.

Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware, over the past two years I have been attempting to bring to the attention of government and governmental agencies, the very serious deficiency existing in the fire protection services in the port of St. John's. My concern surrounds a great deal of activity which is increasing significantly with each passing month, and with it the opportunities of a major fire occurring. Such a major outbreak could have a disastrous effect on the waterfront area, as well as a possible loss of life resulting therefrom.

As busy as the port is, there is just no way a fire or explosion could be adequately dealt with by land based equipment. On the Southside of the Harbour, where all the fueling and off-loading of petroleum products takes place, access to the whole area is by one road only and if something unfortunately occurred to render this road inaccessible, there would be no way any equipment could be transported to any outbreak on this Southside of the waterfront, which extends from the CN dockyard in the West to the power station, or Fort Amherst, at the extreme Eastern end.

History records that St. John's was devastated by fire on a number of occasions in the past and unless something is done very quickly, I fear history will repeat itself.

Any outbreak of a substantial proportion, as a result of some waterfront activity, would in all likelihood be contained if the port had access to the services of a fire tug.

MR. BARRETT: Numerous attempts have been made to try and determine under whose jurisdiction falls the responsibility to provide a fire tug, whether that responsibility is with the City of St. John's, with the St. John's Port Authority which operates the port, or the Provincial Government.

The terms of reference under which the Province turned over the operation of the harbour to the National Harbours Board, were that the National Harbours Board had within their authority the administration, the management and the control of the Harbour of St. John's. My interpretation of this would certainly place the obligation of locating a fire tug in the harbour squarely on the shoulders of the National Harbours Board.

Information would suggest that the Federal Government supplies fire tug services to the ports of Churchill, Manitoba, to Montreal, Quebec, and to Halifax, Nova Scotia. Whether this is through the facilities of the National Harbours Board, is probably in question but it is a federally provided service.

The National Harbours Board has repeatedly stated their position as not being responsible for the provision of a fire tug. My conclusion

MR. H. BARRETT: would therefore be that if the National Harbours Board can so firmly state their position as such, then we must address this question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) for this Province and have it determined whether this position is in fact correct and have the Order in Council transferring the administration of the harbour to the National Harbours Board, interpreted.

I would express strongly that an early resolution of this very important matter could mean the safety and protection of the citizens of this city and the users of our port. As custodians of the waterfront in St. John's, the National Harbours Board is now in control of what is probably the most valuable piece of real estate in Newfoundland, if not, indeed, of all of Eastern Canada. The demands for space in this limited facility are increasing rapidly in view of offshore developments. One would assume that this demand would reflect in much greater revenues to the Harbours Board. Surely, we should ask ourselves the question, should not these revenues be directed towards to the protection of this facility and the users of the port? Surely this charade must stop sometime and I suggest that the time is now. How much longer must the people of St. John's and the users of the port tempt fate? If the National Harbours Board are unwilling or not responsible, I would urge the Justice Department to come to grips with this matter at once. As I indicated previously, we must have the answer to just who is responsible here and then get on with placing a proper fire tug in service for the protection of the life and property of this port.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, of great concern to me and to citizens of the city and in my own district, St. John's West, is the great concern that exists

MR. H. BARRETT: regarding the synchrolift project. This concern is very valid when one considers the attitude of the federal government in its handling of this development. Continuous delays have been experienced in trying to get this project off the ground for reasons of an obvious political nature and have absolutely no relationship to the need for such a facility and the opportunity to provide a larger and more stable work force of highly skilled, above average income workers. A large number of this work force are residents of my district in St. John's West.

When one considers that a provincial government must take the initiative to try and find financing to help a federal Crown corporation expand its facilities from its own hard pressed revenue sources, it is hard not to assume that the federal government's non-contributory role is nothing but a further attempt on the part of that federal government to make Newfoundland suffer just a little more because our government does not agree with the federal position on constitutional issues, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. BARRETT: - the issues including those concerning the resource industries. Every Newfoundland and certainly every person associated with the Newfoundland dockyard facility, should be extremely upset and disillusioned with the federal government's position and their attitude on this matter and should express their views accordingly. The residents of this city are being deprived of an opportunity of continued employment and a chance to provide additional services to shipping frequenting this area. This self-imposed stagnation of the federal government might well cost us the opportunity of continuing with the contracts for repair and maintenance to the Russian fishing fleet. And if this attitude persists much longer, we might well lose out again on an opportunity to create and maintain employment. I do not

MR. H. BARRETT: know how much longer the Russian fleet, or any other potential user of the facility, must wait around and watch this Province be drained of its resources and watch the federal government use its economic sledgehammer to force us into submission. I really believe that Ottawa does not want to see any development occur here at all. The story of the synchrolift that almost was, must surely exemplify what we have to put up with in our dealings with the federal government, a federal government trying to economically sledgehammer us into submission because we want to be treated as equals.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible) fire tug.

MR. L. THOMS:

That is about as much noise now as five members can make.

Mr. Speaker, addressing a few remarks in the Address in Reply. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker in this House again touched on something that is detrimental to the Province of Newfoundland and to the people of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, it is clearly advantageous for this government, for

MR. THOMS:

this administration, and for this Province to be on relatively good terms with the federal government.

MR. WALSH: Sure, to all the way (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: On relatively good terms with the federal government. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. And we have seen some blatant examples of where this administration and the Premier of this Province have gone out of their way to be at loggerheads with the federal government. We saw a blatant example of that when the hon. Mr. Rompkey was appointed to the Federal Cabinet. Immediately the Premier of this Province went on television, went to the media and belittled our minister representing Newfoundland in the Federal Cabinet. And, Mr. Speaker, that is no way to have a good working relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that this administration should have a love-in. with Ottawa. I am not suggesting a love-in with Ottawa. I expect this administration to have times when they are going to be at odds with Ottawa. I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Opposition, the Provincial counterpart to the Liberal Government in Ottawa, at times are going to be at odds with the Federal Liberals. I find myself in that position on the question of offshore oil and gas. I happen to believe

and we do not agree on very much, Mr. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) - but I happen to believe that Newfoundland should have the ownership of its offshore oil and gas.

MR. CARTER: Your sure?

MR. THOMS: I believe, now you do not want to hear this. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter)

MR. THOMS: does not want to hear this, because he is the only great defender of Newfoundland, he is the only true blue Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, that was ever born. He does not want to hear a Liberal member of this House saying things like that. We should be against Newfoundland having ownership and control of its offshore oil resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: But I disagree with Mr. Trudeau. Is that not my right, as much as it is your right, to disagree with Mr. Trudeau? Is that not my right? Now, I happen to agree with him on a lot of things that you do not agree with him on. I happen to agree with him on his Constitutional stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: I happen to agree with him there.

MR. NEARY: So do I.

MR. THOMS: But I do believe that the Federal Liberal Government should confirm ownership of the offshore oil and gas in Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is contrary to his own Liberal Party stand.

MR. THOMS: No. As far as I know, my reading of the Provincial stand is that we own the offshore oil and gas -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - and we should own it.

Now, if I am at loggerheads with my colleagues that is fine. That really does not bother me all that much. I happen to believe what I believe. And I believe that the Federal Government should confirm the ownership in Newfoundland. Now, I have heard the argument -

MR. FLIGHT: They will. When they get somebody to talk to they will.

MR. THOMS: I have heard the argument, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland should not have control and ownership of its offshore oil and gas, because Newfoundland could not handle it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is mad about St. Pierre and Miquelon now.

MR. THOMS: Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, the idea is that the people of Alberta can handle their resources and have \$6 billion in a bank account, but Newfoundlanders cannot handle their resources and have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

MR. THOMS: I do not know why not.

MR. HANCOCK: Because you cannot control the price of gas in Labrador, that is why.

MR. THOMS: I was sitting and overheard a conversation

MR. THOMS: at a hotel in this city and the onward conversation went something like this - and these were C.F.A.ers and we have too many of them. These were C.F.A.ers who were saying how nice it was that poor old Newfoundland was finally going to have a few dollars and they could not think of anybody better, Mr. Speaker, that it could happen to than us poor old Newfoundlanders. They could not think of anybody better for it to happen to. And then this other C.F.A.er makes his comment. He was afraid, Mr. Speaker, he was actually afraid that I, as a Newfoundlander, was not going to be able to cope with this new found wealth.

AN HON. MEMBER: What an insult!

MR. THOMS: I agree with you, it is an insult. It was going to somehow or other change all of us into something that they did not want us to be.

I thought Charles Lynch on television - he was very good, I mean, he was well-spoken, he was articulate, but I felt a little bit insulted listening to him - the simple Newfoundlander. Of course, I am a simple Newfoundlander, but I am telling you, I have met simple Albertans, I have met simple Ontarians. Nobody would ever suggest that they should not have their resources, that they would not be able to cope with their resources, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should have our resources. I do not buy the argument either, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it is not true, I hope it is not the reason why we are at loggerheads with Ottawa today. I do not believe that if we own the offshore oil and gas - it is ours - I do not believe that that resource should be traded off for a DREE agreement in Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - or a road here or a road there, or an agreement here or an agreement there. They are two

MR. THOMS: different situations, they are two different issues. I do not want the resources of Newfoundland traded off for the road to be paved from Lawn to Lord's Cove or for a bridge in Grand Bank. Now, Mr. Speaker, I probably will not get the bridge in Grand Bank; it has been promised now for some ten years. I am not holding my breath. I am probably not going to get the piece of road from Lawn to Lord's Cove done, and the reason, of course, is or the reason may be - and if it were the case I would be disappointed - it is because the district of Grand Bank voted Liberal in the last election. Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this Province or the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett would have the intestinal fortitude if it is the situation, if they would have the intestinal fortitude - I say that, because I am not, Mr. Speaker, allowed to say, if they had the guts - but if they had the intestinal fortitude to say, 'The reason, Mr. Thoms, you are not getting the road paved from Lawn to Lord's Cove' - and I went over that road, Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, and thank God, Mr. Speaker, I was not travelling over that road in Winter conditions. It is extremely dangerous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are there school children on it?

MR. THOMS: Yes, there are school children travelling over the road, of course there are. If we had had Winter conditions I am afraid that there would have been lives lost on that piece of road. I cannot see under Winter conditions, how you could actually travel the road. I would not try it. I would not attempt it. But, Mr. Speaker, if I had any

MR. L. THOMS:

indication from the Premier of this Province or from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) that the district of Grand Bank was being punished, being penalized because they elected me, a Liberal, in the last election -

MR. BRETT: That was twenty years ago.

MR. THOMS: That was not, Mr. Speaker, twenty years ago, that is today. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: - and in worse form. If it happened twenty years ago, it is doubled today. But if I had any indication, if I could get one of those two gentlemen to admit that publicly, Mr. Speaker, I would resign my seat, I would let them call a by-election. I would not run against a Tory if it meant getting for the people of Grand Bank the little that they have been asking for since I have been elected to the House of Assembly. I see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) over there grinning. Mr. Speaker, nothing gets the devil in me more than to look across and see the grin on the Minister of Finance's face -

MR. HANCOCK: He does not know what it is like to drive over dirt roads.

MR. THOMS: - the idiotic comments that come out of the maw mouth Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: I wish you could hear him out in Three Rock Cove.

MR. THOMS: - a man who should resign if he had any integrity -

MR. FLIGHT: Bill Rompkey took care of the Minister of Finance?

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

MR. THOMS: Cannot take it.

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

MR. WARREN: If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: There are certain things, Mr. Speaker, that are allowed to be said in debate but one of the things that is not allowed to be said - no member of this House can either directly or indirectly, with any motivation or for any reason, call into question the integrity of another member. The hon. gentleman has done that. I know the hon. gentleman did not do it purposely and all the rest of it, but it cannot remain on the record of this House and I would suggest that the hon. gentleman on reflection would like to withdraw it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: I certainly would not want to question the integrity of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), even though I just may continue to think that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is not allowed to do indirectly what he should not do directly. He has been asked to withdraw and the hon. gentleman cannot get up and say that 'He has no integrity. Even though I would not wish to say it, I may think it! This is, in effect, what the hon. gentleman has said and it is not appropriate for the House, Mr. Speaker, and it cannot be allowed to stand on the record of this House. And as I say, I would imagine that the hon. gentleman, on reflection, would like, and certainly should be asked, to withdraw any imputation whatsoever with respect

MR. MARSHALL: to the integrity of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or, for that matter, any member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: At this time, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any imputation of the lack of integrity on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order, I think that has now resolved itself.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. WARREN: Tell him off again 'Les'.

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

I can say for a fact though, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries had made a commitment to me some months ago that he would visit the district of Grand Bank and meet with the fisheries. I cannot get him to do that even though he made that commitment. He made a commitment to the Fishermen's Committee in St. Lawrence to insulate the bait depot down there, he has now welshed on that. These are things that I can say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: And the Public Accounts Committee, you can say that.

MR. THOMS: Maybe while the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is reflecting and making his few comments under his breath over there, maybe when he speaks on the Throne Speech he will try to justify how the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation realized -

AH NON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) \$40 million.

MR. THOMS: - a net income of \$41,696,677 which was an increase of \$4,138,218, an

MR. THOMS: 11 per cent increase over the previous year, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would like to justify to the people of this Province making almost \$42 million - net, now, it is not gross, Mr. Speaker. This is not gross, this is net, this is profit, this is clear. This is after all the rents have been paid, after all the salaries have been paid, after everything has been paid, \$42 million in net profit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members of this hon. House have read the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation Annual Report - 1980. I have not been able to find, Mr. Speaker - of the monies that were made by this corporation, I cannot find in this report one single solitary cent that has been taken out of the net profits of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and put into education, not one single solitary cent, nothing to teach the teenagers of this Province what alcohol can do to them if taken in excess - not one cent on education. Are not the members, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, ashamed of that, or can anything shame you? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is no shame on the other side of the House. There is none.

MR. TULK: The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) enjoys it.

MR. THOMS: The hon. the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) - have you ever had an occasion to visit the lockup downtown? Lockup is too good a word for it.

MR. HANCOCK: Just got out!

MR. THOMS: It is a pigsty. A pigsty is what it is. And the questions - the news media, our so competent news media in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: You had better watch out.

MR. THOMS: I do not care if they hear, Mr. Speaker. Let them hear, let them heed - our so competent

MR. THOMS: news media, our competent Evening Telegram that comes out with an editorial on page three or four concerning the proceedings in the House of Assembly and makes the statement that there have been a number of district speeches made in the House of Assembly since it opened last Wednesday or so, I have not heard one. I have attended most of the sittings of the House up to this point in time. I have heard very few district speeches. There have been references to districts, but very few. If the Evening Telegram wants to do something constructive, why does not one of its reporters go down and spend a weekend in the pigsty downtown that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) tries to justify to the people of this Province?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Why does not the mealy-maw-mouthed member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) spend a weekend? - if they can find a cell big enough for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: But I tell you this, you had better take your savoury with you, you will need it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Justice - I heard him on radio this morning: "There is no - oh, we are going to take care of the lockup problem downtown," - there is logic for you - "we are going to take care of the lockup problem downtown. Sure, we are building facilities in Stephenville, Goose Bay, Corner Brook."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Clarenville. Do not forget Clarenville.

MR. THOMS: Now, that is going to help the lockup downtown. That is going to help the problem here. We have lawyers going into court asking that the sentencing

MR. THOMS: be postponed because the lockup is not a fit place to put them. Thank goodness that ultra-Conservative and 'big C' Conservative law society in St. John's, at least one of them had the audacity and the courage and the gumption to come out and call for the Minister of Justice to resign, either that or do something about the things

MR. THOMS:

that are being complained about. What is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) afraid of? What is he afraid of? He will not release the roster reports for this last four or five or six months because then the truth will come out, Mr. Speaker. The truth will be out Mr. Speaker. Because if he did, it would show, it would show, Mr. Speaker, that instead of twenty-two policemen on the streets of St. John's every night, there are nights when we only have half a dozen policemen.

Now, I heard the very competent, "media" in this Province, I heard them say on radio the other day that they had checked and it is not true that there are only six policemen on the beat. Well, if that is true they checked with a doctored roster. Because I saw a roster, Mr. Speaker, I saw a roster which shows that St. John's was being policed by six members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, six members. The Minister of Justice -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were the only one who saw it.

MR. THOMS:

I saw it, saw it with my own two eyes. If you want to prove whether I am right or wrong, let the Minister of Justice bring the rosters into the House. Show them - let people see. What is he afraid of?

MR. TULK:

Is the member afraid of that?

MR. THOMS:

\ The Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) a few days ago announced that Leenn Montgomery, one of Jim McGrath's Tory friends, worked in this office, unemployed, was appointed to study women in the work force. Very noble gesture. As my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said, he did not know there was any problems of women in the work force so why - here we have the Newfoundland Constabulary, the Brotherhood asking for an independent inquiry or commission so that there will be somebody to whom they can go and air their grievances.

MR. THOMS: Now the very fact, Mr. Speaker - the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) even though he has never practiced law - he obtained a degree in law but he has never practiced law - why does he not agree to an independent commission? What has he got to lose? What has he got to lose?

The only thing is, Mr. Speaker, that the truth will come out and then we are going to see that the Minister of Justice is being fed wrong, inaccurate, deliberately wrong and deliberately inaccurate information from the sources within the police department and within the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice should know that there is an old maxim in law which says that justice must not only be done but must seem to be done. And for as long as the Minister of Justice hides his head in the sand and refuses to recognize that there is a problem, justice will never seem to be done as far as the Newfoundland Constabulary is concerned.

The lock-up, Mr. Speaker, is only a part of the problem. The number of policemen on the beat is something which every citizen in St. John's should know - whether they are adequately protected or not. They have a right to know that. But Bill 54, Mr. Speaker, shows what this administration thinks about people's rights.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to clear the air, in order to clear the air, the Minister of Justice should appoint an independent commission.

MR. THOMS: I will not go along with the Police Brotherhood in that we have to bring in independent commissioners from outside the Province. We have them here, they are well qualified, they can do the job. But there are lots of things I will not go along with the Police Brotherhood on. It is not a question of being as - facetiously the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) gets up and says, "You are on a bandwagon." The Police Brotherhood will find out quickly enough what bandwagon I am on. If this administration ever agrees to permit them to be armed they will know quick enough which side of the coin I am on in that one. It would take a lot of persuasion, Mr. Speaker, an awful lot of persuasion for somebody to convince me that our police force should be armed. Whether or not what the member of the RCMP did in Avondale a week ago - that teenager, that sixteen year old boy, would be alive today if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were unarmed in this Province.

MR. MOORES: Absolutely.

MR. THOMS: That is a fact.

MR. MOORES: Absolutely correct, yes.

MR. ANDREWS: - he would be a dead mountie.

MR. THOMS: - not without bullets or a bolt in the gun, you could not have a dead mountie. You could not have a dead member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Whilst the Speech from the Throne is very far reaching, I would suggest the member is beginning to stray, I would ask him to address his remarks to the Chair.

MR. MOORES: That is what they call a -

MR. THOMS: Oh, do not worry. Do not worry. I never forget there is obviously a Tory in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things - I mean half an hour to speak on the Throne Speech is so so little. There is the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1979,

MR. THOMS: the people of this Province, and here again is where the media falls down, King Tut who is leading this Province cannot do anything wrong, he cannot do anything wrong, he is a little fellow who is standing up for Newfoundland. I will tell the news media of this Province that we all in this House stand up for Newfoundland, and we always will stand up for Newfoundland, no matter what they care to print or write or say, whoever they might want to interview, Mr. Speaker, in June of 1979, or on March 17th., of 1979, this Province was getting the new Messiah, the one who was going to rid the Province of the previous administration. Frank Moores and his cohorts, they were all gone. There was going to be no more. Everything was going to be just great. Honesty, integrity, that was going to be the password. That was the catch word. Everything was going to be cleaned up. Then we get the PAC episode where the Minister of Fisheries was knowingly, knowingly contravening the Public Tendering Act.

MR. FLIGHT: What did the Premier say to that?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, that has not changed.

MR. FLIGHT: What did the Premier say to that?

MR. THOMS: That has not changed. The Auditor General's Report, tabled in the House a few days ago, indicates that this is going on still. Tenders are not being called for work in excess of \$15,000, that continues. Our great and noble leader of the Tory now Administration has not changed that. That was not changed and it is not going to be changed.

We have examples here where some \$175,000 was paid out to a landlord for premises that the government had not occupied. But, Mr. Speaker, I have negotiated an awful lot of leases for clients, some of them with the government, I have negotiated increases in leases, but I think this is probably the easiest way I have ever seen, easiest way I have ever seen to get a rent increase. Let the government

March 9, 1981

Tape No. 214

NM - 3

MR. THOMS: fall behind in their rent, they
then take the arrears and they put it together and then they
add on the next month's rental and they come up with \$3,500 a
month in arrears,

MR. THOMS: and the present payment, and then instead of reverting back to the original monthly rental, they continue on with the gross amount that it came up with in arrears. What a way to get a rent increase.

And this report goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, showing where the Auditor General has said to the departments - even the Traffic Court does not come out clean here. I do not know where all of the money that I paid in traffic tickets, where that has gone, and according to the Auditor General nobody else knows where it has gone either.

MR. WARREN: Up in Goose Bay.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to end up on the basis which I began, and I think it is time that this administration - you are going to have your differences. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is going to have his differences with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Leblanc). The Premier is going to have his differences with Mr. Trudeau. But I think it is only Newfoundland that can gain if we got a sensible approach, a sensible relationship. Instead of that everyone in the media, in the House of Assembly - the first speaker for the Tory Administration today, all he could think of to say, if he thought about it to say, I suspect it was somebody else who wrote his speech for him, was a condemnation of the federal government.

AN HON. MEMBER: How are you going to get anything out of them that way?

MR. THOMS: We will all gain if there is a more sensible, realistic approach to each other. And I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, - I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, if I may, by saying we are going to have our differences just like I have my differences on the offshore oil and gas issue. But, I think, that this government has to settle down

MR. THOMS: and realize what it is all about. The Premier of this Province is as much to blame for confusing the oil and gas issue with the DREE agreement for Labrador as Mr. Rompkey is. And it is about time we all took a good, long look and try to decide what is best, Mr. Speaker, for Newfoundland. And that is all I am interested in, what is best for Newfoundland, what is best for Canada, and what is best for the district of Grand Bank.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that somewhere in the legislation that governs this House we are officially bilingual. That is to say that the person who just spoke could have spoken in French, and if he had spoken in French we could have a translation available. I believe -

MR. MORGAN: He will not make headlines today.

MR. CARTER: - that you see a number of Latin maxims scattered about, but even if he had spoken in Latin we could insist upon a translation. But, Mr. Speaker, what do you do when he has spoken rubbish? What do you do in a case like that?

Now, perhaps he could go up and see the Editor of Debates and say, 'In spite of the fact that I said this, this is what I meant to say.' The Editor of Hansard is a very reasonable person and I am sure would allow the hon. gentleman to rephrase - now not the official record of Hansard, that has to repeat what he actually said, but perhaps along side that could be a little extra sheet saying, 'This is really what I meant to say.' Because I have

MR. CARTER: to say that his speech made no sense to me at all, or rather a weird kind of sense, because I think I would like to take him to task in the strongest possible terms for his remarks about the police force.

Now, perhaps the facilities are not all they ought to be, I do not know, I have never spent a night under the clock. But I think that if you are going to criticize the facilities and the service that the police force of St. John's provides, in the same breath you should point out that we have possibly one of the finest police forces in all of North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: And I say that without any fear of correction. Now, whether it is because they get such good police training, or whether it is because they are Newfoundlanders, I think it is a little bit of both, but there is no doubt about it that our police force; you feel a lot safer and a lot more confident with our police force than you do with any other police force.

And I am just reminded, Mr. Speaker,

MR. J. CARTER:

of an incident that occurred in a city in the United States some years ago when the taxi we were riding in inadvertently went through a red light and there was a police car nearby and they brought him down or brought him to a halt and they would scare - I would hate to be a crook in one of these cities because an honest, law-abiding taxi driving who had merely run a red light, in fact, I think it was an orange light, was given the scare of his life - a pistol was waved in his face and all kinds of immoderate expressions were used and the fellow was quite nervous and I do not blame him. We were all very glad when the policeman finally wrote out a ticket and let him go on.

And I would say that is something that could not, would not and I am sure will never be able to happen here in St. John's because the police force we have here are sensible, and they are restrained, and they are dignified and basically decent people. I think to mention them at all without mentioning that is a serious oversight and I am sure the member realizes his neglect and perhaps the next opportunity he has to speak he will rectify that very serious omission. So I think without any fear of correction my remarks can stand.

The nice thing about replying to the -
it is the Address in Reply, or replying to the Speech from the Throne, is that practically anything one says is relevant. This gives us the chance for a very wide-ranging debate. I suppose, one of the Opposition are going to get up and move an amendment to the Speech from the Throne so we will have a chance for two general wide-ranging debates. It is usually the matter of course. It is the first test of confidence in the government, the first chance the Opposition gets to make a motion of non-confidence by amending the Speech from the Throne. So I am sure they will amend the Speech from the Throne and we will all get a chance to have some more wide-ranging remarks, perhaps all of us will not want to participate. But in any event, there are not all that many opportunities in the House for a member to speak on almost any

MR. J. CARTER: topic. A member of the Opposition can presumably ask any question but his questions have to be brief. Points of Order; There is no limit to the number of points of order except Mr. Speaker's indulgence and patience. I would not like to -

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: With your own side speaking, there there is not quorum in the House. Obviously, it is the government's-

MR. J. CARTER: We have a quorum, we have more than a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): A quorum of fourteen at the time it was called. There are fourteen in the House.

MR. J. CARTER: I realize - I hesitate to suggest -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, there is no point of order. The quorum is adequate.

MR. J. CARTER: I hesitate to suggest - I know that the Opposition does not count but I hesitate to suggest that they cannot count.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Well, on that point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to the main body of my remarks, which arise partly out of the debate of last week. But it is a subject that is very close to my heart, and that is forests as private property. I would like to make those the theme of my remarks and the main body of my remarks.

Now, we are at the present time suffering from an infestation of the spruce budworm which is laying waste our forests and we are awaiting the advisability or the necessity of spraying and how far - to what extent we should spray and whether or not this is going to be a yearly occurrence.

MR. J. CARTER:

Now, in my view this is a man-made problem that could have been avoided and still may be - in other words, we may be able to avoid the necessity for yearly sprayings in future if we will change the way we handle our forests.

So I would suggest to the administration that they try the following tactics: sell some Crown land, sell some forest land, make it available for sale at a reasonable rate. I will not suggest any figures at the present time, but I think a reasonable, sensible rate; sell it to private individuals for them to hold and use at their discretion subject to reasonable restrictions. I do not suggest that the land that they sell should be made into a housing development, I do not suggest that it should be made into commercial development, but, nevertheless, as long as it remains forest or perhaps agricultural, I say to the administration sell

MR. CARTER: some Crown land. And then, so as to retain a fair degree of control over it, so that people will not just buy it and sit on it, wait for it to appreciate, tax it, tax it moderately, but apply tax to this new Crown land that I urge the government to sell. Perhaps there will be no buyers. Perhaps this scheme of mine that I suggest, will not work. Perhaps nobody is interested in owning forest land, especially if it is remote from a town or a city or a community or settlement. But I suggest that the administration sell or put up for sale some Crown land, some forest land that can be used. And on that particular land that I suggest they sell, I suggest that they put a moderate tax on it, something to cover their efforts and the administration of this. What I suggest, is a new programme, having placed reasonable restrictions on it. Now, then, I think that people who would buy it would obviously - if it is going to be taxed they are hardly going to buy it to sit on it, they are going to buy it to use it. If they buy it to use it, they can start harvesting the wood sensibly. Now, there are two ways to harvest the wood; there are probably three ways to harvest wood. One way is to just go in and high-grade it and lay waste, and unfortunately, most of the woods that are cut over in Newfoundland have been laid waste for a generation. The generation now alive will not see those woods back again in a state which would permit enjoyment or further harvesting. Nobody here will live that long. That is one way to harvest wood. Another way to harvest the wood is to clear-cut it and replant. This is done in some climates, and it depends upon the climate and it depends upon the topography. But if you are going to go in with these heavy wood harvesting machines, you should follow hard behind these machines with machines that will prepare the land for being replanted, in other words,

MR. CARTER: to be ditched, to be improved. That is the second way to do it. There is a third way to do it and I would suggest this is probably the best and easiest way, and that is to do it on a perpetual yield basis, that is to say, to put in permanent woods roads, permanent side roads and take the mature trees as they mature, cleaning up as much as possible after it. This way, the forest will last for years, well, indefinitely, and should even improve. I will quote some examples that any member may go and see for himself. Who would think, for instance, that Bowring Park supplied a vast amount of wood twenty years ago? And the circumstances surrounding that was the sleet storm that we had in 1958, when much of the birch trees and the hardwood in the park were broken and there was so much wood there that the park had to set up a power saw to carve up the wood. Chain saws were not all that common in those days, so they set up a power saw that attached to one of their tractors and they had a crew working all Spring cutting up hardwood, and truckload after truckload of wood came out of Bowring Park and yet Bowring Park is anything but a devastated area, in fact, we hold it up as a model of landscaping within our city, a model of parkland, and yet that very area yielded many, many cords of hardwood just twenty years ago. Furthermore, I do not know who owns the land. Maybe the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) could explain this. Bowring Park is sort of a valley and it continues further up the Waterford River until it meets the arterial road and there is a great deal of large wood in that area, over-mature wood that could well be harvested and would still turn the area into an improved parkland. I imagine the City Council has its eye on it and in time, when funds become available, that particular area will be a welcome addition to Bowring Park. So that is what I suggest could be done.

MR. CARTER:

Also, another point about perpetual yield is that woods already owned by, say, the Terra Nova National Park, if that type of logging became commonplace, I am sure that the federal government could be negotiated with and the areas under their jurisdiction, such as Terra Nova National Park, that are now closed to wood harvesting would become available. And there is a great deal of mature, large, well-cared-for spruce and fir,

MR. CARTER:

mostly spruce, in Terra Nova National Park, and I am quite sure that that wood could be made available if the practice of careful logging were to be commonplace.

MR. LUSH:

We are all ready for negotiation.

MR. CARTER:

Well, I think that is proof of what

I have been saying.

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) minister in Ottawa

(inaudible)

MR. CARTER:

The hon. gentleman suggests that we should cave in to Ottawa. That was the text of - although he spoke a great deal of rubbish, the implication I got from his remarks was a cave in to Ottawa and they will give us whatever we want. As long as we are interested in crumbs, perhaps that is the best way to go about it.

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) pick up the phone and call

(inaudible).

MR. CARTER:

It depends what you say on the phone.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER:

And I am suggesting that the hon. member feels that we should just give in to Ottawa. I am sure that Prime Minister Trudeau would like to see Canada as nothing more than a string of municipalities. That is what he is aiming for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER:

But we intend, on this side - I am sure this administration intends to resist that.

MR. HANCOCK:

You all know what happened to Joe Clark.

MR. CARTER:

Well, I would like to - I -

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) knife in the back, I bet you he would (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: You know, the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the hon. member - what is his district, Grand Bank? - the hon. thrips from Grand Bank, as far as I am concerned he represents the triumph of matter over mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: And I suggest he closet himself with the Editor of Hansard to try and put some sense into his remarks. Perhaps - I hesitate to say it - perhaps he even illustrates the triumph of mind over morals, because I do not think he cares what he is going to say and I think that, you know, he should have a more careful rein of his tongue because he has already succeeded in insulting the policemen, he has insulted the administration, which I suppose is fair game, and he has insulted his own party by suggesting that he is going to break ranks with them.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: So I think he should put a very careful rein on his tongue because he is digging himself in deeper and deeper all the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: The hon. medievalists across the way who would bring us back like the Khymer-rouge, back to the thirteenth century, against all chemicals, against all developments. I suppose they would like to see us light our way by fireflies and glowworms.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: (inaudible) pot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, having finished the text of my remarks, the theme that I wanted to explore, there are a few smaller themes that I would like to just mention in passing,

MR. CARTER: and one of them, of course, is the one that very intimately concerns the district of St. John's North and this is the junction of the crosstown arterial with the parkway, and what is considered to be the beginning of the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) arterial

MR. CARTER: And what I am afraid of - Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate some order in this House because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: I am more than happy to bandy words with the hon. gentlemen but only if they will give me an extension of my thirty minutes.

MR. THOMS: Take all the time you want.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird) Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Do I understand Mr. Speaker, that I have leave to go on for the rest of the afternoon. Is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. CARTER: Well, I would like to have a clear understanding on this so that I can structure the remaining few of my remarks properly. Anyway, the crosstown arterial is about to be completed, to join in with the beginning of the Trans-Canada Highway, and I understand that it is going to be another spaghetti junction and there are going to be a great many cross access - sort of a cloverleaf with a number of exit and entry ramps, whereas I think the whole thing could be done rather more simply. Anyone who has had any experience with driving on the mainland will realize that once you get through one of these, what I call spaghetti junctions, if you make a wrong turning you have to go on for quite a few miles before you get a chance to get back on your track. And I would

MR. CARTER: like to just once more say for the record that I would like to see what they call a roundabout built there. It is much simpler, it can be two, four even six lanes wide, but it allows traffic to get in and go around and exit at the desired point and if they miss a particular opening or exit, they can go around once more and -

MR. HISCOCK: Labrador does not even have roads and you are complaining about that.

MR. CARTER: The hon. gentleman realizes why he does not have a road in Labrador, it is because he will not do anything about the climate. Until the climate up in that part of the area changes, he can have a twenty-five lane highway and I do not think anyone could use it unless they had a Sherman tank.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) savoury too.

MR. CARTER: Anyway I would like to see some very careful thought

MR. CARTER:

put into that junction. And it not only concerns St. John's North, it concerns the whole city because, I suppose, there is not a single driver who does not go through there at least once a week. It is a very useful artery and will be used more and more, but I would hate to see us follow the practice that they have up along, I think there is a better way to go.

There are a few more points that I would like to touch on before I sit down. I suppose in the next few years we are going to see more changes because of the oil, and talk of oil, and preparation for oil development that is going on. We see the price of houses is increasing almost exponentially, building lots are now in short supply and extremely expensive, and we are going to have to face increasing inflation, It is a real inflation here because it is an inflation of expectation. It is not just increase because of the rest of Canada, it is because there is a shortage of land, there is a shortage of houses, there is a shortage of apartments. And I do not suggest that I have any solution to this problem, but I think it would be remiss of all of us if we were to end our remarks without mentioning them. And I hope that the administration will, you know, concern itself with this very, very pressing and very, very difficult problem.

On the Constitution, we are about to be sold down the river by the Prime Minister. I am sure he does not care anything about Newfoundland and yet I would assume that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) presumably can get in contact with Mr. Trudeau and could perhaps try and talk some sense. But I suppose in order for -

MR. THOMS:

Call an election.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: - the Leader of the Opposition to talk some sense into Mr. Trudeau, he would have to have some sense himself and this is perhaps asking too much.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) the member for St. John's North.

MR. THOMS: Call an election and see who will negotiate with Ottawa.

MR. BARRETT: We already did, we won that one. How many more times do you want it beaten into your heads.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Do I have unlimited time, Mr. Speaker, or do I - I do not have leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, another point that should be mentioned, of course, is the imminent change in municipal boundaries. Some of us wish they were larger, some of us wish they were not quite so large but, nevertheless, the boundaries are going to change and I hope that the administration puts a great deal of thought into any changes that are made.

MR. THOMS: You are in trouble (inaudible) down in Grand Bank.

MR. BARRETT: So are you.

MR. CARTER: I think the two districts might do very well if they were combined because, I think, the Liberals would certainly be outnumbered.

So there it is, Mr. Speaker, These are the few points that I wish to mention and I will perhaps have a chance to continue my remarks when the irresponsible Opposition makes an irresponsible amendment to a very responsible Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The Hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise with fear and trepidation in view of the lambasting that we of the Opposition

MR. T. LUSH: received in a telegram on Friday and I plea for mercy from my critics because I had a very busy weekend and was not able to give this speech the kind of preparation that it deserves. I was involved in four hockey games on Saturday, three constituency meetings yesterday and a private meeting with the Minister of Revenue Canada (Mr. W. Rompkey) to quietly and diplomatically voice my concerns about this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I did not get much time to prepare so I decided I would listen to the radio to see if I could get any inspiration from it. So I listened to the radio and I must say that I got some clues on the kinds of things that I should be saying publicly. I heard two backbenchers expressing their disappointment that communities in their area were not considered for the sites for

MR. LUSH:

petroleum related developments. You know, that was big news. They were apparently disappointed that certain communities were not considered.

Then, of course, another very important announcement I heard was the PC Organization on Fogo announcing that they were going to get an extra trip with the ferry on Sunday. And I only wish the minister were here because I would like to ask him if I could find a PC organization in my district, if I could find one, and if I could find the president, whether or not he would approach the minister, whether he would do the same thing with the ferry on St. Brendan's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Then, of course, the last one I heard, Mr. Speaker, the last statement I heard and it did not give me much information or much working material here today, was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) advising us all, telling us all that it was a very mild Winter, and prophetically announcing as a result of that that the fisheries might get an early start.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: And lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, the oddity of the thing was about an hour after the minister made the announcement it snowed in Central Newfoundland for the first time in six weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: And I advise him again, I advise the minister - in fact, I do not know what the purpose of the announcement was, whether the minister was trying to take credit for the good weather we have been getting, but again I advise the

MR. LUSH: minister and the government, if you are going to take credit for the good weather you also got to take credit for the bad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what can one say about the Throne Speech, again without being repetitive, so that I can measure up to the graduation from Dale Carnegie and to give someone the idea that I do know something - about making speeches, to say nothing of asking questions in the Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the presentation of the Throne Speech, the Premier announced that we were going to witness sweeping, economic, job creating legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have gone through the Speech from the Throne, granted it is a number of days since I read it now, I could only see about three pieces of legislation that are mentioned here. One refers to the political system, bringing in some legislation to correct that to make it a more proper and efficient political system. Then the Speech goes on to say that amendments will be made to The Financial Administration Act to provide for a separate office of Comptroller General. Now, I do not know what jobs - there will be an amendment there - I do not know what jobs that will bring in, or how many. But another job, I suppose.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) Will get that.

MR. LUSH: 'New regulations will be introduced to govern the conduct of the civil servants.' I do not know, again, what job that is going to create. I do not know if we are going to have some law enforcing officers here or something. I do not know. But, Mr. Speaker, that is another sweeping piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: there is probably one other little bit. To ensure that our people have access to adequate health care services, an amendment to the Medical Care Insurance Act will be introduced in this session which will extend coverage to include charges of optometrists for eye examinations, Mr. Speaker. Well, I do not know what kind of job that is going to be, or how many.

So, Mr. Speaker, when one views this, when one looks at it, you see very little legislation that is going to create jobs. The only hope, it looks like, of job creation, is the couple of references that were made to the federal government; talked about DREE, hoping we can make some more arrangements with DREE, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that we can make some arrangements with DREE. And they are talking about revitalization of the Newfoundland railway. They are great, Mr. Speaker, for making plans where they do not have to spend the money. They are great for making plans where Ottawa has to foot the bill. So this is another great plan, revitalization of the railway, a great plan they have for this but this, again, they need Ottawa. So they mention specially here two things where we could get some jobs and improvement in public services, but of course it all relates to Ottawa, the DREE arrangement and the Newfoundland railway.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the jobs I can see where they have 1,800 jobs. That is the great announcement about jobs, Mr. Speaker, 1,800-1,500 of these will come from the federal government. It will come as a result of the forestry

MR. LUSH:

agreement and 300, of course, they are going to create themselves. So that is 300, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the exporting of 100 cords of wood. So that is 1,800 jobs. Now, counting the comptroller amendment they are going to do there, we do not know how many that is but let us say it is one. That is 1,801. Since we have been in the House they have created one other job. I imagine that is a paid position, the appointment of Miss Montgomery for the women. So I imagine that is a job. So that is 1,802 that we have as a result of the Throne Speech.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have scoured this thing. I have gone through this in detail and I see no evidence of any sweeping legislation that is going to create jobs or anything else, I see no evidence, Mr. Speaker. Indeed this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is as empty as Mother Hubbard's cupboard, just as empty. And there is nothing in this, Mr. Speaker, for the unemployed people of this Province, nothing in this to make these people excited.

Well, let me go back, Mr. Speaker, because you see this is a hard government to attack. You talk about the Telegram spoke about pounding this government. Well, this is a cagey government. They are hard to pound, Mr. Speaker. They are hard to knock. They are hard to get at because, Mr. Speaker, anything you bring up provincially, where they are inadequate, where they are inefficient they blame that on the previous administration. And anything, of course, that has any resemblance or any control at all by the federal government, they blame it on them. So, Mr. Speaker, they are a hard government to nail down. They have abdicated their responsibilities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to direct my speech this afternoon to two items that are clearly a responsibility of this government and I am going to be talking about unemployment and labour relations. They

MR. LUSH: are clearly the responsibility of this government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never been the one to say that the federal government have no responsibility with respect to creating jobs in this Province, I have never been the one. But, Mr. Speaker, I have not done it of late because there are enough members on the other side now condemning Ottawa, I figure I do not need to do it, I will just take my shots at the provincial government. But as I have said in the past, I have done it and done it on more than one occasion, to hold up the federal government as having responsibility in the area of job creation in this Province and God knows that they have given us money for jobs. Because without their programmes now I do not know what would happen in Newfoundland.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I do have to do a little bit of repetition again because I want everybody to understand the insincerity that was behind the Premier's promise in 1979 when he promised to create 40,500 new jobs for the people of this Province. I want to, Mr. Speaker, expose the insincerity of that promise. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that back a year ago the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) denied that the Premier made the promise. He denied that the Premier made the promise. But a couple of months after that he started looking at the statistics of Statistics Canada and found out that the percentages were creeping up a little bit. Oh, golly, we made that promise all of a sudden, we made that promise. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me explain to hon. members how the Premier came to make that promise of 40,500 jobs, Let me explain it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every year there is an increase in the number of people employed in the Province. That is purely on a demographic basis. In other words, it is related to the increase in the numbers of people coming into

March 9, 1981

Tape No. 221

IB-3

MR. LUSH: the labour force. So you have that. So you have a natural growth in the labour force. And if one looks at the growth in the labour force from 1972 up until now, 1980,

MR. LUSH: eight years, one discovers that there were 54,000 jobs created in that eight-year period, 54,000 jobs, new jobs. They just happened as a result of the natural growth in the economy. Now, when you analyze that further, it becomes more revealing. In 1973 - that was the first year of the PC administration in this Province - there were 11,000 new jobs. Well, I do not like the terminology 'new jobs' because statistics - they do not measure that. It means 11,000 more people in the work force but we will call it 'new jobs' for the want of better terminology. There were 11,000, Mr. Speaker, in 1973 and then the next year after there were 8,000, and then it goes up and starts decreasing until - and the point I want to make here is that in that period of 1972 to 1980, where there were 54,000 jobs created we had a period when the government was on a deliberate path of not creating jobs but taking jobs away. It was in that period we experienced the close-down of the oil refinery at Come By Chance. It was in that period we witnessed the close-down of Stephenville. So, with these two major close-downs we still witnessed 54,000 jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, so what one does, of course, is to look at the statistics. That is what the Premier did, looked at the statistics and found out what the natural growth was in the labour force in the last few years, and - the statistics available to the Premier were from 1972 up to his election of 1979 - the average growth was somewhere around 6,600 workers. You multiply that by five and what do you get? Five sixes are thirty-five, six, carry your three, 30,300 jobs, 30,300 jobs. Well, if the oil is going to mean anything to us, because if the new plans that the - if the 200-mile limit is going to mean anything to us, if the agreements we are going to get from Ottawa with the forestry are going to mean anything to us, for sure we can stick on another 7,000 and call it 40,500 jobs. That is how the figure was arrived at,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, that is how the figure was arrived at, and that is not what the people of this Province thought the Premier meant. They thought the Premier meant creating 40,500 jobs as a result of the initiatives and job creation programs directly coming from this government, not the growth in the natural economy of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier would have really shown his sincerity if he had said to the people of this Province what he would do is not create 40,000 jobs but to say to the people of this Province that we will reduce the unemployment rate in this Province by 5 per cent. We will reduce the unemployment rate in this Province by 5 or 6 per cent. We are going to bring it down to 10 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not their plan, that is not their plan. Even with the creation - not the creation because the government is not creating these jobs - they are going to happen regardless of whether the Premier is there, or whether the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is the Premier, we are going to get these 6,000 or 7,000 jobs every year, and with the economy, a little bit of improvement in the economy, we are going to go to 8,000 and 9,000. Mr. Speaker, those people over there have not reached the level of job creation yet of their predecessors or the people that they do not want to associate with, the previous administration, when in 1973 there were 11,000 new jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, that will tell you what influence this provincial government has on job creation. That will tell you, that will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister reads the statistics and is very happy when there is a little fluctuation. There was an improvement, Mr. Speaker, from 1980 to 1981 with half a percentage point in the rate of unemployment in this Province, 1.5 is the difference, 1.5. It has been reduced by 1.5. It was 14.6 in January of 1980. That was the unemployment rate, 14.6 in January of 1980, and in January of 1981 it is 13.1, and, Mr. Speaker, if you subtract 13.1 from 14.6 you get 1.5.

MR. T. LUSH: That is what the unemployment has decreased by, 1.5. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what they are jumping up and down about, talking about 19,000 jobs towards meeting the commitment of 40,500 jobs.

MR. L. BARRY: Did you look at the national statistics?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are gone up.

MR. T. LUSH: I would not dare get caught up in retorts back and forth again for fear that the retorts might get the press and I do not want to go sallving back and forth. Although I - hon. members should realize that in fifteen years of teaching I did have the know how, the technique, from time to time, casting pearls, but I have not done it as a practice in the House of Assembly and I do not intend to.

But moreso, Mr. Speaker, when somebody who interrupts gets the coverage and the fellow speaking does not get it, I am not going to engage in that. That is for sure. That is for sure, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: He is acting like a big sook there now.

MR. T. LUSH: There is no sook here, Mr. Speaker. This fellow can handle himself in any forum in this Province, any form of debate, any form of public speaking, any form of asking questions. I have made my living on it for fifteen years and I can go back at it tomorrow, although a couple of more reports like that and I am doubtful. But as far as I know I can go back at it tomorrow and still make my living, much better than I am making here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. LUSH:

But, Mr. Speaker, 40,500 jobs—

I want the people of Newfoundland to know that that was a colossal bluff. It was a colossal bluff! It was not a sincere promise by the Premier of this Province and they are not meeting it. It is just a natural growth in the economy of this Province. And to say that from June of 1979 up until now that they have gone towards it, 19,000 jobs towards creating that commitment, Mr. Speaker, it is the perpetration of a bluff on the people of this Province and it should not continue.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the peculiar thing was up until a year ago the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was denying that the promise was made, was denying that the promise was made because the statistics did not look good. Now they are up a little. They are at 13.5 - 13.1 now and that is .9 points below the accepted goal or the accepted level of unemployment for this Province as enunciated by the government in their Five Year Plan. And in that Five Year Plan they say over the next five years that our unemployment rate is to remain at about 14 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of nonsense for the minister to jump up and down when it goes to 10 per cent. He cannot do that, that is making him look silly, that is not in accordance with the plan. The plan is the 14 per cent and when it goes down to 10 per cent and the minister jumps up, it shows that he is not in control of what is happening, he is just reading the statistics. And, Mr. Speaker, a doctor cannot cure a patient by reading the thermometer. He cannot cure a patient by reading the thermometer—

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: -there has to be some treatment administered. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what the people of this Province are wondering, they are wondering what time this government is going to apply some treatment for that unemployment problem that is in our Province, that cancerous problem. They are wondering what time the provincial government is going to do something about this. Strip this government, Mr. Speaker, of its constitutional hazzle with Ottawa and what is left? Strip this government of its constitutional hazzle with Ottawa and what is left? What is left? A Premier in the clouds and the rest of the Cabinet ministers navel gazing. Both occupations, Mr. Speaker, have gone out of date a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are growing impatient, they are growing impatient. They are wondering what time this government is going to come to grips with solving the financial and economic problems which face this Province. The unemployed people, Mr. Speaker, they are bored, they are bored silly with this patriation of the constitution. They are bored silly with it, this patriation of the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this government to perform. It is time for them to bring in some employment strategies, real employment strategies. It is time for them to show the people of this Province what they are doing. It is time for them to demonstrate action. It is time to stop these platitudes,

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop this verbosity about the Constitution. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that this government started doing something, it is time they started performing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have cleared up this bluff about the 40,500 jobs.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: As a matter of fact, they are reduced. You see, in the last Throne Speech it was 40,500, but when it gets into this Throne Speech there are only 40,000. Now we better watch that in the next Throne Speech it is not 39,500. It was 40,500 that was the commitment but, Mr. Speaker, you know, they keep it down a bit because the more we diminish it, the closer we are going to get to that figure, that natural growth in the economy. And, Mr. Speaker, if oil is going to do anything for us, if the forestry agreements are going to do anything for us, if the fisheries are going to do anything for us, I would say, yes, that within five years, Mr. Speaker, we will get that 40,000. We can do that, I think we will do that, but, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the people of this Province thought about that promise, that is not what they thought it to mean. They thought this to mean 40,500 new jobs as a result of the initiatives and policies by the provincial government. Can the minister tell us how many of these jobs are related to government initiatives? That is what he should tell us. How many of those 19,000 are related purely and only to the initiatives of this provincial government? Do they fit in with the schedule that the Premier sorted them all into because the Premier had so many jobs for each sector; so many jobs for the fishery. so many jobs for manufacturing, so many jobs in forestry?

Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about are natural resources. I wonder what happened to

MR. LUSH: agriculture in the Throne Speech?
I do not believe it is mentioned. Agriculture - what, have we given up on that?

AN HON. MEMBER: It does not exist.

MR. LUSH: Agriculture, Mr. Speaker?
Coming from an area, Mr. Speaker, that is the greatest agricultural area in the Province, I feel offended by that. But the government, it looks like, have given up on agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody over there knows anything about it.

MR. LUSH: The word is not mentioned in the Throne Speech, it is not mentioned.

MR. WARREN: How come?

MR. LUSH: And yet we have a policy of self-reliance in agriculture but it is not mentioned. Well, that was taken from PEI. A couple of years ago they mentioned or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, one of these provinces, adopted that policy and the government thought it sounded nice and they took it too.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with five minutes left I want to touch on the labour problems of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, far be it for me to attempt to make any political points on strikes and labour problems in this Province and I think the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) will have to admit that, I am never the one to try and score political points via labour disputes, because I realize the difficulty involved, particularly when they are with the Public Service. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not happy with what I see, I am not happy with what is going on and that is not to say that the minister is happy either. I expect the minister is not happy but, Mr. Speaker, we must all realize what the present labour disputes in this Province are doing to the collective bargaining process. That is my concern, Mr. Speaker, I believe the disputes that are

MR. LUSH: now going on in this Province within the Public Service are eroding the collective bargaining process.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, also, if one can believe what one hears, I have been told and it looks like the government is sticking to an 8 per cent across the board for all the bargaining units. For all of the workers within each unit, the government is sticking to an 8 per cent increase. Now, Mr. Speaker, that defies negotiation, that defies negotiation. And, Mr. Speaker, if that is what the view of the government is, if they are going to stick to an 8 per cent increase for every bargaining unit, the units that are now bargaining - the NTA, the nurses and the others that are not yet agreed to, they may as well pack up their bags and go home.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the situation, that is not negotiation. That is not negotiating in good faith, if that indeed is the situation, and that and that alone, Mr. Speaker, is very detrimental, that alone will have a very negative effect on the collective bargaining process of this Province, if that is what the position of the government is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again a couple of days ago I asked the minister whether or not the government

MR. LUSH:

were using all their powers to resolve the labour disputes in this Province, the two existing disputes with the Workers' Compensation and the workers of the College of Trades and Technology. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I was convinced that the government were using all of their powers. Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members know, when we run into some sort of a problem with respect to negotiations we have the right to a conciliation officer. That is the first step. Most unions turn that one down. Most unions turn down the conciliation officer and go for the conciliation board. Well, Mr. Speaker, a conciliation officer was assigned but these people wanted the conciliation board and the minister denied them and rejected that right of a conciliation board. Of course, it is the minister's right but it is most unusual. It is the minister's right to reject but, Mr. Speaker, again I do not like the reasons for the rejection. It is not the rejection per se that annoys me, it is the reason for the rejection; that the minister took the report from other boards, took the report of other boards for this group. Now, the point must be made, Mr. Speaker, if this group is a separate bargaining unit, then they must be dealt with as such, as a separate board.

And the other step of course - there is still another step left and the minister knows what it is. I ask the minister has he interceded? There is still another step and until that step is worked out with both sides, then the government has not used all of the powers at its disposal. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am not all that excited about what the hon. member said but what he said was rubbish and what he said can be refuted and will be refuted whenever he says it. Mr. Speaker, he talked about 40,000 jobs and the Premier is being conservative again. Yes, he said 40,000 jobs and that means 8,000 per year and that means that in five years we will have 40,000 jobs. And how is the Province bearing under this prediction? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Province is way ahead of what the Premier predicted and I cautioned him not to make predictions like this. It is way ahead now. It looks to me as though it is going to be way ahead in 1981 and I would like to read through a few of the statistics so the hon. member will have the accurate figures, so that the hon. member will not get up and make a fool of himself as he did for the past twenty minutes or so.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not normally like to brag too much. What they normally do is they like to make a conservative estimate as to what the job creation will be, and then it go along and see how it is and they are generally conservative in their estimates, very conservative in their estimates. They do not like to brag about, for example, the offshore alone. We have more jobs in the offshore than we did at Come By Chance. We have a Come By Chance this year in the offshore alone. We would not have these if the hon. members' counterparts in Ottawa get their way, we would not have these jobs. But I can relate to the hon. member that in Come By Chance at its peak there were 506 people working, that in the offshore today, offshore and onshore related to the offshore, we have 617. I know that is going to disappoint the hon. member but these are the facts. They are laid out by job, they are laid out by company, they are laid out by position and the facts are there for anyone to read, 617 jobs for Newfoundlanders.

March 9, 1981

Tape No. 225

IB-3

MR. DINN: That is not the total number of jobs now. There are 896 total but 617 of these jobs, as of the end of January, are in the offshore which is a Come By Chance that we did not haul out the golden spade for, we did not turn over any sods. We are not out bragging about it, maybe we should, but these are the facts. We have a Come By Chance equivalent in jobs, created in offshore to offshore

MR. DINN: and onshore, related to offshore right now. But we do not get out the golden spade and get down and turn over the sod and tell everybody you do it four or five times and tell the Newfoundland public that that is what we did. But that is what we did, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may not like it but these are the facts. And any hon. member who wants to see the facts in black and white, all he has to do is come over and he can go through it by job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not like it. Well, all I can say to that is what a great gentleman once said, 'The sanity or insanity of a group lies in the continuity of its traditions.' Now the continuity of traditions of people on the opposite side, they are living up to their press clippings, they are living up to their past, selling out, and we will not have any jobs but we will have the welfare.

AN HON. MEMBER: Slow down! Slow down!

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to sell it out, we are going to do everything that we can for the people of this Province and we are going to get jobs.

Now the hon. member said that the 8,000 jobs or so that are created a year that is the normal. That is what the growth rate is. Well, the figures do not bear that out again, Mr. Speaker. The figures I will just relate a couple to them - but between 1977 and 1978 there were 5,000 jobs created. In 1979 there were 9,000 jobs created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: In 1980, Mr. Speaker, there were 10,000 jobs created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And the hon. member is going to get scared to death now when I take out the latest from Statistics Canada, and I am going to give it to him whether he likes it or not, by month if he wants them. Mr. Speaker, in January, if he wants to take the actual figures, over the past two years, 19,000 jobs. Now, the Throne Speech said 19,000. The hon. member does not want to believe that but that is what the Statistics say, 19,000. If they want to look at the adjusted figures for January, for the lowest or the worst month of the year, the unadjusted figures say 24,000. But the Premier is being conservative again. He does not want to get up on top of the building and announce to all of the people of the Province that he created 24,000 jobs. 'Let us take the accurate figures, let us take the minimum of what we have done, it is at least 19,000 and that is the way it is.

Hon. members can get up and argue about that but these are the facts. The fact is that between 1977 and 1978 there were 5,000, it is not the norm, there were 9,000 created the following year. Now, Mr. Speaker, - and not only that, but the significant thing is that there was no improvement in January and February, but there was an improvement in March, a significant time in the career of a great politician in Newfoundland, a significant time, I believe it was the 17th. that something great took place and then, of course, we were all appointed to government on the 27th.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) is not up talking about the 1,800

MR. DINN: jobs. He announced it in the Speech from the Throne. They are facts. There is going to be a number of jobs created over the next four or five years. They are not even included in the 40,000 that the Premier talked about last year. That is over and above. These are things that we are doing because of the negotiations held by the Minister of Lands and Forests out with Abitibi-Price and the agreements he got with them, that they are going to pay two-thirds of the programme, that reclamation of timber etc. are going to create another 1,800 jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) is a little bit - he does not like to get up and brag all that much, he just likes to do his job. He likes to go out and negotiate and get these companies doing the things that they should have been doing for years. He likes to get put in place -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - a management of our forestry that we did not have before, and, Mr. Speaker, he has been successful. The dollars are there to prove it, that these companies are going to get involved now in silviculture. They are going to get involved in assisting with protecting the forests, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to pay two-thirds of it. I think that is something that we should all be proud of, that we should be on radio and television and on the highest pulpits telling the people of Newfoundland what we are doing, but the Minister of Lands and Forests is a little bit modest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the statistics are frightening hon. members opposite. They cannot attack this government not because it is Ottawa that things are being

March 9, 1981

Tape 226

PK - 4

MR. DINN: blamed on or anything else, it is because
we are producing. How can you attack somebody who makes a

MR. DINN:

prediction that we are going to have 40,000 jobs in five years, when we have 19,000 and two years not even passed? Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite got no powder. I mean, they just cannot do it. So, Mr. Speaker, they cannot criticize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How did you do it?

MR. DINN: How did we do it? We had reclamation of timber last year. We had fisheries. If the federal government has their way, they will take 20,000 jobs away from the fisheries, but I would like to see them this Summer, I would like to see them this Summer when a guy comes in with his load of fish and he only has a partial licence, when we have 20,000 people coming aboard with fish, and Romeo LeBlanc or one of his fisheries officers stops him from fishing or stops him from selling that fish, I would like to see that day. We do not have to do anything about, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to do anything about Romeo LeBlanc. The fishermen of this Province will take care of Romeo LeBlanc in his time, and, Mr. Speaker, the big crunch will come this year when 'Romeo' tries to stop the fishermen from fishing. That is when the crunch will come; a fisheries officer goes down on the wharf and tries to stop a guy from fishing. That is going to be when the cruncher is going to come and he is going to get it out in Fogo and he is going to get it in Bonavista and he is going to get it all across the Northeast coast. When he goes down and he says, "You cannot fish because you only have a part-time licence", that is when he is going to get it, and he is going to get it from the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), too. He will get it, Mr. Speaker. We do not have to worry about Romeo LeBlanc and his foolish resignations. It has nothing to do with Romeo LeBlanc. Romeo LeBlanc will not last ten seconds in Newfoundland after that fisherman comes in with his load of fish and tries to sell it and 'Romeo' tries to stop it. Mr. Speaker, Romeo LeBlanc, the only protection he

MR. DINN: will have are the game laws. They will run him out of this Province, run him out, and any member who stands up on the opposite side and tries to uphold Romeo LeBlanc's regulations, he will be annihilated, too, Mr. Speaker. Not only that but they know it. They know it, Mr. Speaker, that this year is going to be the big cruncher for Romeo LeBlanc and next year if he tries it again, and he is going to get it in St. Mary's - The Capes and he is going to get it on the Northeast coast and wherever poor, old 'Romeo' goes. Nobody will love old 'Romeo' if he tries to stop them from fishing, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to worry about old 'Romeo'. 'Romeo' is after blowing his powder. He is going to be on the run this Summer when he goes down on the Northeast coast, either himself or his fisheries officer, and tries to stop a fisherman from fishing. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: Do you think that is going to happen?

MR. DINN: - oh, my, he will never do it.

Old 'Romeo' will back down this Summer. He will go away with his tail between his legs and everybody knows it. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does not have to fight Romeo LeBlanc. He stated what his position is, everybody knows what it is and 'Romeo' will go back to Ottawa this year with his tail between his legs as he should, as he should. There is no way that Romeo LeBlanc can take a man from St. Mary's - The Capes or anywhere else, a man who has been in the boat for fifteen or sixteen years, take him out of the boat and prevent him from fishing. And, not only that, he will not do it. We know he will not do it, Mr. Speaker, and the old cruncher will come this Summer out in Fogo when 'Romeo' arrives with his fisheries officer and tries to stop the hon. members' constituents from fishing.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) they love
Romeo.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker - no way. So, more jobs will be created in the fishery this year, I predict, that poor, old 'Romeo' will not stop. And, Mr. Speaker, more jobs in the forestry this year and poor, old Billy Rompkey will not stop that either. He has no choice, Mr. Speaker. Poor, old Billy Rompkey went on TV with the hon. the Minister of Finance the other night (Dr. Collins) and got annihilated, much like the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) got annihilated by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) here the other day in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, that are all going to get annihilated if they stick to their old policy, the insanity, the insanity. 'The insanity of a group lies in the continuity of their traditions,' And they are trying to keep up the old traditions of 'let us sell her out, let Uncle Ottawa run the show'. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen will decide this year on fishery policy, not Romeo LeBlanc. Romeo LeBlanc will not decide on fisheries policy. It does not matter what he says, it does not matter what kind of a system he brings in, licensing or otherwise, when it comes time to fish and the fish are there, the fishermen will fish, and I defy 'Romeo' or anybody else, and hon. members opposite better watch which corner they paint themselves into, because they are going to have to try to weasel their way around Romeo LeBlanc's policy this Summer and they will not be able to do it.

MR. HANCOCK: Why? Why?

MR. DINN: Because they will not, because the fishermen will tell 'Romeo' where to go this Summer themselves.

MR. J. DINN:

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. J. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up and he gave us his little dissertation about we did not create the jobs and they are not new jobs. Well, I told the hon. member before the jobs were not there last year and they are there this year so the jobs are not much more than a year old, relatively new. They are relatively new jobs. Mr. Speaker, 19,000 is what it says in the actual figures over the last two years. This June it is going to be at least to 19,000, the same as it says in the Throne Speech. If we add the forestry jobs that we are creating this year, it is going to be more than 19,000. It is going to be more than 19,000, Mr. Speaker. So the Premier has always been conservative - I mean the guy is just - when he makes the predictions, he wants to be on the conservative side because he does not want to disappoint anybody. And, Mr. Speaker, up to this point in time he certainly has not disappointed anybody in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN:

Because, Mr. Speaker, his predictions are low. He has reached very conservative.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did he say about Romeo?

MR. J. DINN:

It does not matter what he says about Romeo or what I say about Romeo or the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) says about Romeo, he is after blowing his last bolt. Romeo will be run out on a rail. The fishermen will decide about Romeo this year or next year or whenever Romeo goes down and tries to stop the fishermen from getting into the boat. The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) knows, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) knows, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) knows, the hon. member for Port

MR. J. DINN: au Port (Mr. Hodder) knows that the minute that Romeo goes down and tries to stop a fisherman from fishing, he is finished, he is wiped out. And, Mr. Speaker, we will do it. The 40,000 will be there whether we get the DREE agreements or not. Last year Mr. Rompkey came down and said, 'Well, we could not sign any DREE agreements because we did not have enough time'. Well, Mr. Speaker, he had enough time to sign a DREE agreement in Nova Scotia for the facilities in Halifax. I think it was something like \$50 million. He signed a \$50 million agreement in Nova Scotia. He could not put a few million towards a synchrolift here in St. John's but he got down to Halifax and he signed a DREE agreement in 1980. He could not sign one here but he signed one in Halifax in 1980 for their shipyard.

MR. FLIGHT: That is wrong.

MR. J. DINN: That is not wrong. I will give the hon. member the date. Does the hon. member want the date?

MR. FLIGHT: No, (inaudible) I said, not wrong.

MR. J. DINN: Last June an agreement was signed, very shortly after they got into power. Down, whipped right down to Halifax and signed an agreement for over \$50 million for Halifax. He could not sign a DREE agreement here because they could not get time he said. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are still on target.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) on the other side.

MR. J. DINN: They were stopped, yes, We know and the people of the Province know who stopped them, The reason why the synchrolift did not go ahead with federal funds. we all know, the people of the Province know and if they do not know they certainly will know by the time the next election rolls around.

MR. J. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rompkey can try to weasel his way around why the DREE agreement was not signed. But if he signed one in Nova Scotia for \$50 million, he should be able to give \$11 million or \$12 million to the St. John's synchrolift. But he could not do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: Time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DINN: No, it is not time yet, Mr. Speaker. I have a little more time. It is going to hurt the hon. gentleman a little bit. I am going to start shoving a few more little barbs in. He is not going to like it, Mr. Speaker, because he feels - the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) feels uncomfortable where he is. He just feels uncomfortable sitting where he is. He would like to be over here now. If he puts his application in and he is nice, if he is nice about it and reasonable and changes his ways, Mr. Speaker, he has a

MR. DINN:

chance. I will talk to my colleagues and see if I can get him into the seats over here. We have room down here. Look there is room for another desk down here. There is not much more room but, I mean, we have got another little bit of room down here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Well, I know we have seven

applications in now, I believe, but, I mean, I think four or five have been thrown out because we would not accept. What are the latest figures on that? There are seven applications in. We threw out five. There are two others that we are considering. So the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock), well, he is still being considered.

MR. FLIGHT:

The member for Baie Verte

(inaudible) to Gander (inaudible) local content over there or what?

MR. DINN:

Depending on what local

content is right.

MR. DINN:

Depending on how much local

content is right. Mr. Speaker, so the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up and he did not say much. He talked about statistics. Well, of course, his contention was certainly shot down. The number of jobs created in 1977-1978 was 5,000, in 1978-1979 it was 9,000. It is 9,500 and soaring. It is 9,500 now, on the average per year, and soaring. In January the hon. member will know, for example, that there were 14,000 over last year, Mr. Speaker, and these are the actual figures of course. I mean I can get into other areas, I can go to other months but that month is a little bit high, 14,000 and the unemployment rate is going down and we will get to 10 per cent this year, possibly.

MR. FLIGHT:

This year?

MR. DINN:

Oh yes. There will be two or three

months this year when we will get down to 10 per cent and the

MR. DINN: Opposition will go into straight shock, shock will set in. And that is because 'Romeo' will not be able to stop the fishermen from fishing. If he could, maybe we would have fewer employed this Summer. But he will not be able to stop that. We know it. Hon. members know it. And we are going to have a few more jobs in the forestry this year. More jobs offshore, even though the national energy policy, if you can call it that, the national energy policy is a disaster in every province in this nation. It is going to have a drastic effect here in Newfoundland, the national energy policy but we will still have the jobs. There will be at least seven or eight rigs out there and we will get more than 900 of the jobs this year. We only had 900 last year, we will have more this year and it is because of our local preference policy and we are not backing down on that. We will have over 900 this year again and that is two Come By Chances. Hon. members do not like that but on a year-around basis there is one. Hon. members would like to know that we did not go below 600 this year. Do you know that that is 100 more than Come By Chance, 100 jobs more than Come By Chance. We did not go below 600 jobs this year, offshore and onshore related, to the offshore, we did not go below 600 on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Therefore if hon. members opposite do not watch it -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please! The Chair is also interested in what is going on and I cannot hear therefore you cannot hear. The hon. gentleman has a right to be heard in silence so keep it down a little bit please.

MR. DINN: That is okay, Mr. Speaker. They do not like the truth much. Some hon. members opposite like it. The hon. the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) likes it because he knows the truth will out this Summer on poor old 'Romeo'. And, Mr. Speaker, we had over 600 jobs this year, in the offshore and onshore, related to the

MR. DINN: offshore and that is more than they had at Come By Chance at its peak. We did not get the big spade out and we did not go out and brag about it but that is the way it is and it is going to go up this Summer, it is going to go up this Summer, it is going to go up this Summer more than I predict right now, Mr. Speaker, that there will be more than 900 jobs in the offshore this year at peak, but if it just continues the way she is going, Mr. Speaker, we may have only 600 jobs on a year-round basis which is a Come By Chance. We do not get up and turn over the spade. We have not got a John Shaheen to ride us into Placentia Bay and tell us all about the good things that are going to happen. And the average wages, Mr. Speaker, by the way, hon. members would like to know that the average wages in the, offshore and onshore related to the offshore, jobs of the Newfoundlanders that are working, are equivalent to the average wages at Come By Chance. I have the statistics here. The hon. member might like to know about it. I have that here. I have Come By Chance's listed by person, the same as my offshore registry, Mr. Speaker, by job and by person and we did a fair comparison. But we are not standing up on the tops of the towers and running around the City of St. John's and telling them of all the great things we are doing. But if hon. members opposite keep interrupting, if hon. members opposite keep knocking down the fact that we have 14,000 over January, then I may be tempted, as a matter

MR. J. DINN:

of fact, I am being tempted lately by the hon. member for Terra Nova (T. Lush), I will be tempted to go out and tell the people where the jobs came from -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: - 617 in

the offshore alone. I will be tempted. And 'Romeo' will not be able to stop the fishery, he cannot close that down. They are after costing us, by the way, Mr. Speaker, just in one fell swoop just on energy policy alone, they are after costing about 500 jobs this year. Just like that, no dollars no cents no nothing, they just brought in their energy policy that is after costing us about 500 jobs. That is what they are doing for us. They want us to be on welfare and we are not going to be on welfare down here, we are going to develop our resources our way for the benefit of the people of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: With their money.

MR. DINN: With or without, Mr. Speaker, it did not take any of their money for the offshore, it did not take any of their money for the fisheries, it just took sound rational policy, that is all it took. And Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: -and Mr. Speaker, yes, what is ours is ours, we have given it away too long. The hon. member agrees with the old policies of 'give it all away', give it to Quebec, give it to the foreigners, give it to Mr. Shaheen or give it to somebody else, do not keep it here in the Province, do not allow the jobs to be for Newfoundlander's, allow them for other people. And the hon. member is against the spruce budworm spray programme. He is going

MR. J. DINN: to go out - I think what we will do to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is - what we will do is we will have his speech printed in the Grand Falls Advertiser so they can see what he is saying in this House. And, Mr. Speaker, I would predict that the loggers and all the people out in that area, will question whether their member is representing them in the House the way they would like him to represent them.

MR. HANCOCK: Why do you not all T.V. (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I would not allow T.V. because I would not allow the people of Newfoundland to see what the hon. members opposite are talking about in this House. Mr. Speaker, we only have so much room over here.

MR. HANCOCK: You are trying to wipe us out.

MR. DINN: If we allowed T.V. everybody would be over here and I would have more people competing for my job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, no we do not want T.V.'s in the House -

MR. HANCOCK: It would not be a bad idea.

MR. DINN: - but if we ever get into - if there is ever some doubt in the minds of the people of Newfoundland as to what the opposition is doing in this House, then I will talk to my colleagues and maybe we can get T.V. into the House, if there is ever any doubt as to what they are doing on behalf of their constituents. hon. member for Windsor-Buchans cares nothing about the loggers and the foresters in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible) and he acts silly.

MR. J. DINN: And the hon. member cannot take it.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: When the hon. member gets in trouble the hon. member gets at this, look - yapping across the House. He knows the rules of the House. He is intelligent but he cannot follow the rules of the House, he just cannot do it. The hon. member cannot restrain himself, he loses his cool. The hon. member loses his cool in the House, he just cannot take it.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) buffer zone.

MR. J. DINN: I only have five minutes. NO. that cannot be true. That cannot be, By leave. Obviously I did not get into the -

MR. SPEAKER: Four and a half.

MR. J. DINN: - I never got into the other areas that I wanted to.

MR. FLIGHT: Come By Chance, was it? Come By Chance?

MR. J. DINN: Well, let me touch a little bit on labour relations. The hon. member for Terra Nova (T.Lush) aspires to my job, he would like to be the Minister of Labour and Manpower in Newfoundland, and I want to tell him a little bit about labour relations, about how they work in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member got up and talked about two of the biggest problems in Newfoundland, one was labour relations and the other one was jobs. Well, the jobs, that has been thrown aside, he has been shot down again on the job bit, he has been shot down again on the policies of the federal government, and when he is espousing those, so let us talk to him a little bit about labour relations. Well, Mr. Speaker, under the

MR. J. DINN: Labour Relations Act, under the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, under the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Collective Bargaining Act, the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act, there is a process that you go through in labour relations and that process is this, that you go in and you negotiate and if you have not been making a lot of progress and you want the assistance of a conciliation officer, you request, under the legislation, you request a conciliation board. In 95 per cent of the cases an officer is sent in to assess the situation. Whether it is in private industry, whether it is in the public service, it is all done the same way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: In goes the conciliation officer and he sits down with both sides and he gets the sense of the groups and he does in most cases, in a lot of cases, in over 85 per cent of the cases, the conciliation officer solves the problems that are there. But there are other cases,

MR. J. DINN: the cases that are not solved by the conciliation officer. And there is the sense of the meeting, that the only way -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: - I was down on the picket line with the Workers' Compensation people on Friday night and I was down again with them on Saturday night. As a matter of fact, on Saturday night we had a happy hour down there.

MR. THOMS: What were you doing there?

MR. DINN: Went down to talk to them. Yes I talked to them. They are going to have another meeting the week, and, you know, we are -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you carry a sign?

MR. DINN: I did not need to carry a sign, they were carrying it for me. I was in the truck with them, talked to them, know what their feeling is.

MR. WARREN: Are they happy with being on a picket line?

MR. DINN: No, they are not happy with being on the picket line but, Mr. Speaker - and if the hon. member does not, you know, like what I am saying he has got a chance after to stand up and do his bit in peace. I doubt whether he will make much sense at it, but he will get up.

And, Mr. Speaker, the conciliation officer goes in and gets the sense of what is going on at the meeting. Now, generally what we do is, whether it is in private industry or whether it is in the public sector, we give a conciliation board if the sense of the meeting is there. Now, in the case of the College of Trades and Technology, the General Service came up before - and I tell you what I will do to the hon. members, I will get a complete sequence of events as to what happened in the College of Trades and the Workers' Compensation dispute for tomorrow if they want it. It will be irrefutable -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) to the president.

MR. DINN: I talked to the President only a week and a half ago. Ten days or so ago I talked to Mr. March in my office. Mr. March was in my office, we sat down and we talked for about three hours.

MR. WARREN: Ten days ago.

MR. DINN: Yes, about ten days, two weeks.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the case of whether it is in the paper industry, we usually appoint a conciliation board. You do not appoint a conciliation board for Abitibi-Price and Bowaters and Consolidated Bathurst and all the rest of them, you appoint it generally for one group. And when that group settles, generally that is the pacesetter, that is the trendsetter as to how the disputes will be settled. Then the conciliation officer generally sits down with the negotiating committess for the other units and settles all the local problems. When all the local problems, generally, and I say generally, in the fishing industry last year the pacesetter for the fishing industry was Fishery Products, and when Fishery Products settled all of the others settled for exactly the same package as Fishery Products settled for.

AN HON. MEMBER: You forced that union out.

MR. DINN: There were some local issues that were different but generally, I say generally, the wage package was exactly the same for Fishery Products, for National Sea, for the Lake group and for all the rest of them that were signed. Mr. Speaker, that is the way it was in the fisheries and it is the same in public service. In the public service you had a conciliation board set up for General Service. All the major items in that were concluded, were solved by either the conciliation officer -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) you forced them.

MR. DINN: Well, why is National Sea not a part of Fishery Products? Why is the Lake Group not a part

MR. DINN: of Fishery Products negotiations?
Because they determine that there are local conditions, there are local problems and they would like to solve those local problems as a separate unit. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the way they go.

When the General Service Conciliation Board majority reported, the union at the time went back to their membership and they said, 'Do not, reject the latest offer, reject the majority report of the conciliation board', their members accepted it. The same thing happened in the MOS, The union executive went to the membership and they said, 'Reject the latest government offer'. MOS signed, You got 5,500 signed. So, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the College of Trades and Technology they said, 'Reject the government's offer and we will pay you the same' -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. DINN: - we will pay you the same and the small unit at the College of Trades and the Workers' Compensation said, 'we are going to get paid anyway so we will go on strike, and they talked them into going on strike.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Is the member now concluding his remarks?

MR. DINN: 5,500 accepted, The people at the College of Trades and the Workers' Compensation did not accept and that is their right. And it is their right to strike and we are not going to - there is a step we can take, we can come into this House and take away that right but we have no intention whatsoever in God's world of doing it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) for what amounts to a very good speech. It was delivered well and contained

March 9, 1981

Tape No. 231

SD - 4

MR. MOORES: a number of very substantive remarks. However, there are some very serious factual errors, factual discrepancies in his speech that lead me to believe that basically he has a very serious lack of knowledge about the topics upon which he speaks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MOORES: It never ceases, Mr. Speaker, to amaze me how much knowledge these people reputed to have in districts where there is very little, if no fishery activity at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: The minister outlines the trepidation that the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Lablanc) should be aware of, should be conscious of in relation to the licencing programme that was recently implemented by the federal government. I might point out to the minister he is from Pleasantville, he is from a St. John's district, and that is factually untrue. The fisheries licencing programme is being accepted generally well by the population of the Province and is being accepted exceptionally well by the fishermen in this Province.

I just came back from a very wide-ranging review of issues and activities and the situation in my district, and I can tell you now that Carbonear is not necessarily a major fishing district in this Province, but it is a very important one. It does have a very well balanced inshore fishery, it has a number of fish processing units that employ hundreds and hundreds of fish processing workers, and the general attitude is that the federal government is right, perfectly right in confining the number of fishermen in this Province who fish.

MR. PATTERSON: That is not what I heard over the weekend.

MR. MOORES: And I want to point out to the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), that I would not want, as he suggested, that there be an election called on this specific issue. Because the reality of the situation in the fishery in this Province right now is that the union is calling the shots. The Fishermen's Union is calling the shots and

MR. MOORES: for good reason, because they have only the fishermen and the fishermen's interest in mind. Of all of the issues, of all the confrontation, the purported confrontation in the fishing industry in this Province, I have never yet heard one concentrated attack on the Fishermen's Union by any group of fishermen anywhere in this Province. And that speaks for itself. Because if the government of this Province were equally popular with the populace, with the electorate of this Province, you would have lots to boast and brag about, because conversely I believe that the people of this Province do not think, in many respects that the government of this Province is acting in its best interest. Constitutional rancour, and Hibernia guff does not create jobs and it does not create a prosperous economy.

The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) talked about all of the jobs that were created. Nowhere in all of my readings on economic issues confronting not only Newfoundland but nations and countries of the world, nowhere in all of my readings have I seen one economy floundering that is at the same time providing employment. And the economy of this Province is floundering. There has been no real industrial growth in this Province or jobs contributed to it since the Upper Churchill project.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Nothing at all. We have seen industry after industry closed down in this Province. And the government of this Province cannot stand up now in one instance and talk to me of a developer or a financier who is prepared to come to this Province and on the basis of the economic environment, invest their money.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. MOORES:

Not one.

Now, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) talked about Hibernia, and the jobs in the offshore. He is the only minister that I know of who can eat his cake and have it too, the only politician in this Province who can do that. Firstly, if the government of this Province wanted to they could not have kept oil drilling and the eventual

MR. MOORES: finds out of Newfoundland. If you wanted to you could not have done it but, at the same time, right now you are strangling the development of the oil industry in this Province by your foolish confrontation with Ottawa. You have done nothing in that regard to speed up what is drastically necessary to enable the Newfoundland economy to recover. The jobs in the offshore oil are there only because this world is energy exhausted. Industrial developing countries of this world are gone mad for oil and if it comes right down to it - and the perfect example of this was the reaction of President Reagan to Canada's energy policy - if it comes right down to it, my friends, if Newfoundland and/or Canada continues to obstruct the development of Hibernia and the offshore oil resources, then the major economic nations of this world will soon apply pressure and they can apply it and will apply it. They will only stand for so much of this childish kindergarten stuff while their nations and their industry and their people and the whole world economy is suffering as a result. When you enter the field of oil you enter a global community, not common, trivial nonsense relating to the district of Carbonear or to the City of St. John's or the D.A.C. Group or to a few other self-centred individuals or groups or governments. We enter a very global, a very unstable, very volatile picture, and the Province of Newfoundland is soon going to bear the brunt of it. The oil companies have threatened in some obscure fashion to take action. 'Reagan' in the United States is starting to move now on Canada's energy policies, and Canada is fed up with Newfoundland's nonsense in obstructing the development of Hibernia. Pretty soon all this is going to come together in the cauldron and we will see then just exactly what happens and why people like Joey Smallwood came out with the dirty end of the stick when he had to deal with these people.

MR. MOORES:

The Labour minister (Mr. Dinn)

talked about Come By Chance and he compared the employment ratio, the 600 or 500 jobs there and those in the offshore, and then he went on to say how we did not sell it out. Nobody asked the oil companies to come in here, they came looking for a commodity that they wanted so badly they would have done almost anything to get. But at the time that Smallwood negotiated Come By Chance, what did he have to offer that the world needed? He had nothing and he went with good intention and earnest efforts and brought about industrial development in this Province at a price that we could not afford to pay but, nonetheless, we had to pay. Now, that is not Hibernia but it is fast becoming Hibernia. you push yourself into a corner too far with governments on an international basis and oil companies who spend more each year in popcorn than we have in a provincial product. You only toy with that kind of power for so long and, at the same time, Newfoundland, the people of Newfoundland are suffering immensely. Who in the world would argue other than the Minister of Labour and Manpower that a floundering economy, an economy that has not produced one single cent in fifty or sixty years, that survived in its current account only because of \$1.3 billion from the federal coffers, what other minister of the Crown would argue that in this type of economy we can produce 40,000 jobs? And I wonder,

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I wonder in view of certain comments in the press over the past few days, because when you are on the outside of this House you can far more objectively assess what is going on inside, when you are an non-participant, and I have said repeatedly to the members of my caucus and to anyone who wants to listen, that the single most serious obstruction to good government in this Province right now is the press, is the media. Because if the Premier of this Province sneezes, it gets front page.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: And if any minister of the Crown talks about government policy, the policy is written and published but the sometimes very serious and very intelligent criticisms of the Opposition go by the wayside.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!.

MR. MOORES: Listen now. Listen! The single most important obstruction to good government in this Province is the press, the media. They have no substance, very little knowledge about programmes and the effect of programmes and policy on the people. And if you put them outside the overpass in St. John's they would beat themselves like a whale. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member like to adjourn the debate?

MR. MOORES: Thank you very much. Adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for Carbonear adjourns the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.