

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), Mr. Speaker, and it is relative to his announcement yesterday that he would approve the Cat Arm project from the environmental standpoint. And I would like to draw the minister's attention to the Environmental Assessment Act, clause 23, that says at any time during the environmental assessment of a proposed undertaking, the minister may invite written comments from interested persons concerning the environmental impact of an undertaking, and I would ask the minister if, to this point in time, he has invited written comments or if he intends to?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Act has been followed to the letter of the act and the letter of the law. Paragraph 21 of the act, if the hon. member will refer to it, talks about an assessment committee. This committee was appointed and I can give the hon. member the names of the committee if he desires. Article 23, "At any time during the environmental assessment of a proposed undertaking, the minister may invite written comments from interested parties." We have done that. Not only has the minister done that--our department and the minister before me--but Hydro also did with public meetings in the White Bay area.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I would ask the minister if he would be prepared, as an aside, to the table the copies of the letters and the names of the private individuals or the concerned people that the letters may have gone to. But further on down, Mr. Speaker, in the act it says, "Where the minister receives indication of strong public interest" - now obviously there must be public interest in a \$387 million project that has got great potential for environmental damage - it says that, "the minister may appoint an environmental assessment board for the purpose of conducting public hearings" - "an assessment board for the purpose of conducting public hearings to the environmental assessment of the undertaking. And that no person on that board shall be employed in the Public Service of the Province, or the Public Service of Canada."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the only impact statements that have been made have been made by Newfoundland Hydro to the minister. That is the impact statement. The committee he refers to is a committee of civil servants. He is right. Under the act that is - but under this act, if the minister so deems it necessary, he can appoint an environmental assessment board, a board made up of people who are not part of the public civil service or federal civil service, I want to ask the minister if he has appointed that board for the purpose of holding public hearings or does he intend to appoint that board?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) has not even read the statement yesterday. And I said, 'In closing I would like to point out that Hydro has conducted a

MR. ANDREWS: that Hydro has conducted a public information programme in the course of this environmental assessment involving interested representatives of several communities. At no time has either Hydro or my department received any communication from the public indicating serious concerns about the environmental impacts of the Cat Arm project."

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister is not going to answer that question. This act has not been applied, there have been no letters gone out to the members of the general public concerned, there has been no Environmental Assessment Board set up and there have been no public hearings. In the spirit of the legislation, that is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSALL: A point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, you know, has been using the statutes to explain his question and that is fine, but now the hon. gentleman is taking the question that has been answered by the hon. minister and making -

MR. THOMS: It was not answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: -comments and speeches in his interpretation on it. There is a procedure, Mr. Speaker, that takes place tomorrow afternoon and the hon. gentleman can avail himself of it if he wishes to, but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, he is not allowed during Question Period to make any speeches.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, to the point of order, the hon. member is on his second supplementary and really there should not be too much preamble required anyway. I allowed him some preamble and now perhaps he could ask his question.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, yes. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the minister's attention in this supplementary, an impact study that was done on Cat Arm by the Department of the Environment for the Minister of the Environment in 1976, and I would quote, "Flooding of the Cat Arm empoundment will result in irreplaceable loss of wildlife habitat. The loss of the sheltered valley forest habitat will be critical for wintering of moose and other animals. Winter habitat if any exists in these areas will also be eliminated." Now in view of that kind of evidence that was presented to the minister in 1976, having that information available to him does the minister still not believe that it is worthwhile, it is worthwhile before we proceed with the Cat Arm to have Cat Arm subject to the legislation and that a board, an Environmental Assessment Board be set up so that at least the Cat Arm project will be done in the spirit of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, and that concerned people will know that an independent board, not Newfoundland Hydro employees but an independent board will look at all the environmental aspects and report on it to the minister? Now will the minister appoint that board?

MR. MOORES: Yes or no.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the decision has been made not to appoint the board-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MAY 13, 1981

Tape No. 1503

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: - for the obvious reasons, the reasons that I said yesterday, that I find and our department finds that the Cat Arms project is environmentally sound.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: I would like to point out to the member a couple of things that have been said in various reports written about the environmental impact. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) mentioned the impact on wildlife. All the reports that I have been able to come by, including Hydro's impact statement indicate that

MR. ANDREWS:

the Cat Arm project will flood approximately twenty-one square miles. That is a very small project compared to some of the other projects that we have had in Newfoundland and Labrador. Bay d'Espoir, for instance, is 259 square miles, so this is about one-tenth or one-eleventh of the size of the Bay d'Espoir project.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, the wildlife and fishing game that would be destroyed, the estimates range to a total of fifty-five moose in the whole area and approximately twenty salmon and two hundred trout.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the minimal impact of this project does not warrant the cost and the expense and the delay that such extensive other studies would need and the time that it would take up. The material, the information that we have received to date is satisfactory to me.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want the minister to tell the House why it is that he is not prepared to let the Cat Arm project, a major project, Mr. Speaker, why it is he is not prepared to let that project have the benefit of his legislation, of the legislation brought in to protect the environment of this Province? Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Assessment Act, that was debated and became law in this House was for the very purpose we are talking about now. One cannot imagine - there will never be in this Province a project that would require that legislation.

MR. HODDER: The last of its kind.

MR. FLIGHT: The last of its kind - and why it is that the minister refuses to allow the Cat Arm project

MR. FLIGHT: to be subject to the Environmental Assessment Act in this Province? Now why?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ANDREWS: This project has followed all the guidelines of the Environmental Assessment Act. It is possibly - more than possibly, most likely the most studied hydro project ever in Newfoundland. I do agree with the member that it is possibly the last large one we will ever undertake in this Province. But also what should be remembered, the Department of Environment has told Hydro, and listed them in this one paper alone, of a dozen recommendations to Hydro and orders to Hydro on things that they must do in the process of fulfilling this contract.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: We will appoint a full-time monitor. They have to have a continued liaison with the communities there and with this department. This thing will be monitored all the way along, Mr. Speaker. I am very confident that this is probably the best major construction project ever undertaken in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) wish to yield?

MR. THOMS: I yield.



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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister why this is. The Cat Arm project has been under consideration by Hydro for six or seven years. I have a report here that was presented in 1976, the report took a year or two to do, so since 1976 Newfoundland Hydro have been preparing to develop the Cat Arm. Now why did the minister not use his ministerial authority and say to Hydro - it is a crisis situation now - but why was Hydro not informed that that project would have to conform to all the aspects of the legislation, and the board could have been appointed and the board could have held their meetings? Why, Mr. Speaker, was Hydro allowed to go ahead with this project without submitting to the legislation? They have been at it for five years, had all the time in the world, so why, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. Minister of Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it is getting kind of repetitious. There is a very simple answer, that the Environmental Protection Act was passed in 1980.

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

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

I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in his capacity with Consumer Affairs coming within his department. I was wondering if the minister is aware of what I consider to be despicable and cruel action which is carried on by some mortgage companies in the Province at this moment. The minister knows that normally it has been the practice, as long as I have been practicing law in St.

MR. THOMS: John's, that if a mortgagor is one payment, two payments, three payments behind in his mortgage payments, if he goes to his company and brings his mortgage up to date they will continue with the mortgage. But the practice is now developing that the mortgage companies are refusing to accept arrears payments such as this and are forcing the consumer, the mortgagor, to pay the total mortgage. And this all comes about, of course, because of the difference between the interest rates as they were when the mortgage was placed and the interest rates as they are today.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, no, it was my understanding, as indeed the hon. gentleman indicated, that the usual practice was that if a person was in arrears a reasonable period of time, two or three months or whatever it happens to be, and presumably informs them and does not remain in that arrears without information as if, you know, showing any total indifference, that indeed mortgage companies would, in most circumstances, you know, go along with arrears for a reasonable period of time, whatever that happened to be, and I suppose a lot depends on the person's previous record of prompt payment and things like that.

I was not aware, as the hon. gentleman alleges, that it has become, let us say, a general practice now to, you know, immediately move -

MR. NEARY: Shocking, shocking.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - once arrears have been entered into. I will certainly, you know,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: have that matter looked into, As the hon. gentleman says, with the difference in interest rates, you know, one could see the temptation on the part of mortgage companies to act in such a way, but certainly it is necessary that the legitimate rights of mortgage holders be protected, and I think we are speaking here of people who are one or two or three months in arrears, not people who are in sort of total disregard of their financial responsibilities. I will have the matter looked at and see how extensive it is and see, you know, what could be done from the point of view of consumer protection. To say off the top of one's head, you know, what could be done would not be a sensible way of doing it, but I will certainly have it examined to see if there are certain measures which can be taken, legislative or otherwise. It will probably have to be legislative.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Is the minister saying that he will have his department investigate, go to the mortgage companies, determine whether or not their policy has changed in this regard and if the policy - I have had complaints. Now, I am not prepared to name the particular mortgage company in the House of Assembly but I will be only too happy to give the minister the complaint privately. So, is the minister prepared to bring in legislation that would stop this practice and put a limit on this sort of thing, or make this a law that if a person would bring his mortgage up to date then foreclosure proceedings will not be available to the mortgagee?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, certainly I will undertake to have such an inquiry

MR. OTTENHEIMER: or check made of various mortgage companies to ascertain what specifically their policy is and then to ascertain whether there has been a change in that policy recently. Now, if as a result of that, the situation is as the hon. member has described it, then obviously we shall endeavour to have a remedy. You know, what that remedy would be I think would depend to a certain extent upon the result of discussions with the mortgage companies. Now, if we can get a voluntary or co-operative agreement worked out which they will abide by, let us say in a self-diciplined point of view, then that would be one solution. If not, then obviously then only other solution would be legislation or regulation. And if that were required, then obviously we would have to do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the land freeze on the Avalon Peninsula, agricultural land. Members will recall that six or seven years ago the government imposed a land freeze on the Avalon Peninsula, especially in the St. John's area, where vacant land would have to be looked at very carefully to see if it was agricultural land before the

MR. S. NEARY: land could be developed for housing or commercial development. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if there is any budge on the part of the government on lifting the land freeze on any or all the region, especially around the greater St. John's area where the land freeze is now in force? Is the government going to budge on that?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, there has been no decision made by government at this point in time to lift the land freeze or to make any sections of land within the agricultural zone exempt from the freeze. Now there has been one exception, we lifted a quarter of an acre of land in one particular area, I think somewhere near Torbay, a half year or so ago to allow a person to construct a home on a piece of land which was a quarter of an acre inside of the zone. That has been the only exemption so far.

We are carrying on, we are entering about the fourth year of a land classification and soil analysis programme which is associated with the agricultural zoning. That will be completed within two years at the maximum. At that time government, I would think, will be in a position to make a decision on which land would be lifted and which would remain within an agricultural zoned area.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. House will recall that the government did not bring in compensation for those people whose land has been frozen, that they have been discriminated against, that the government would not agree to purchase the land. Is there any movement now towards government offering people whose land had been frozen the going price?

MR. S. NEARY: First of all, are they moving towards purchasing the land, which they should have done in the first place? When you freeze land you remove people's rights, then the government should have bought the land. Is there any movement in that direction and, if there is, will they be offered the going price, the price now that is being inflated through the oil boom syndrome that is in this area that they created?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is alluding to what is commonly referred to as land banking. And at this point in time government has addressed itself to that process over the last number of months. But there has been no decision made at this point in time to purchase land at any particular value. We try and assist farmers presently in the industry or people who want to become involved in the agricultural industry; if they want to go ahead and buy some agricultural land then there are grants, programmes and so on available to these

MR. GOUDIE: people to take advantage of getting involved in the agricultural industry.

But there is no plan at this point in time to land bank.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question really had to do with these people being discriminated against because the government has placed a freeze on their land. They do not want to develop it, they are not farmers, a lot of them, and they do not want to develop it as agricultural land. They cannot sell the land. They do not have the same privilege that other people have to make a bundle at this particular point in time. The land is frozen. There is nothing they can do with it and the government is refusing to buy it. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman this. The hon. gentleman mentioned that there was only one exemption, one exemption in the Torbay area where a person wanted to develop a quarter of an acre to build a house. Is that what I understand from the hon. gentleman? Well now what is happening around the St. John's Airport and right here in the East End of St. John's with all these speculators who are going out and paying \$2 million and \$3 million and \$4 million for large slices of land; will they be able to develop it? The land around the airport was also frozen; some of it is now being developed. How many applications has the minister had in the last year or two for exemptions and who have they been granted to? And is the hon. gentleman prepared to table the number of times that he has exempted an individual or a company from the agricultural land freeze? Because the rumours we hear, the reports we hear are that it is going on right, left and centre, that these speculators are at work and they are not paying \$2 million and \$3 million and \$4 million for large pieces of land if

MR. NEARY: they cannot develop it for housing or apartment buildings or use it for a commercial project.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what I can do as minister responsible for agriculture to prevent people from speculating. I guess there is nothing that I can do for that matter, and I suppose in some ways if a land owner wants to accept money from some potential developer as some kind of a speculation bid on his land, I guess that is one way of making money. I do not know. I have no plans at this point in time, and I do not think government has either, of lifting the land freeze to accommodate speculators who want to come in and talk about developing - housing developments, industrial development, or whatever. As I said, there has been only one since I have been responsible, approximately three years, for the Agricultural Division of the department. There has been one section of land, approximately a quarter of an acre in size, lifted from the zoning area to allow this person to construct a home. There have been many requests, I would estimate a hundred or so, requests from individuals, from firms and so on, to lift a particular parcel of land from the freeze. None of them have been approved, not one.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Minister of Transportation a question, but in the continued absence of that



MR. CALLAN:

minister, let me ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mrs. Newhook) if she could tell us if a decision has been made within her department yet of how many towns will receive water and sewer projects this year and how many new ones there will be of that number, ongoing and new ones?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot give that information as yet. Our capital works programme has been presented to Cabinet and when Cabinet makes the decision well, then it will be made public and I will advise the hon. member.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the minister made reference to the fact that when Cabinet makes its decision - a supplementary: Would the minister indicate what sort of guidelines will be used this year in ascertaining which towns, in a degree of priority, which towns will receive funding for water and sewer projects? What are the guidelines that Cabinet uses? Is it, for example, the size of the community, the number of years that they have applied unsuccessfully? I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, in particular, of a town that water and sewer was approved in in 1975 and then lost it again that same year. So six years later, that town still has not been on the list of priorities and approvals. I am wondering what are the guidelines this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, our programme is broken down into four categories. One category is where

MRS. NEWHOOK: pre-design work has been done; another category is where we have already had phases of water and sewer, so it would be extensions; another category, then, is new projects, and then we have a fourth category, which is provincial roads, and that is our roads programme. Priority, of course, is always given to environmental problems and where there is pollution of water and good clean water is really needed, and where there is no water at all available.

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

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. In using these guidelines then, I am thinking of the town of Norman's Cove, where water and sewer was approved in 1975 and cancelled again after the election of that same year. In view of the fact that that town is on the priority list, or was six years ago - it is the second largest town

MR. CALLAN:

in all of Trinity Bay, perhaps the largest in Newfoundland that does not have an adequate water and sewer system- I am wondering can the minister confirm then that under these guidelines, using these guidelines would not the municipality of Norman's Cove-Long Cove qualify?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of

Municipal Affairs.

MRS NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, all requests

received are listed alphabetically under the various categories and then recommendations are made to Cabinet and then Cabinet makes the final decision as to which projects will go ahead. And, like I say, they are not necessarily by population or the number of people in a particular town but according to need and environmental problems.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St.

Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is directed to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie). Mr. Minister, is funding available from your department for an impact study related to the pulling away of one of the major industries from Deer Lake, namely, Eastern Provincial Airways? Is funding available from your department for that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of

Rural Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

No, Mr. Speaker. There was

a request from, I think, three or four individuals in the community of Deer Lake. I believe a couple of months ago, or whenever this issue became public, there was a request for some funds to travel to Ottawa to fight their case and we at the department with the guidelines we have under which to operate could not provide that funding. As far as I am

MR. GOUDIE: aware - I would have to double check to make sure- but as far as I am aware we have no programme in the department to allow that kind of a study to take place unless a development association in the area was addressing itself to that question and in that way there may be the possibility of providing some funds. But off the top of my head I would say no.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary.

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I realize my lack of knowledge about your department, Mr. Minister, but should the development association approach your department, then would there be monies available for such a study, that is an impact study?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. GOUDIE: The only thing I can suggest, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time is that if a development association wanted to go ahead and make a proposal to my department we would certainly consider it. But I would not want to override the decision of the board which considers such submission by answering yes or no in the House of Assembly. We would certainly consider it and deal with it at the board level.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to report on the Estimates Committee for the resource departments of government. This committee has met a total of 19.5 hours.

MR. BARRETT: examining the estimates of departments referred to it for review. These departments covered Head VI, Department of Development, Head VII, Department of Mines and Energy, Head VIII, Department of Fisheries, Head IX, Department of Forest Resources and Lands, and Head X, Department of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development.

I should like to report to the House that all of these Heads have been passed without amendment, and I would like to in closing express my appreciation to the members of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett); the members; the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan); and the Clerk of the Committee, Miss Elizabeth Murphy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):  
Labour and Manpower.

The hon. the Minister of

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Workers' Compensation Board for the year 1980.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further reports?

o o o

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order by the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in today's Daily News there is a front page story with a headline

MR. NEARY: that says that the Speaker okayed police in the House. And then the item went on to describe the point of privilege that I raised and the ruling that Your Honour gave and portrayed the wrong information completely to the people of this Province who would read that item, Mr. Speaker. What Your Honour said was that the police would, as in 1971, be allowed to occupy the public galleries of this House. Your Honour did not say that the police were allowed on the floor of the House. As a matter of fact, Your Honour said that the police would not appear in the doorways of the House again, that they could occupy the public galleries. Anybody can occupy the public galleries.

So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that my interpretation of your ruling was that the police were not allowed in the House. They could survey the House from the public galleries the same as anybody else, and the corridors from now on would be free. Now, that was my interpretation of the ruling that Your Honour gave and I am pretty sure I am right, and I would like for that item to be corrected.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Well, it is not a point of order, it is a point of information and the hon. member has taken the opportunity to interpret a ruling which I gave yesterday which is easily accessible to all members of the House, all members of the media or anybody else just by checking Hansard, and the ruling is quite clear.

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

MR. STIRLING: No, I thought we were on Orders of the Day.

MR. L. STIRLING: Before Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members of the House would like to join me in extending sympathy to the family of Mr. Ted Vincent who was a member of the National Convention, an ardent Confederate representative of Bonavista North in that historic event. And I think that it is traditional that the House notes almost as colleagues the passing of those people who attended the National Convention.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: We would certainly wish to be associated with those remarks of sympathy. Mr. Vincent is very well known, I think, to all members of the House and prior to his retirement, I believe, had been a member of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission for a number of years. And to Mrs. Vincent and his daughters we certainly would like to be associated with these words of sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER: You have heard the motion. Those in favour, 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

This being Private Member's Day, according to Standing Order 53 I now call motion number four moved by the hon. member for Baie Verge - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Last day the debate was on the amendment which had been moved by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), who had approximately twenty minutes remaining. The hon. member for Grand Bank is not here.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to discuss the amendment introduced by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who sets out the -

MR. SPEAKER: If I may. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) as he proceeds. I would just to give interpretation for the guidance of hon. members so that when it arises later on today everybody will be aware of it. My interpretation of the Standing Orders is that the hon. member who moves this particular motion on a Private Member's Day has the right to close the debate on the motion at twenty minutes to six. Therefore the interpretation in my mind at least would be that the amendment would have to be dealt with prior to twenty minutes to six. So that all members will agree and understand, I just wanted to mention that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is my interpretation of what the Standing Order says.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, I think you have been following that rule, Mr. Speaker, and we are all familiar with it that we talk on the amendment up until twenty minutes to six and then you interrupt us and we put all the votes at the same time, the amendment and main motion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set out the position of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liberal Party on this question of offshore oil. And I will include in it a proposal to the Premier and the government as to how we can get to the next step. So I hope that the Premier will be able to remain in the House so that we can make some progress.



MR. L. STIRLING: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have been challenged many times by the members on the government side to set out our position on the offshore. We have set that out many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, with many different speakers and it was never completely accepted. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we decided to use the opportunity of the visit of the Prime Minister in maybe the most dramatic fashion possible to let there be no doubt, no doubt in anyone's mind, either of the Prime Minister or of any person in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And as the member who introduced the original motion said it eventually got to be carried on national television across Canada. So as of this point I presume now that there is absolutely no doubt about what the position

MR. STIRLING: is of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liberal Party.

And, Mr. Speaker, to be consistent to talk in terms of what is in the best interests of all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to be fair and not just to try to grab the headlines as has been done by the present administration, the position has always been consistent in this House of Assembly. It was the position of the Smallwood administration, supported by the Opposition of the day; it was the position of the Moores administration, supported by the Opposition of the day; it was the position of the Peckford government, supported by the Opposition of the day. There has been no change that the offshore resources are owned by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, in our right as the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. There was no question, no doubt about it.

Mr. Speaker, when we invited the Prime Minister to attend our dinner there was discussion, obviously, about a choice of subjects. And we said, Mr. Speaker, that the most important question that could be resolved for the benefit of all of Newfoundland and Labrador is to answer the question. Can there still be a political settlement of the offshore gas and oil?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have made clear is that the position of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liberal Party is that we own the offshore and, as everybody saw, the position of the Prime Minister of Canada is that he does not believe that we own the offshore.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is, how do we resolve that question? And, Mr. Speaker, if we have a choice, the choice is that we have a simple negotiated solution, very simple. If we had a choice. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am now suggesting to the members on the opposite side, and I am really a little bit disappointed with the Minister

MR. STIRLING: of Mines and Energy (L. Barry)  
that he cannot hold back his political bias, that he should  
be as anxious as we are to arrive at a settlement of this  
issue in the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. BARRY: Not if you want to give it away,  
though.

MR. MOORES: Living in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) on national TV.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Premier said, and  
I will give him credit for it, I will give him full credit -  
I have criticized the attitude of the confusion and the con-  
frontation in the past but I will give him credit-that when  
he heard the comments of the Prime Minister, in the interview  
and again at the dinner, when he heard those comments,  
the Premier said, 'He seems to be coming part way. It seems  
to be a better attitude. I am willing to meet with him.'  
And I give the Premier full marks and full credit for that  
kind of statement, very unlike the Minister of Mines and  
Energy in his interjections here today. So, we have made  
some progress, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us see where we are.

Everybody in this House of Assembly believes that we own  
the offshore. The federal position is they do not believe  
we own the offshore, so what do we go from here? We have  
only two choices, Mr. Speaker - I guess three. We can bury  
our head in the sand and say, we own it, we are not taking  
any action, nothing is going to happen. It is now time for  
somebody to give in.' That is one position, bury your  
head in the sand and hang tough. That is one expression.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) hang tough.

MR. STIRLING: No, it is a very appropriate phrase.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) to hang and it is going  
to be tough.

MR. STIRLING: It is an expression, Mr. Speaker,  
that every Newfoundlander could understand and I will try not

MR. STIRLING: to be political because I am honestly going to make an appeal to the Premier in the context of his remarks after the Prime Minister's remarks.

So, position number one is bury your head in the sand-and that is what we have been doing for some time, a year, two years and nothing has happened. Position number two is that we go to court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on this question of going to court, I take the word of the advisors to the government. We have not been given the information, we have not had the benefit of all the legal documentation. I believe the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) has said in Committee and said here that we have spent up to \$500,000 on a legal case and Mr. Martin, speaking on behalf of the government, felt that we did not have a very good chance if we went to court, so I am taking their word for it.

MR. STIRLING: So where does that leave us, Mr. Speaker, in a sane, reasonable manner with the greatest asset next to the fishery, next to people, maybe the third greatest asset that we have, the offshore gas and oil? How do we handle it? Obviously, there has to be some kind of an agreement.

Now, the problem that we have right now is that the Premier does not want to write a letter to initiate it. Now, we have a difference of opinion on that. I believe it is the job of the Premier to take the initiative to do whatever has to be done for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, for whatever benefits to take whatever initiative is necessary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. STIRLING: - to make as many trips, to be the first one if there is the slightest chance, to say, 'Okay, I am coming on a 'plane. I am prepared to take the initiative because it is my job to manage Newfoundland and Labrador.' I accept that he does not operate that way. Okay, now what we are proposing here is a means whereby we can save face for the Premier and save the pride of the Premier and the super-sensitive Mines and Energy Minister (Mr. Barry). We are going to get around that problem. And how do we get around the problem? We get around the problem by sitting down as a caucus and we work out an amendment that takes the problem out of the hands of the Premier and out of the hands of the Minister of Mines and Energy and makes it a unanimous Resolution of this House.

Now, just look at the wording. There is no criticism of the government in the wording: "WHEREAS the position of the House of Assembly is that offshore mineral, oil and gas resources are owned by the Province;" - unanimous and we are in agreement - and WHEREAS the wise and controlled development of offshore

MR. STIRLING: resources is important to the future of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador;" - we should have complete agreement on that - and WHEREAS the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political settlement or a court settlement;" - no argument, the Premier agrees on that -

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House reassert its position that we own the offshore resources," - essentially the same resolve that was in the main motion. Now, how do we get the next step going? Here is how we get the next step going:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provincial government express its willingness -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. STIRLING: - to meet with the federal government" - notice the words "willingness to meet" - "with the federal government to consider a co-operative and joint development of the offshore resources so that controlled development can take place," - Who for? - "for the benefit of our people," - When? - "while the question of ownership is being resolved." In other words, Mr. Speaker, the exploration phase is going ahead now because of this kind of co-operative and joint agreement between the provincial government and federal government so that we could get the last number of years of development of exploration taking place. All of the exploration, Mr. Speaker, is going ahead not as a result of resolving the ownership, but it was a result of reasonable and reasoned people coming together and working out a position that said, 'Okay, jointly we will allow for exploration.' And it has been agreed and understood. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are coming to this moment of crisis, and it is obviously one in which there is a great deal at stake, Mr. Speaker, and that is the decision to develop. We had a visit from the people of the oil companies; we have heard stories of the government saying, 'Do not dare take us to court.'

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, if we had been given the facts and the background, we probably would have supported that kind of position. But it is urgent. So, Mr. Speaker, what we are proposing on this side is so that it does not have to embarrass the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). Let us all be unanimous in voting for this Resolution, because then the House of Assembly takes the action. It is an easy getting together. It seems now that the only question is how do we get the Prime Minister and the Premier together? My belief is that it is our resource and that we have to take the initiative, we have to take the action, and this Resolution, not having a single word of criticism of the government makes it very easy for everyone to support that Resolution. We gave it a great deal of thought in caucus. It was presented as representing the whole caucus, of an attempt to bring together the federal people and the provincial people to get to the next step.

Now, what are the possibilities, Mr. Speaker? Now, the Prime Minister has said

MR. STIRLING: that if we had agreement with them that until we become a have Province we would get 100 per cent of the benefits as though they were on shore. Now let us suppose he said: You can have that forever; that would be ownership. So the question that we have to negotiate, the question we have to discuss, is how long a period can we have those total benefits while we are resolving the question of ownership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Prime Minister has gone just about as far as anyone could go in coming to Newfoundland and saying yes, to use the words in the Evening Telegram, 'I plead for you to get together with us and resolve this question in a political manner'. And, Mr. Speaker, that very simply is our position. Our position is that we own the offshore but in order to develop it we have to get together with Ottawa, we have to work out an agreement. Now by the government's own figures, by their own estimates, if we take the next twenty years, and if we had world prices - by the way, Mr. Speaker, that is something that is not generally understood. We talked about electricity here yesterday. This government appears to be on record as saying that they want the world price for oil and, if that means passing that along to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, we cannot live with it. But, Mr. Speaker, there are some inconsistencies there, so that our job in the Opposition right now is to try to find a way, on behalf of all of Newfoundland and Labrador, to bring this Province together with the federal government, our partners, to develop the offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything inconsistent, I do not see any problem in getting the agreement, I do not see any problem in having this a unanimous resolution of this House of Assembly and, therefore, I would urge the Premier to instruct his colleagues on that side of the House to support this resolution because it will get us away from this position that the government has dug



MR. STIRLING:                   itself into , a position in which there is not place for movement. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I present that case and present it now while the Premier is here. To get the next step, we will support the government on the question of ownership, but on the question of getting together and resolving the next step of development, maybe it will be a twenty year plan. The government's own figures show that for seventeen of the next twenty years if we get all of the ownership rights settled, if we own it, then if we jack the prices up to world prices - that means Newfoundland and Labrador residents paying double the present prices - if we get that, we will still in seventeen out of those twenty years have to go to Ottawa and say we would like to have our share of equalization.

                                  Under the new constitution, Mr. Speaker, we will be going to Ottawa as a right saying we are getting our share of equalization. Under the proposal of the Provinces, equalization was not a right but under the new constitution we will get it as a right. So, Mr. Speaker, if the government has select the twenty year programme -

MR. BARRY:                   All they have to do is give one dollar a year and that would satisfy that right.

MR. NEARY:                   No, that is not true.

MR. STIRLING:               Mr. Speaker, so if we sum up this whole position of where we are now -

MR. NEARY:                   (Inaudible) narrow- minded.

MR. STIRLING:               - we have a resolution which everybody should be able to agree to and that is that we own the offshore and we want the Province and the federal government to get together. We should have the unanimous support of the House on this, Mr. Speaker, because for seventeen of the next twenty years, we are still -

MR. STIRLING: not going to have enough money to be able to do without equalization payments. So we seem to be talking about the same period of time. If we are talking about the life of the well being twenty years, maybe. Maybe there is not that great a difference on Hibernia. There may not be that great a difference between the provincial position and the federal position from a practical point of view. So, our proposal, Mr. Speaker, is "Let us open discussions on what is going to happen for the next twenty years. Let us work out an agreement that Ottawa will give us everything they said they will give us, which is 100 per cent, for the next twenty years." Maybe it will be seventeen to twenty, that is part of negotiations, part of getting together. Let us talk in terms now of a twenty year development programme which is the life of Hibernia, and if they are going to give us that, then let us negotiate on that basis while we try to find a way to resolve the ownership. Because otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the alternative, if this government continues to maintain its head in the sand approach, the alternative is that somebody takes us to court and, based on the advice that they have given out, through their advisor, we may lose everything. So you cannot negotiate, "Okay, we will take the twenty year deal" when we have lost everything.

I do not want to lose it to Ottawa and the federal civil servants. I can see the hardening of their position. And the position being taken by the Province at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is allowing any of those people who are not friends of ours in Ottawa to be hardening their position. What we need to do is to take some action while we have a choice.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you saw

MR. STIRLING: a good example of action having to be taken where there is no choice. And that was on the Cat Arm development. We just ran out of time. Nothing is happening on the Lower Churchill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do make this plea to the Premier, in the context of working together and what is in the best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I do ask the Premier to allow his members to vote for this unanimous resolution because there is not one word of criticism of the government's position in it, and then the House of Assembly sets up the mechanism to get the Province and the federal government together. An excellent resolution, Mr. Speaker, and one done in the spirit of what is in the best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard another approach that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is trying to take to get some of the credit that this government and this Party has been getting for the last ten years on standing up for the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a chance to try to worm their way into the good graces of an issue that most Newfoundlanders and Labradorians agree is the right position that a Newfoundlander or Labradorian should take as it relates to the offshore case. I welcome the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), I welcome the Liberal Opposition to our side, to finally having seen the light on the issue of the offshore. They have hemmed and hammed. They have danced a jig many, many times over the last few years as to whether they would support or whether they would reject.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It got so bad, Mr. Speaker, it got so bad over there that one of their members on a matter of principle, not too long ago, had to cross the floor of this House and had to put this resolution on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) one of the most naive approaches to the development of this Province that I have ever heard. If this attitude prevades the Liberal Opposition then the sell-outs of the past would only be minor in comparison to the sell-outs of the future. Because to enter into a position that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to put forward now, as being the party that always supported the ownership of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: offshore when the Leader immediately before the present Leader hemmed and hammed in this House over talking about something less than ownership, talking about the word 'jurisdiction', standing up here in the House and asking me questions, 'Does the Premier mean jurisdiction? Does the Premier mean ownership? What does the Premier mean?' when it was clear to all except members on the opposite side what was meant by it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just indicate to the members of the Opposition and to the members of this House just very briefly the history of this particular issue, the history of it, because it bears repeating in a very quick way so that we get the context of what we are talking about here today, and the context of the resolution put forward by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and the subsequent amendment put forward by the members of the Opposition, who are now trying to claim some credit from something that the government has been a part of for a long, long time. Let us look at the history of it, let us go back to the early, middle and late sixties when Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Doyle and other people were alive and well in this Province and when the Premier of the day gave by comfort letter to these people certain parts of the offshore that were near the shore. And then later the federal government, through its regulations literally gave away, because the regulations were loose in those days in the federal jurisdiction, a lot of the land that is now held by the companies; that was held at the time by the Eastcan group off the Labrador coast, that was held by Amoco off the South coast, and that was held by Shell, Texaco and Mobil and Imperial essentially, and BP, off

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the Northeast coast.

All that land was put out. In 1972 there was a drastic change in public policy in this Province as it related to the whole question of the offshore. The new government of the day, in 1972, reasserted a dormant idea which said that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, because of the Terms of Union with Canada, had claim to and ownership of the minerals on the Continental Shelf in the same way as if they were above the water. And suddenly, this change being brought about by the new administration of 1972, work was started by the Minister of Mines and Energy at the time, who is now the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and others to develop a legal position on this and to do additional work to form the foundation of what we have now evolved into here in 1980-81. 1972 to 1977, essentially, was the period in which this research was going on by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador when they were developing their case.

Simultaneously with this kind of evolution, this kind of research, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador was talking to the Government of Canada over those numbers of years, over those five years, and all through that period of negotiation and of talk and of discussion, there was some chance that there would be a resolution of the issue in favour of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And many, many different meetings were held and many discussions were held at the highest level, and within the bureaucratic level, to see that it could be. However, as we moved toward 1975, 1976, 1977, it became clear that the federal Canadian Government was not willing to entertain the idea that the administration that came in in 1972 had put forward and they became

PREMIER PECKFORD: pretty hardened in their position that there was to be change in that position at all.

But let us not forget there were five whole years, or four whole years for sure, in which there was a lot of talk. And even to the time when I became Minister of Mines and Energy in 1976, or whenever - I think it was '76 - there was still discussion going on with the Minister of Energy in Ottawa, then Mr. Gillespie, and myself, and with the Prime Minister and with the Premier and at the bureaucratic level, and through all of that there was absolutely no change in the position of the federal government. If anything, it had hardened over that period of time.

We then proceeded through the process of establishing, in fact, jurisdiction by issuing oil and gas regulations under the Oil and Gas Act that had been passed earlier and these regulations were promulgated and from those regulations have flowed, essentially, the exploration programme of the companies, the relinquishment of acreage and all the rest of it, and what we see today.

Now, after all of that was done, Mr. Speaker, as most people know, it is recent history now, we continued to do that and both sides continued to take their respective positions until the constitutional process of last year when after some persuasion by some of the other Premiers and myself the Prime Minister was persuaded that it should become part of the constitutional package so that, therefore, we sat down, and, Mr. Speaker, this is extremely significant, during all the constitutional discussions of last Summer

PREMIER PECKFORD: at the ministerial level when the offshore was one of the more prominent issues for that constitutional change, the federal government and the Prime Minister of Canada refused to even put a new position on the table as it related to offshore. It was one of the few issues of the twelve that the Canadian government refused to put any kind of position on the table, zero, none, over and over again would not respond, every single jurisdiction, every single province responded. And there were meetings with the officials, back to the ministers and the ministers back to the officials, and each time it was vetoed by the federal government's representatives at those meetings, through that whole bit and piece, until we come to the time when the crunch came on the constitution and the Prime Minister decided to act unilaterally -- forget about the offshore, forget about hydro transmission, forget about other things that other provinces had had at the table -- and go with the very shortened package of a Charter of Rights, patriation and an amending formula which left us out in the cold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in-between that time and before that constitutional conference -- I am sort of ahead of my story chronologically -- there was a change in Ottawa for a brief period of time at which time the Prime Minister of the day, Prime Minister Clark, prepared a letter and signed it acknowledging the ownership of the offshore for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The present Prime Minister of Canada has refused to accept this written documentation from the previous Prime Minister and exempted himself. He has totally and absolutely refused that. Then the constitutional conference, then the rejection of the offshore by the Canadian government, and no new proposals on the table right through the bit and piece, and then we will get down to the



PREMIER PECKFORD: unilateralism. At the same time - this was the very interesting part of it - as the Canadian government was saying absolutely no on this issue, putting no new proposals on the table, they were negotiating with the Province of Nova Scotia seriously about doing some deal. Now they thought they had a deal with Nova Scotia when Mr. Reagan was the Premier of Nova Scotia and they had done a memorandum of understanding on the Maritimes Agreement, but when they changed governments, when Mr. Reagan was defeated and Mr. Buchannan became the Premier, the policy on offshore changed in Nova Scotia somewhere close to where our position was and Mr. Buchannan rejected the Maritimes Agreement. It really never got off the ground anyway, it was only a piece of paper that really never meant anything. But at the same time the Canadian government was saying, 'No, no, no, no, no, no, no new position even; not only no, but no new position, they were negotiating with Nova Scotia for some kind of what the Prime Minister called, when he was down here, a joint agreement. And we had meetings with Nova Scotia, Nova Scotia asked for meetings with us during that time, that constitutional conference in Ottawa. And we sat down with Nova Scotia, went through it with them, indicated that from our point of view and all of the talks we had with Mr. Lalonde lately and with his deputy minister and with his assistant deputy minister, there position had not changed. The Minister of Energy was at some of those meetings with me during that period.

The long and the short of it was that Nova Scotia felt optimistic that they could do a joint kind of agreement. And it was only last Fall that that whole situation broke down, that the Nova Scotia government, which did not have the legal foundation for a case that we had, were unable to reach an agreement with the federal government for joint management and sharing of revenues

PREMIER PECKFORD: on the offshore. And that is where it remains essentially to this day, Mr. Speaker, only with only one caveat; the Prime Minister promised to all the Premiers at the constitutional conference, secretly and in public, that after the constitutional package was over, not knowing that he was going to do it unilaterally at that time, but because all twelve might not be able to get done by that point in time, there would be a - whatever was done, not knowing how it was going to be done, whatever was left would become part of another constitutional conference immediately thereafter. That was a solemn promise given by the Prime Minister at that time. And we intend to hold him to that kind of promise if in fact before that time some change in the federal position can be discerned so that we can sit down and do some serious negotiation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) in court.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and the Liberal opposition, I do not know if they are totally familiar - the Leader of the Opposition seems to be coming familiar with the fact of what we are talking about here. We are talking about a massive, massive development. Now it is alright for the Prime Minister and, you know, as I said the day or so after the Prime Minister was down here, if the federal government has a new

PREMIER PECKFORD:

position, fine, let them put it on the table. We have been waiting for it since last June. We have put our positions on the table and we have been waiting for a position from the federal government since last June and we are - I am prepared to sit down at any time to do it. But let us not forget what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker, and we have got to be very careful how we approach this matter. It is alright for the Prime Minister on the one hand to give and then on the other hand to take away and when he says or anybody says that suddenly we somehow can have revenues until we can become a 'have' Province and then we are treated differently than all other Canadians, I mean that kind of idea is revolting in itself. But as I said at the time in response to questions, I am willing to sit down regardless of those kind of particulars being completely unacceptable because they mean that somebody wants to make us permanently unequal to everybody else in Canada. But the history is important to this because the opportunities abound, there is a multiplicity of opportunities for the federal government, if it wishes to resolve this offshore dispute, this jurisdictional problem, to sit down with the Government of Newfoundland and so to do. But up to this point in time, except for a television interview in this Province, a verbal television interview in this Province, with a speech which did not address itself to that very much, the Prime Minister and his government - and then, Mr. Speaker, you have to add all the other facts that are going on in the country to that, laws have been passed, laws have been passed treating the offshore Newfoundland situation different than Alberta, the frontier situation, the role of Petro-Canada. You cannot on the one hand come to Newfoundland and verbally say something and then allow your Minister of Energy

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Mr. Lalonde) in the House of Commons to do something that is totally the opposite of what you said verbally in Newfoundland. You cannot allow yourself to be going to Alberta and saying one thing and in Newfoundland be saying something else. If the Canadian government is really serious, we will go around the world a million times to sit down to try to resolve this problem. But we are not going to go down and resolve this problem and sit down under conditions which mean that from the first day we sit down at that meeting we have recognized the principle which means we are going to be unequal to other Canadians after 1995 or after the year 2000. We are not going to sit down and be party to a meeting which means by sitting down we have already accepted certain principles which are as far as we are concerned rights that we understand that we have in Canada. But if there is to be a change then let us get on with the job.

And now, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution on the offshore. Here is the resolution put forward by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has a moral and legal claim ; AND WHEREAS the federal government does not recognize our claim. And remember now, recognize our claim. And to this day, the Prime Minister statements withstanding, the Prime Minister's statements standing, they do not recognize our claim for ownership. It is a partial thing, it is a partial thing. It was done for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party of Newfoundland to try to help you along and boost you along down here, to get you out of the doldrums, to get you up of your political knees and you grabbed it. You allowed him to hoodwink you verbally, you allowed him to hoodwink you and you should not have allowed him to do it. At the same time then, he slapped half

PREMIER PECKFORD: you across the face because he gave all his attention to Mr. Eddie instead of giving it to Mr. Len. That is what he did to you. You allowed yourselves to get sucked in over there and thought that this was going to be some great political plum that you could thrust at this side of the House. How naive can you get? And now you are left prostrate on the floor with nothing only Ed Roberts, who is supposed to be the big hero now in the Liberal party of Newfoundland . I would not have put up with it, Mr. Speaker. We were dying to fight for you opposition members over there when we saw the way that it was handled. And if the Leader of the Opposition is not careful, the handwriting will be on the wall. The Leader of the Opposition, I give him a warning, I will give him a little bit of sound advice; if he is not careful the handwriting is on the wall, somebody over there or somewhere does not like the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, there is a basic principle here. Is there a recognition of our claim or is there not? That is the great question.

AND WHEREAS the Province needs revenues and jobs from offshore oil and gas to better our society;

AND WHEREAS the government of the Province - there is no negatives in this resolution either,

AND WHEREAS our regulations give twenty-five per cent of each dollar earned, shared with the federal government and thirty-five per cent goes to the companies;

AND WHEREAS this percentage is reasonable and consistent with revenue sharing currently

PREMIER PECKFORD: being enjoyed by the other producing provinces, then let it be resolved that this hon. House urge the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and control of them. And once that recognition of claim is acknowledged, then there is, I think, the basis for a very fruitful sharing of revenues, sharing of management responsibilities, sharing of environmental responsibilities, so that we can get on with the job of developing the offshore. But there is a basic, fundamental principle that must be at the bottom and must be the foundation of that, that there is recognition of claim, not for a finite period, not until we have all our bills paid so that we can go back on welfare again, but for all times, that we are to be treated as Canadians for all times, that suddenly our forests here now, that are on land, there is not some time in 2020 when suddenly the forest, the trees are taken away from us again. There is not anything in this Province now in law which says that the iron ore deposits in Labrador suddenly are to become federal responsibility when we become half have or all have, there is a recognition that that is in the provincial domain, which is not to say that there is not sharing of revenues with the federal government but is to say that the major management techniques to be used in the utilization and development of that resource lies with the provincial Legislature and the provincial government. That is what the ownership and the claim means.

So, Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Opposition are trying to do, and will fail miserably in doing, is to try to go down a middle of the road and have their legs on both sides of the fence.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, ownership but. Ownership, but. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) protests too much. I will say to the Liberal party, I will say to the Leader of the Opposition to be fair with the Prime Minister we are prepared as a government to sit down, if in actual fact the Prime Minister and the Canadian Federal Government, which it seems, have changed at least their attitude toward the offshore situation.

And, Mr. Speaker, during his speech the Leader of the Opposition - I should dispense with this, and I have dispensed with it a hundred times, over and over again, and other people on this side - talked about his trying to get across the idea - the Leader of the Opposition - that we are in favour of world price for oil and gas. Now, Mr. Speaker, over and over again we have reiterated the 75 per cent of world price which would be a reasonable and fair price, and allowed for - do not forget that if you do not have a higher price for your oil and gas our oil and gas offshore will not be developed very quickly, that they must be able to get a fair price for it, otherwise, the companies will not be developed.

Our position on pricing is clear, it is in writing, and we have said it over and over again and we stand by it because it means that we will be able to develop the resources here. We are willing to go to any place, Mr. Speaker, to sit down as we did all last Summer, as we did from 1972 to 1975, and we will go it again now to try to get some kind of resolution on the offshore. But we are not going to do it when by so doing part of our rights that are God given are thereby automatically extinguished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Now you are going to hear a speech. Now you are going to hear it, boy. You have set him up. You got him going. I can hear the adrenalin going over here.

MR. BARRY: Why were you not there?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HANCOCK: Never mind the dinner.

MR. NEARY: Why was I not at the dinner?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I do not think Cornish hen is worth \$150. If it had been \$20 for a bean supper I probably would have gone.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must say we are very disappointed with the Premier's reaction and his attitude toward this matter, especially his reaction to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). Now, let me reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said that the Premier tried to distort. I think now, probably, before I say that, that we know now what the problem is with the Premier of this Province, it is vanity. It is vanity, Mr. Speaker, that is stopping the offshore development, vanity and playing political games. The Premier is noted for that, in the last couple of years, for playing political games. But let me reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said, if I interpreted what he said correctly. I believe he said that if the Premier of this Province, if the Government of this Province is prepared to sit down and negotiate in good faith, common sense prevailing, if





MR. NEARY: that the Premier goes into these negotiations with us behind him as far as ownership is concerned, right in the resolution itself. In other words, if negotiations take place, that we on this side of the House say, 'Yes, Premier Peckford, go in, you have our blessing, negotiate in good faith, use a little common sense and we are right behind you as far as ownership is concerned.' I believe that is what the Leader of the Opposition is saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We would say the same thing if the -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) scared over there.

MR. NEARY: No, it does not have us scared.

MR. STIRLING: Everybody should be scared. You are going to blow it if you are not careful.

MR. HANCOCK: Production will start when Peckford goes. You can mark it in your yellow book.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: That is the word outside the overpass. That is the word outside of the overpass.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the government, if the Provincial Government takes the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada to have it settled that way, then we would be behind the government in stating that Newfoundland owns the offshore. If Mobil takes the Province to court, we contend that Newfoundland owns the offshore. So there is no dispute in that, there is no disagreement over that fact. The Premier should forget playing politics and stop being paranoid about this matter. He should stop that and get down to brass tacks because what the Leader of the Opposition did today, I thought, was very courageous. He laid out a case which would give the Premier an opportunity to sit down and

MR. NEARY: negotiate in good faith.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not got sense enough.

MR. HANCOCK: He was expecting a lot.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Canada, if the Prime Minister of this country and if the Government of Canada was unreasonable with the Premier of this Province or with the government, if they were unreasonable, let them come back to the House and then see where my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, stands if they were being unreasonable about this whole matter. I believe the Leader of the Opposition would be the first to say, 'You did the right thing, break off the negotiations, come back to the House and report to us and then we will take it from there. We will steer our course from there.'

But, as the situation stands, Mr. Speaker, is the Government of Canada being unreasonable? The Government of Canada are offering the Province more than they have in their own regulations. The Government of Canada is saying you can have one hundred per cent of forty-five per cent until you become a 'have' province and then you share with the rest of Canada. And there is not a living soul in Newfoundland today who disagrees with that policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier should stop making these silly statements like, 'This is another approach so that the Opposition can get some of the credit for the government's hard work over the last ten years.' He made that statement there a few moments ago. He should stop making statements like that. They are not getting us anywhere in this Province. And then he said, 'They are trying to worm their way into the issue.' We are trying to worm our way into the issue! What does that gain the Province, Mr. Speaker, making that kind of a statement?

MR. WARREN: From the Premier, too.

MR. NEARY: From the Premier you would expect better. I mean, you know, you would expect a little class from the Premier of this Province, a little class. He says, 'The other side,' he says, 'has finally seen the light.' And then he goes on to say, 'They danced a jig, they danced a jig for the last ten years.' That is what you call class on the part of the Premier of this Province. That is going to help our negotiations, Mr. Speaker. That sort of talk is going to help us to resolve the offshore problem! I sometimes wonder.

And then he went on to say, - oh, he went right back to the sixties, right back to the sixties when he talked about Mr. Shaheen and other industrialists who came into this Province. He had to drag that into it again. I thought he left that to the President of the Council (W. Marshall), the member for St. John's East. I thought that was his role, to go back and drag all these names on the floor of this House, a gentleman who tells us that all we do in this House is smear people's character and so forth. The Premier just referred to Mr. Shaheen as if he were some kind of a criminal, that he had leprosy. I thought that was the role for the President of the Council.

But, Mr. Speaker, we could if we wanted to, but

MR. NEARY:

this is too serious a matter. We could drag up all kinds of names and trot them out on the floor of this House. The government have skeletons in their own closet. We mentioned one yesterday, Mr. Beubella of J. Tyler Mining and Exploration. If we wanted to trot that out in this debate we could do it, but we are not going to, we are going to take the high ground in this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, we could trot it out. We could say to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), 'Is it true that Mr. Beubella flew in here the day before yesterday on a private jet that he had chartered and had a stand-by at Torbay airport so he could come up and consult with his lawyer, Mr. Dick Greene, who is very close to the administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and then rush back to Torbay airport, get back aboard his private jet and take off before his creditors could get at him?' I mean, we could trot that out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But what good will that do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, if they want to refer - they have their Mr. Doyles and their Mr. Shaheens on that side of the House.

MR. WARREN: And they are sitting on that side, too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I guarantee you!

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are primarily interested in is trying to get the parties back to the table. We are trying to entice the Premier of this Province to forget playing political games -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. NEARY: - to stop being paranoid about this matter, and try to resolve the problem in the best interests of the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if the Premier wants this matter resolved at all. I believe, Mr. Speaker, I really firmly believe that the kind of game that the Premier of this Province is playing is that he wants to keep this issue going and use it as an issue in the next provincial general election. I believe that is why he wants to prolong it. Nobody in this Province, nobody but nobody can see any sense in what he is doing now, continuously attacking this one and attacking that one, attacking the oil companies, attacking the Government of Canada. There is absolutely no sense to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not want (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: He does not want anybody's support.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is disappointed now we got (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And he would be the most disappointed man in this world if the matter was resolved tomorrow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the Government of Canada and the Province entered into a joint agreement to develop this resource? The Government of Canada would pay for the surveillance. The Government of Canada would pay for the protection of the environment. This Province would be off the hook. The Government of Canada would police the offshore resources that would cost literally millions piled upon millions of dollars every year -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which we cannot do anyway.

MR. NEARY: - which we cannot afford to do. That would be one advantage of having a joint agreement to develop this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: And there are all kinds of other benefits that would flow from a joint agreement. But, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I am becoming more convinced all the time that the Premier does not want an agreement. Whether it be a joint agreement, whether it be an agreement for the Province to proceed with the development of the resource, or whether it be an agreement for the Government of Canada to control the resource, I am convinced the Premier does not want to see this matter settled. He is gunning for a showdown. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, he would have an election on the matter if he does not get his own way.

Mr. Speaker, it will backfire. The Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, is espousing four causes and he is going to lose all four if he does not be careful. He will be the biggest loser in Newfoundland's history. The constitution, as he calls it - the constitution issue is gone. After the end of July the Premier of this Province along with seven other premiers in Canada will wish that they had never heard of a constitution, or as he says, 'a constitution'.

MR. NEARY: That issue, after July of this year, will be a dead issue.

MR. STIRLING: Whatever happens when the eight premiers, the agreement of the eight Premiers means that they all agreed. How come they did not have -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: - the offshore into that?

MR. NEARY: That is right. The offshore was not in that.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the transmitting of hydro electric power across Quebec with the Premier's attitude, and his approach towards that, he is going to lose that battle too.

You know what the hon. gentleman told us in the House the other day, Mr. Speaker, you know what he told us. Just listen to what he said. Just listen to the logic of it. Listen to the common sense of it and the poor old dolts and clowns and buffoons in this Province who write editorials are too stunned and too stupid to see it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on. Right on buddy.

MR. NEARY: Too stupid to see it.

Listen, let us just listen.

The Premier of the Province is saying, "Why does not Quebec - why does not the Government of Canada force Quebec to give us the same right to transmit power through Quebec, a separate transmission line, or over the existing transmission line, the same as they do for pipelines to transport gas and oil?"

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight minutes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me explode that myth. First of all, there has never been a province in Canada object to a pipeline going across its boundaries. No



MR. NEARY: Province has ever objected. So the matter has never arisen of whether or not the Government of Canada should be called upon to enforce the constitutional rights of the Province as far as movement of goods and services is concerned.

The matter has never come up. It has never been tested. And if it was ever tested I am sure the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister of this country would give the oil companies the same answer as they gave the Premier of this Province in connection with the transmitting of hydro electric power and that is, "Go and negotiate with the Province of Quebec, if they are unreasonable with you come back and see us and we will see what we can do."

The matter of the pipeline has never arisen. But this Premier takes the attitude - now let us just follow it through and see what would happen if the Prime Minister of this Country fell in line with the Premier of Newfoundland. Let us say he did. Let us say, Premier Peckford, you are right and we are going to force Quebec to give you a right-of-way across the Province of Quebec without their approval, we are going to force them to give you that right-of-way to transmit power.

Now, what would that mean, Mr. Speaker, what would it mean? It would mean that this Province would then have to construct a transmission line 600 or 700 miles across the Province of Quebec. Now, is the Government of Canada going to come in and work out the nitty gritty, work out the details, and tell the Province of Quebec where that transmission line is going to go? Is it going to go across private property in Quebec that has to be expropriated? Is it going to go through buildings? Is it going to go right through sky scrapers in Montreal? Is it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. NEARY:

Well, where is it going to go?

Who is going to decide where the transmission line is going to go? Who is going to work out the details? Is the Government of Canada going to send in the troops, the army, to guard that transmission line once it is constructed, a lot of it out in the wilderness, in a Province that does not want it? What would happen then, Mr. Speaker? It would not last five minutes.

The obvious thing for the Premier to do, if he wants to win that case, and he is on a collision course now, is to go to the Prime Minister of Canada, call up the Governor of the State of New York, or the State of Maine, go up to Ottawa, see the Prime Minister and say, "Look, we have a contract. We have a contract to sell the surplus power. Now we went to Quebec, they would not negotiate with us, they were unreasonable with us, now will you -

DR. COLLINS:

Contract with whom?

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

DR. COLLINS:

Contract with whom?

MR. NEARY:

With New York State, that is what the Premier is telling us, or/and the Minister of Mines and Energy, contract with the State of New York or the State of Maine to sell the surplus power.

AN HON. MEMBER:

At what price?

MR. NEARY:

At what price? I do not know.

MR. S. NEARY: That is up to them. I mean, I am not running the show.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) the established price (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: Do not be so silly. Keep going 'Stevie'.

MR. S. NEARY: Unless you know the - Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point that I make. You know that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: This is the same minister who told us a year ago that you buy something for one dollar and you sell for two dollars, 1 per cent, the same minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: I would not want to have him out negotiating the transmission line across the Province of Quebec. 'He neatly', so The Daily News fellow says - the poor, simple little clod - 'He neatly answered the Opposition'. He answered nothing. And since when did they start editorializing in the coverage of this House? I was tempted to call up the editor of The Daily News this morning, or the publisher and ask him if they have a new editor moved over on page sixteen of their newspaper. It is unheard of, Mr. Speaker.

But in the meantime, I am not going to be distracted by the hon. gentleman. And then there is the cod fish. They are going to lose the cod fish war. Those are three issues gone, and if we are not careful we will lose the battle of the offshore. And this Premier will go down in history as the biggest loser in this Province. It will not be him that will lose it, it will be the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to try to get the thing back on the rails, to try to get them back on track, to try to get the Premier to listen for a change, to try to get the Premier down off his high horse. And if he thinks this speech that was made by Mr. Trudeau the other day when he was here for the fund raising banquet, if the Premier thinks

MR. S. NEARY: that is a victory for the Province, well, I am all for it, let him go on thinking that. I think all of us on this side of the House should get up and congratulate the Premier on his victory, if that is what he wants. If he wants to go on an ego trip, if it is vanity, let everybody get up and congratulate him and say, 'My God, what a fantastic victory. The Government of Canada are going to give you 100 per cent of 45 per cent until you become a 'have' province. And, Mr. Speaker, with Hibernia, by the way -

MR. BARRETT: Why leave it at becoming a 'have' province?

MR. S. NEARY: All right, the hon. gentleman raised the point that I was going to make as a matter of fact. I am all for going beyond being a 'have' province, I am all for that, but how can you resolve it unless you sit down and negotiate it? Maybe the Government of Canada can be persuaded to let it go beyond becoming a 'have' Province, maybe they can. But how do you find out?

MR. BARRETT: They should not have to be persuaded.

MR. S. NEARY: They should not have to be persuaded, they do have some interest in this Canadian resource, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: They say they own it.

MR. S. NEARY: They say they own it - well, okay. Mr. Speaker, Hibernia alone is not going to solve Newfoundland's problems. We need two or three Hibernias. If anybody thinks in this House for one minute that Hibernia is going to solve the welfare problems, the unemployment problems, the high cost of living in this Province, well, they had better wake up. It is not, Mr. Speaker, As a matter of fact, it is going to further aggravate the high cost of living. It is not going to solve the welfare problems, it is not going to solve the unemployment problems. As a matter of fact, we are

MR. S. NEARY: told by the administration that 500 people will be employed in the offshore in production, 500 or 600. That is the same number employed in the senior citizens homes in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, we may need Canada after seventeen or eighteen or nineteen or twenty years, we may need Canada. And so, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier stop playing political games with this important issue and that he stop being paranoid and get down to brass tacks and go and negotiate. If he cannot get a satisfactory settlement, if Mr. Trudeau is being unreasonable, report back to the House and then we will plan our strategy from there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to address myself to this particular issue in this session of the House. It is an issue that we on this side have been addressing ourselves to

MR. STAGG:

throughout our tenure in government. It is something that is of tremendous importance to us as a political party, and the decisiveness and the position that we own the offshore is not one that we have come to recently, it is something that we have been consistently espousing for some years and we will continue to espouse in the future.

A friend of mine recently, at a social function that I was attending at which there was another member of the House of Assembly, indicated what the different philosophy between the Progressive Conservative Party in Newfoundland was and the Liberal Party and he said that the PC position is as follows: He says, 'We own it' - talking about the offshore - 'We own it'. To the federal government, 'you want it, you cannot have it'. The Liberal position, on the other hand is, it is ours, i.e. Newfoundland's, you want it, take it. And that is the position, basically, that is outlined in this resolution, this proposed resolution.

It starts off, it says, 'WHEREAS the position of the House of Assembly is that offshore mineral oil and gas resources are owned by the Province'. Okay, well we are on all fours there. We own it. Then they go on to say, 'and WHEREAS the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political settlement or a court settlement.' Well, here we are, the position of the Liberal Party is that we own it. They cannot wait. There is only one paragraph in between which talks about wise and controlled development being necessary. And then they say, 'and WHEREAS the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political settlement or a court settlement.' Well, I suppose he would. Their position is that we own it. The Prime Minister's position is that he owns it so we, of course, if the Prime

MR. STAGG: Minister feels that he owns it, we have to talk settlement with him. Well, I say hogwash to that and that is not our position, our position is that we own this resource. And just because the Prime Minister says that he owns it, is not necessary for us to rush up there and effect a settlement with him.

That is the position of the members opposite. It is ours, you want it, take it. And that is the position and the history of the Liberal Party in this Province when there is any resource, any Newfoundland resource that anybody else wants, the Liberal Party will be in the forefront to give it away. And I am certainly glad, and I know that the people of Newfoundland are glad, that the hon. gentlemen opposite will never be in a position to bargain away that resource.

And I must say, I was pleased with The Evening Telegram's reporting on this issue. The Trudeau Visit. 'The Trudeau visit to Newfoundland recently, have you ever seen anything so despicable? A man coming down here to 'shore up the lackluster Provincial Liberals'- that is how The Evening Telegram editorial put it and I believe that it was correct-'to shore up the lackluster Provincial Liberals.' How did he get down here? How did the Prime Minister get down here? Did he come down here by Air Canada? I have asked that question privately. I asked it publicly. Now, how did the Prime Minister get here? Did he come here by Air Canada or did he come down here by government jet Star. If he came down here, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, I expect that the \$150 per plate, well, a significant amount of that, will have to go for the Prime Minister's travel because that was an entirely and purely political visit.

MR. STAGG: He came in to wreck his vitriol on this Province and on our Premier. And the things that he said about our Premier. The man who would have the nerve to say here is what he said - I have a transcript of his remarks here, I would not want to misquote him. He said, 'The truth is I would have liked to meet with your Premier but I did not have the time to go to Florida.' Now, that is the position of the Federal Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau.

Now, this is the same man, ladies and gentlemen, who in December of this year, or early January, was caught in one of the - how could I say - one of these resorts in Austria where only the filthy rich go. There are the rich and then there are the filthy rich. Well, he was where the filthy rich go. The only thing is that Mother Nature captured him while he was there and he was stuck there for several days and as a result, his foray into the third world, going down where all the people are starving and hungry and they want re-allocation of the world's resources, his foray into the third world was stymied. Well, this is the same man who, over there in the lap of luxury when asked, 'Are things going to get bad?', said 'Well, we have plenty of wine and cheese here and I will have a gay old time while I am here.' This is the same man who would have the audacity to come here and make a cheap crack and say, 'The truth is I would have liked to meet your Premier but I did not have time to go to Florida.' Ha, ha, ha, a standing ovation from the Liberal hordes at Memorial University. That is what he said, that is what the man said.

MR. RIDEOUT: He just got back from down South, himself.

MR. STAGG: And he just got back - well, he travels. He is a globetrotter. He spent his first forty-five years globetrotting the world through inherited money,



May 13, 1981

Tape No. 1525

EL - 4

MR. STAGG: none of it through the sweat of  
his brow. And that is the kind of person,

MR. STAGG:

that is the kind of person that hon. gentlemen opposite have thrown in their lot with, who say in the one breath, "It is ours. It is ours. If you want it take it. Take it." That is the Liberal philosophy, 'You take Churchill Falls, you take the fisheries, you take it all and give us some crumbs from your table'. That is the philosophy of the Liberals.

Now, what is the position in the resolution as put forward by my hon. friend to my right - only literally to my right, he is not to the right of me politically - the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the hon. gentleman who has not gotten his just desserts in this House for the courageous stand that he took last year, the man who came across the floor of this House on this very issue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He came across the floor of this House on this very issue and his position, his position on the issue has been vindicated and will continue to be vindicated. And hon. gentlemen opposite who are now trying to slither their way back, or slither their way into the affection of the Newfoundland public, they are not going to do it. They are not going to do it because they are damned because of what they put to writing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: "Whereas the position of the House of Assembly is that offshore minerals, oil and gas resources are owned by the Province." And then it says, "Whereas the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political settlement or a court settlement." Well, why would he not? On the one hand you say, "We own it." On the other hand you say, "Let us get together so I can give it to you." Well, what kind of a bunch are you anyway? Well, that is typical. It is what I expect of the Liberal Party.

MR. RIDEOUT: Or go to court.

MR. STAGG: Or go to court. Yes, go to court where we appoint all of the judges. Well, well, well.

MR. STIRLING: You will have a long wait.

MR. STAGG: Now, let me deal with some of the points in our resolution. So I am going to vote against this amendment. And I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side are going to vote against this amendment.

MR. STIRLING: Regardless of what the Premier does?

MR. STAGG: We are going to vote against this amendment. It is not even very well worded. I presume that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) must have been busy that day because he did not have time to draft it. I wonder who the drafter of that resolution is, or that amendment is?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a draft dodger.

MR. STAGG: A draft dodger. Yes, whoever it was was a draft dodger.

Now, what is the position of the Canadian Government so far? What is their position so far other than the few offhand comments made by the Prime Minister which have never been put in writing? The only writing that it has been put into is the transcript of his remarks that have been done by some people who wanted to find out exactly what he said. Has it been followed up by a letter to our Premier saying basically that you want to get together and you want to negotiate or you want to talk about a reasonable deal or let us put it all behind us? No, nothing like that. Instead they will forge ahead with the Canada Oil and Gas Act. Oh, a very nice sounding name, Canada Oil and Gas Act. Well, what does the Canada Oil and Gas Act have in it? It has it in some very insidious -

AN HON. MEMBER: It rapes Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: - clauses. It has something in it called the Canada lands. Oh, the Canada lands, but what are the Canada lands? The Canada lands by definition are all those lands which are off the Northwest Territories in the Yukon which are the so-called frontier lands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: - but, also, all of those lands that are off the Eastern shore of Canada. And who is off the Eastern shore of Canada? Who is it? Obviously it is Newfoundland, and obviously it is Hibernia. Well, the federal government is now passing an Act through their Parliament -

MR. STIRLING: That is why we want you to do something.

MR. STAGG: - and suggesting, not suggesting, they are putting into law that Canada lands will be -

MR. DINN: Out.

MR. STAGG: - by legislation, will be part of Canada. It is, in effect, a confiscation and an expropriation of a land that Newfoundland brought into Confederation in 1949.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) they get away with it.

MR. STAGG: Yes, if they get away with it. The only thing that will stop them, because they have the majority in the House of Commons and undoubtedly they are -

MR. BARRY: The Opposition will not stop them.

MR. STAGG: They have the majority, and, I suppose, the weak-kneed NDP that they have up there, even if they did not have a majority, the NDP could be bought off with some mess of pottage or other.

But let me briefly review

MR. STAGG: what our legal case is. And there is a very good article on that in The Ottawa Law Review, and it says, 'For a brief time, for one brief shiny moment' - I will editorialize it as I go through, but I will basically quote from it - 'For a brief time it appeared that the Province of Newfoundland along with other Maritime provinces would have its way with offshore minerals when the short-lived federal administration of Joe Clark purported to give them way late in 1979, notwithstanding the apparent federal victory in the offshore mineral rights reference.'

MR. STIRLING: Table it. You have to table it, you are quoting from it.

MR. STAGG: 'Prime Minister Trudeau' - I will table it surely - 'Prime Minister Trudeau made no such promise. Nevertheless, the legal claim of the Province of Newfoundland is distinguishable from that of the other provinces.' It is distinguishable from that of the other provinces. 'The legal ramifications have been elaborated elsewhere.' And they do not go

MR. STAGG:

into it in detail here and I do not have time to go into it either. "Briefly, the first component of the Newfoundland claim asserts that the English common law recognized long ago the sovereign rights of the Crown extending to the Continental Shelf underlying the territorial sea and beyond; secondly, even if this right somehow did not accrue under the common law, it is argued that the Province acquired it through antecedent Dominion status and through recognition in public international law of the right of sovereignty over the resources of the adjacent shelf prior to Newfoundland joining Confederation in 1949."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: The third term of union explicitly provided that Newfoundland was to become an equal partner in Confederation with the other provinces -

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the member is quoting from a document and I understand once a member quotes from a document it must be tabled, so I would ask the Chair to -

AN HON. MEMBER: He already said he would table it.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: I will table 400 of them if you want me to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
It was my understanding the member volunteered to table it.

MR. RIDEOUT: The member just woke up.

MR. STAGG: He just woke up, yes. Well, he wants to interrupt my train of thought.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

He is scurrying out of the House.

"The third term of union explicitly provided that Newfoundland was to become an equal partner in Confederation with the other provinces. So whatever the property the Province so sovereign possessed at the time must have been retained." And so on, it goes on. And we have an excellent legal case. And I am sure if it ever does go to court, if we are ever forced into court, that we will win it. However, what do hon. gentlemen opposite want? Hon. gentlemen opposite want at the first possible opportunity to sit down and so-called 'negotiate', but I do not call it 'negotiate', it is to give away this resource of ours. Well, our member, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) says that Newfoundland has a moral and legal claim to the resource. Well, I have dealt in general with the legal claim and others will deal with it in more detail. It has been dealt with in considerable detail both in this House and elsewhere. But what about our moral claim to it? That is, in effect, a political claim. The legal claim is one thing, but what about our moral claim to it? There is no doubt that Newfoundland is in last place in this country with regard to the bringing of services to its people. We are in last place, yet we are probably the most resource-rich Province in Canada. I doubt whether there is any other province in Canada that has a diversity of resources, the sea resources and the land resources and the mineral resources that Newfoundland has. The per capita resource ownership of Newfoundlanders is probably unexcelled anywhere in the world, and yet we are in last place. And why are we in last place? We are in last place because the political power in this country is elsewhere. But morally, there is no doubt that we have a position that is unassailable. And the member for Baie Verte - White Bay makes that point. He says, 'Whereas the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has a moral and legal claim to the minerals on the Continental Shelf'. Well, we cannot overlook the moral. It is immoral

MR. STAGG: what the federal government is trying to do with Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He says, 'And Whereas the federal government does not recognize our claim' - well, that is true, they do not recognize our claim. I have it here on very good authority that they do not recognize our claim. Here it is. "We have said essentially this," says the Prime Minister, "You say you own it. I hear Len Stirling say, 'I believe we own the offshore'. I believe that you do not," said the Prime Minister. There was a chap, called Wacky Bennett in British Columbia who thought that he owned it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, comparing our case with the B.C. case (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: That is right. Mr. Pearson thought that Bennett did not. They went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court decided that you did not own it - 'you' - and then tried to bring it around as if it applied to Newfoundland, and the case is very much different. Well, the Prime Minister, your federal leader says that we do not own it. Now, obviously, the federal government does not agree with our case. They do not agree with our case because they are afraid. They are afraid of the economic power that Newfoundlanders will wield if and when this claim of ours is confirmed.

I only have three minutes left and I have just started.

"And WHEREAS the Hibernia oil and gas field can have significant negative impact on our society and our environment" - well, is that not true? Is it not true that the federal government would like to have rapid development of the offshore? It is well known that they would like to have rapid development - tanker the oil off,



MR. STAGG: get it up there as fast as you can and lower the balance of the payments for Canada. What about the gas? To the heavens with the gas, we will flare off all the gas. And what happens? You will have wet holes on the Grand Bank, you will have dry holes in Alberta, we will have wet holes in Newfoundland. And the result of it all will be a return to our previous semi-colonial status which we are so-called enjoying.

MR. NEARY: What kind of hole (inaudible)?

MR. STAGG: Some cuckoo just stuck his head in the door and said something but I am not sure what that was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Negative impact, yes, yes. How is this resource best developed? This resource is best developed by Newfoundlanders. It is best developed by a government which Newfoundlanders can elect and defeat. The only government which Newfoundlanders can elect and defeat is this provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. STAGG: If you are not doing it properly, if you are being profligate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: - extravagant with your resources - it is a hard word not everybody knows it, I would probably have to spell it for you, I am having difficulty pronouncing it myself.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Profligacy is something that the Liberals are quite familiar with. But if we are doing it wrong, then you can defeat us, then you can toss us out and put somebody else in, put the NDP in. By that time, of course, hon. gentlemen opposite will be receiving their pensions, some of them might get re-elected so they can get

MR. STAGG: their pensions.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Leader of the Opposition wants (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: That is the position that this side of the House has. The only way that the people of Newfoundland can control this resource and control the rate of development and control how it is going to be used, is if the Province controls it because, essentially, the Province, the provincial government is the only government that the people of Newfoundland can elect and defeat, we have absolutely, well, negligible control over the federal government. Even if we had elected seven PCs here last February, 1980, it would have had negligible effect on the national scene. It would have made it close but that is all. But the NDP -

MR. STIRLING: Seven P.C.'s would have made (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: - with their soulmates the NDP the federal Liberals would have sneaked back into power. So I put it to you, and I think that is the basic position that we in the legislation must espouse.

MR. STIRLING: Will you support our amendment now?

MR. STAGG: We must control it because only through us - we are the surrogates of the Newfoundland people in this House of Assembly. Only when the Province controls it, and through its representatives in the House of Assembly will this resource be properly controlled. The Opposition through their amendment are trying to do their usual routine by giving it away, say you own it on the one hand, somebody else wants it, well take it, because we do not have the expertise or the will to deal with it, as is put so well by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) -

MR. STIRLING: Like the Public Tendering Act (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: - who wonders whether we have the power and the will to look after it, and the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) who espouses an industrial strategy which says we need more linerboards and

MR. STAGG: more Come By Chances in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is a party of the past in this Province as is put forward, as is so well stated in this amendment of theirs. I am voting against it and I am voting for the motion so ably put by a man who walked across the floor on the issue and I say he did the right thing. We are going to support him on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird) The hon. member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would wish that the total House of Assembly would stop politicking. I would wish most certainly that the Premier and those I have heard on the government side, I would wish, Mr. Speaker, they would stop politicking and playing with the lives of people, playing with the lives of Newfoundlanders. People of this Province put their trust in you and they want sane, sensible leadership in government -

MR. STIRLING: Make him table the report.

MR. T. BENNETT: - and it will not be very long before they get it if this government continues the political abuse of the economy of this Province. And I have no hesitation in suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it is political abuse. It is political abuse in the grossest manner.

MR. T. BENNETT: All the emphasis of survival and deliberation is placed on offshore oil when we have so many things that - if we could stop this political rhetoric about offshore oil and talk about something that our people can relate to and make a living from, earn their bread and butter from, issues that are not so political. I certainly would like to see you, the Premier, and the government support the amendment and make it possible that it could be a unanimous vote in the House of Assembly. I have always thought, I

May 13, 1981

Tape No. 1528

SD - 4

MR. T. BENNETT:            have always learned, I have always  
been taught, Mr. Speaker, that you can an awful lot more  
by co-operating, you can get an awful lot more

MR. T. BENNETT: by saying please and thank-you and being courteous. And when the Premier stands up in response to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) said, when the Premier stands up with his political rhetoric again, I can hardly believe my ears. I can hardly believe my ears when he is the Premier of this Province to lead this Province into prosperity into the future. People put their trust in the Premier like they put their trust in the government, like they put their trust in the members on this side who were elected. You were elected to do a job to the best of your ability for the masses of this Province, for the people of this Province, for the people of Newfoundland and for the people of Canada.

And in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very poor showing when you accuse, especially when you accuse the Opposition, of being interested in giving away. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. S. NEARY: We are not the government, we are not going to give it away.

MR. T. BENNETT: We are not the government, we are not able to give it away. But we have had, Mr. Speaker, such a stagnant economy since the Tories took power, that it might be just as well that we give it away because it is no good to anybody anyway. The dog in the manger attitude and approach will do nobody any good. It will certainly be no good to the people who are coming into the later years of their lives. And I cannot see where we are going to have any revenue from offshore oil, as long as this government is in power, to help with the provincial debt, to help with the unemployment situation, to help with the welfare situation and to help with the education that we need for our young people coming on stream when they have to go out and face

MR. T. BENNETT: that difficult world. We are supressing them, we are depressing them, we are keeping them down and we are doing it for political expediency. And I am appalled that this Premier and this government should take the attitude they do, a continual confrontation with Ottawa, a continual confrontation. And nobody but nobody could make me believe that Ottawa or even Britain or even any other country - that it is the desire of any country, especially a country which we are part of, you could never make me believe that Ottawa or any other country wants to perpetually keep Newfoundland poor. Success is in your own hands, your own destiny is in your hands, and unless you awaken and face reality, bite the bullet and get with it, we are going to have more poverty, more unemployment.

And it is going to appear to be more of a giveaway because we are going to have less entrepreneurs come in to develop the Province, the resources of the Province that can be developed with the jurisidiction of this government.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that unless this government gets with it and develops some of the resource that is presently under their jurisdiction, they need not worry about offshore oil resource development because they will not be around to see it developed, they will have to be voted out of power so that somebody can most certainly get on with the job.

The hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) said the Liberals would say they would take it. He tried to explain the difference between Tory times and Liberal times. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of us remember Tory times. Those of us who did not live during the Tory times most certainly have read a lot and heard a lot about Tory times.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

We know what Tory times are now.

MR. T. BENNETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is Tory times. It is getting more difficult. And without Ottawa, mind you, we would have very, very difficult times at this very moment in Newfoundland. While the government sits on its hands, bashes Ottawa, Ottawa-bashing continually, sits on its hands and does nothing, absolutely nothing except borrow more money, borrow more money to pay off an escalating cost of living, escalating debt that they have incurred themselves since they came to power, the debt that they have tripled, quadrupled. And now they are caught in a bind. Their interest rates have escalated equally, gone from 9 per cent when they took power, I suggest, up to possibly 18 or more per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not that high.

MR. T. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman across the way suggested, 'Make us equal'. I cannot believe that he believes that Ottawa wants Newfoundland to be anything but equal.

MR.S. NEARY: You would not know but it was an enemy we were talking about, North Africa

MR. BENNETT: Yes, you would think it was a foreign country, Make us equal. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa wants Newfoundland to be independent. Ottawa does not want to be sending down to us hundreds of millions of dollars annually so that we can eat, and this is exactly what they are doing, the Unemployment insurance that has to come down to this Province, the equalization payments. Look, Mr. Speaker, this government could not even do up a budget this year without federal funding, 50 per cent cash flow from Ottawa. I wish, Mr. Speaker, they would talk about some of the benefits that come from Ottawa. I wish they would talk about some of the benefits that have been derived since we have been a partner to Ottawa, and I say 'a partner', Mr. Speaker, because we have tried to contribute, We have a resource and we have been taxpayers to the federal treasury but, in turn, I think that we have been reimbursed. Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have done well by being Canadians, and it disturbs me to think that we have so many people who are presently members of government that I suspect would elect to cop out of Confederation, to opt out, as it is, of Confederation. Should that day come, there will be a lot of sorry people. Some of these people who are presently members of the government, Mr. Speaker, will be sorry for the day they were born if they should lose their right to be Canadians. Most of the major projects, Mr. Speaker, that take place in this Province are 90 per cent federally funded so why should we not negotiate with Ottawa? Like previous speakers have said, when we become a have province and when we have our roads in condition, when we have our schools in place and when we have a higher standard of living - some of us have a good standard of living now - when most of these things have come about, I totally agree, Mr. Speaker, with sharing with Canada, with the other provinces. There is no way that these people across Canada, like Alberta and Ontario who have been so



MR. BENNETT: kind and shared with us while we were developing in the last thirty years, there is no way that they want to keep us poor and there is no way that we should deny them an obligation that I feel to the rest of Canada that we should, in turn, pay a debt, because I feel indebted to Canada and to Ottawa and to Canadians. I feel a debt and I have explained that to my family, and I hope that my family never wish to opt out of Confederation. So, I am pleading with this government, Mr. Speaker, to stop using people's future, to stop playing politics with people's lives, and get with it, sit down and negotiate.

In this amendment that we have put forward on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we agree wholeheartedly to support the Premier in his ambitions and desires to negotiate with Ottawa, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if during the course of these negotiations the Premier came back and did not play politics with the people of Newfoundland, and if the Premier explained to us some of the terms during his negotiations with Ottawa that we did not accept readily, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we would, in turn, support the Premier's desires and ambitions for the Province. We are just as good Newfoundlanders as anybody on the government side. I am just as much of a Newfoundlander, but I want it made quite clear that I am a Canadian and I have no reluctance or hesitation, Mr. Speaker, for my part, to share with the country that has done so good by me and done so well by me and my family and the people that I know, the people around me.

MR. BENNETT: I know what Newfoundland was before Confederation. That is more than I can say for a lot of the hon. gentlemen who sit across the House of Assembly, especially those who are from the urban St. John's upbringing. Conditions have not been as desperate and as destitute in St. John's as they have been in some of rural Newfoundland where we shipped everything in to St. John's for sale. And we did not always get the best treatment from the St. John's business establishment when having to deal with the St. John's establishment. But that is water under the bridge and we shall not continue to flog that. We are happy to be Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, if this government were given control and ownership totally without strings, if they were given total ownership and total control of offshore resources, I would be very much afraid - I am very much afraid - with no better management than they can do with the rest of the Province, I hesitate to see what they would do with offshore development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, we have several debates going on across the floor here now, it is a little bit distracting.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: So, I am wondering, like it has been mentioned before this time in the House of Assembly, what kind of a patrol we would put on. I think my hon. colleague has wondered if the Norma and Gladys would be pressed into service to patrol offshore resource, the fishery, the oil spills. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to see Newfoundland co-operate with Ottawa in development myself. I am not saying this for the rest of the Opposition, my colleagues here, they all speak for themselves, and this is one freedom that we find on this side of the House. We do not have to toe party lines, we are free to speak as we feel.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: And I want this government to co-operate with Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: 'Brian' will not even let the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) speak on (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! The member requested to be heard in silence.

MR. BENNETT: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada wants to co-operate with Newfoundland in offshore development, but to me there is too much greed and it is displayed, unless I do not understand what greed is all about, when to me this government wants to put their arms around everything all of a sudden in the fishery, in the offshore resource, anything and everything they can get their arms around and push Canada aside and say we do not need you any longer now because we have resources of our own and we are quite capable. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if they would rather negotiate and deal with foreign oil companies where it might very well be easier for big, corporate rip-offs within the provincial jurisdiction, with the internal administration even of the Province? Quite frankly, I would rather deal with Ottawa myself and negotiate with Ottawa than I would be dealing with some of the big oil monsters, some of the big seven or any of the big seven. I feel that Ottawa would have more compassion and more time, a lot more time and a lot more compassion for the welfare of the people of Newfoundland who are a part of Canada and Canadians. I am sure that Ottawa would have a lot more time and a lot more compassion. The masses and the classes, Mr. Speaker, need that development out there, we need the cash flow that would come from it.

MR. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) says the Newfoundland Government can be elected or defeated, and that is very true. I would like to remind him, Mr. Speaker, that unless this government changes its mind and stops brainwashing the electorate of this Province over the offshore resource - and Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what it is, brainwashing, political brainwashing, exciting people to vote against a Liberal government or a Liberal administration, this big-deal Tory administration because they are flogging the Liberal government in Ottawa. And if we had a Tory government in Ottawa there are so many things that we would have missed and we would be missing now - in the short time that our own minister, Mr. Crosbie, the Minister of Finance - so many things that were going to be thrown in the garbage can, so many things that were going to be let go and not brought into Newfoundland for the benefit of the employment picture of this Province. Canada Works is one of them. There was such a short-term of their office in Ottawa and there was more damage done to the economy of Canada and to the image of Canada across the world, Mr. Speaker, and more damage done to the economy of Newfoundland in the short-term of that Tory government in Ottawa, than we have seen in twenty-odd years of Liberal administration.

MR. BENNETT: If the Speaker would permit me, I would speak about interest rates for here, now and a day. I could talk about it because I have been involved in interest rate dealings myself. And I doubt very much if this government knows anything about what interest rates are all about. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the comments of the last speaker are symptomatic of the attitude taken by the entire Liberal Party even though there are almost as many polices on the other side of the House on any one issue as there are members, almost as many individual policies, Mr. Speaker, as there are members on the other side of the House. So many different policies on every issue that as my learned friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has pointed out, they could be known as the kama sutra political party of this Province for the number of positions that they have on any particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, on this particular question they seem to be unified and their position on offshore mineral rights is unified supine on the floor in front of anybody who speaks to them from the federal government, totally supine, Mr. Speaker. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there is a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of this Province on the objectives of this government -

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about misleading this House, I said a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of this Province.

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

MR. SPEAKER Order, please! A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows that you cannot say indirectly what you are not allowed to say in this House directly. And to accuse the Opposition either individually or collectively of misleading the people of this Province is -

MR. HANCOCK: Keep going. Deliberately misleading.

MR. NEARY: -deliberately misleading, is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to the point of order.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The rule is that we are not allowed to allege that members opposite are attempting to mislead this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order, it is my understanding that the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy did not say that any member opposite was deliberately misleading the House. Therefore, there is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: What I have said is the same as if I were to say that members opposite were attempting to dupe the people of this Province. Members opposite are attempting on the one hand to try and climb aboard of the bandwagon because they know that this government is on the side of God and the angels as far as offshore mineral rights are concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And members opposite are chasing along behind the wagon, trying to jump on. And they are trying to jump on because they know, Mr. Speaker, that it would be at their peril, they would be totally wiped out in the next election were they to get up and deny the

MR. BARRY: God given birthright of Newfoundlanders, the right to ownership of offshore minerals. But, Mr. Speaker, they are so intimidated by Mr. Trudeau and their federal counterparts in Ottawa, they are so subservient to Mr. Trudeau and the federal Liberals in Ottawa that they are afraid to challenge, to attack their colleagues in Ottawa when they come out with a deliberate attempt to take away the birthright of the people of our Province.

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

MR. BARRY: And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out -

MR. BAIRD: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: One of your colleagues is calling a point of order.

MR. BARRY: Good heavens!

MR. BAIRD: A point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the weakest point of order I heard called in my life.

MR. BAIRD: Am I to understand that now exhibits are to be displayed on our desks. I would like to note the member across.

MR. HISCOCK: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I am sorry about displaying the exhibit but a student in my district asked that a Canadian and a provincial flag be sent down to the district. But seeing only Canada provides free flags and not the provincial flag then I cannot send it. But seeing it does upset the member, then

MR. E. HISCOCK: I will take the exhibit away.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Well, I think that matter is dispensed with now.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, yes - keep quiet and do not go cutting in on my time, will you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, here is why I am standing here in this House to support the motion proposed by my colleague, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and to oppose the Opposition amendment: Not because, Mr. Speaker, not because the government, the members on this side of the House would in any way disagree with the desirability of speaking with the federal government, but it is an attempt by the Opposition to get attention away from the main point of this resolution. And what is the main point of this resolution? It is that this hon. House urge the federal government to re-consider its position on offshore minerals and, Mr. Speaker - I underline this - and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and control of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is room for another debate upon how we should go about the process of negotiation. If -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
There has been a quorum call.



May 13, 1981

Tape No. 1534

DW - 1

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there is an attempt to cut into my time and I object. I know the members opposite are really getting burnt by what I am saying but this is a deliberate attempt to -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

I will ask the Clerk to count the House. The Chair has already done it. Count the House please.

We have a quorum.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, obviously when it starts to hurt, when it starts to get right down to the point here, they cannot stand it on the other side of the House. We have the Prime Minister at this recent rent-a-Liberal dinner, turning to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and saying, 'Len, you say you own it and I say you do not', and he rolls over and plays dead. The Leader of the Opposition - that is the last we have heard of him on the ownership issue, the last we have heard of him. Instead of being on his two feet before the people of this Province denouncing the federal government for denying the heritage of his people, he rolls over and he smiles nicely - he is not even Chairman of the dinner! He is not even Chairman of the dinner! He is invited to go to a dinner to be insulted. He paid \$150 to go to a dinner to be insulted by the Prime Minister of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: I mean, it is one thing to be a massochist but it is another thing to pay for the punishment that you get, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there is something kinky about that, anybody who would pay \$150 to get insulted

MR. L. BARRY: by the Prime Minister of Canada. Because that is what it has to be for the Prime Minister of Canada to get up and say to the leader of the same party in this Province on this fundamental issue, 'You say that you own it, 'Len' I say you do not. Now sit down like a good boy', and he pats him on the head, maybe even on the behind, 'Sit down now and be quiet and let us go on with this nice dinner'. And that is all we hear in terms of the Opposition fighting for this basic right of Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: No wonder members opposite are trying to get out of this House, trying to crawl out of this House on Quorum calls, on asking the Clerk to count the House, no wonder they are embarrassed and ashamed for their leader! No wonder they are! I am sure they are wishing that they had 'Eddie' back there again. At least he can get the Prime Minister of Canada down to insult them for \$150.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would insult them for nothing.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, this amendment that is proposed, if this was the issue that we were debating, this government would have no problem, Mr. Speaker, in accepting the principle that if there is a genuine intention on the part of the federal government, as there might be from what they have said, to change their position, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: - of course, we will speak to them. Of course, we will speak to them. I would love to see an agreement negotiated to protect the rights of Newfoundlanders tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow. But that is an issue which is a red herring in this debate. The motion before this House is to ask the federal government to re-consider its position on ownership and members opposite do not want to do that. They are afraid, Mr. Speaker! They are afraid!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Afraid! Afraid! They are terrified, Mr. Speaker! They are terrified! They will not ask the federal government to re-consider.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!  
MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.  
MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, see we are getting them again, we are touching them to the bone again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I cannot hear the hon. gentleman speaking. I would like to hear what the hon. gentleman is saying. I feel sorry for him. He is making a very poor effort at parroting what the Premier said earlier this afternoon. And I believe we should have silence when the hon. gentleman is speaking, Mr. Speaker, do him that courtesy to find out what he is saying, see if we can pick some kind of a policy out of what -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Hold on a minute now, I have not made my point of order yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
The Chair certainly concurs with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I will ask all members to restrain themselves.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair on these spurious points of order. As I get going in full flight, Mr. Speaker, and it starts to touch home, it starts to come home, close to the bone, they start to become embarrassed, they cannot take it, they cannot accept it. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. BAIRD: They cannot live with themselves.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. L. BARRY: - the red herring of attempting to bring in this notion of our chatting with the federal government, of our negotiating with the federal government when we spent seven years, Mr. Speaker, eight, nine years -

MR. S. NEARY: When did you last meet (inaudible)

MR. BARRY: - the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition a few months ago, and mentioned again today or last week, saying maybe we should try an LCDC approach, a joint management approach. Mr. Speaker, I put a joint management approach to the federal government in 1975, which was rejected out of hand. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the member opposite getting up and saying that we are being greedy because we do not want to share when even the Prime Minister of Canada has had to now back off and admit that he is not offering 100 per cent of revenue it turns out, lo and behold, even though members opposite are still calling it 100 per cent, suddenly it is translated now to 45 per cent by the Prime Minister's own words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: All of a sudden the 100 per cent has become 45 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - and it will become 43 per cent Mr. Speaker, soon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please! Order! Order! Order, please! Order, please! Hon. members I am sure

MR. SPEAKER(SIMMS): are aware that when the Chair or the Speaker stands that members should be silent. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is the democracy that this Province could ever expect if that crowd got into power, attempting to shout down Speakers in this Honourable House. That is their notion of democracy, the same dictatorial tactics that were there when they were in power a few years ago, shout you down, intimidate you. Well, there is nobody over here can be intimidated Mr. Speaker. They cannot get us with their bully-boy Gestapo tactics, shouting down members in this Honourable House, just because they are embarrassed, embarrassed by their leader, embarrassed by their leader's policies, embarrassed by their policies and their poor old leader has got no control over their policies, there are as many policies as there are members over there, Mr. Speaker. No wonder the leader had to leave the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. STAGG: There are X-leaders, there are XX-leaders and there are XXXX-leaders (inaudible).

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: They will have another one next year, sure.

MR. L. BARRY: - members opposite -

MR. WALSH: Why wait for next year?

MR. L. BARRY: - members opposite are saying that this Province is not prepared to share when we have set out, we have set out in printed form the situation under our regulations where the federal government would get approximately twenty-five per cent, the companies would get approximately thirty-five per cent and the Province

MR. L. BARRY: would get in the area of forty per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, all along members of the opposition have been going on saying, "Oh, we are going to get one hundred per cent. The Prime Minister of Canada comes down and he agrees that now he is going to let us have, out of the goodness of his heart, forty-five per cent, it is not one hundred per cent anymore. Remember up at Memorial, it was one hundred per cent and that is all we have heard from the lackies and lap-dogs of the federal government offices, Mr. Speaker, one hundred per cent, one hundred per cent and if they -

AN HON. MEMBER: Equalization.

MR. L. BARRY: That may not be, that might not be quite parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to insult any lap-dogs, so I will take it back.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Perhaps the hon. minister would like to withdraw those words. He does take them back? Okay.

MR. BARRY: I would take it back and I suppose varlets is not acceptable either, none of this -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: All of these good middle-English words are gone out of style. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, members opposite, they are being totally frustrated; they just get in line with learning to parrott one federal policy when the Prime Minister comes down and he change the numbers on them and then they have to jump and they have to parrott his new numbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And if they were looking at the debate that is going on between Alberta and the federal government, they will see that Alberta says that what the federal government is offering is not forty-five per cent or forty-three per cent, under the new federal energy policy, but Alberta says it is something like thirty-five per cent,

MR. BARRY: that applies to Alberta as well, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government and Mr. Trudeau are not being totally revealing when they say that it is 45 per cent that the provinces get. Because they are adding in certain things which Alberta says - Alberta says they are cooking the figures, in other words. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have members opposite running to jump in line so fast, Mr. Speaker, that they cannot even get their figures straight.

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

MR. BARRY: Is it 45 per cent or is it 43 per cent, I would ask?

MR. FLIGHT: 45 per cent.

MR. BARRY: Oh, it is 45 per cent. Well, well, well, The member opposite has not heard the energy critic that they had to scape to get one after the former energy critic saw the light. The new energy critic opposite is saying 45 per cent, when already the federal government is admitting it is 43 per cent under the new budget proposals. Now, is it 45 per cent or is it 43 per cent?

AN HON. MEMBER: 45 per cent.

MR. BARRY: Is it 45 per cent or 43 per cent?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is only 45 per cent.

MR. BARRY: Oh!

MR. FLIGHT: It maybe 43 per cent.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, members opposite, when I look at them, it is really sad to see what I thought were once fine parliamentarians, once fine, aggressive Newfoundlanders willing to get up and fight for their Province's birthright now afraid to get up, afraid to get up and ask the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore mineral rights. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker, not whether we will have a negotiation with the federal government. Maybe we will if they

MR. BARRY: have a genuine desire to do so. So let us have not anybody detract or take away attention from the main issue here which is that this hon. House ask the federal government to reconsider its position.

MR. FLIGHT: And they did.

MR. BARRY: And I say to members opposite that if they continue with this fear, this terrible fear that they have, this terror they have of doing anything to displease Uncle Ottawa, that the people of this Province are going to look at them with great sadness and say, there is no spirit, there is no courage on that part of the House. What is the point of voting for members who are afraid to get up and challenge a federal government -

MR. BAIRD: Right on.

MR. BARRY: - which attempts to take away the birthright of Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: We stand here in this government and say that we can be every bit as good a Canadian as any member of this House or every -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - every bit as good a Canadian as somebody in Ottawa or Saskatchewan or Alberta, but being a good Canadian does not mean that you have to be meek and mild and afraid to criticize the federal government when they do something that will interfere with the control that you should have over your resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And that is the difference between this side of the House and that side.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible).



MR. BARRY: You are afraid to speak for your Province, we are not afraid on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): Order!

The Chair will now put the question on the amendment. Those in favour of the amendment, please signify by saying "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment defeated. The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay now has a right to close the debate. If he speaks now he closes the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt about how the Opposition felt about their amendment we saw it when they did not have the guts to force a standing vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: We saw it, Mr. Speaker, when (inaudible) a standing vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the term guts.

MR. RIDEOUT: Gladly, Sir! I shall gladly do it, Sir, Intestinal fortitude, it was a slip of the tongue.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: What about the terminological (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I made a number of remarks on the main motion last Wednesday and I will not go into any great detail on them today.

MR. STAGG: Tell us why you came over here.

MR. RIDEOUT: I want to take the few minutes that are allotted to me to reply to some of the comments made by gentlemen on the other side. There were some excellent speeches made, especially by the people who supported the original resolution. The speeches from the other side, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen were like people whistling as they walked passed the graveyard, they were really trying to find a way out in this frivolous amendment that they put down last Wednesday.

MR. BAIRD: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, I want to go back over some of the comments that were made.

MR. STAGG: Tell us why you came over here.

MR. RIDEOUT: The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), Mr. Speaker, I will go in the order of the last speaker who spoke because it really does not matter, it was the same thing all the way through, but the member for St. Barbe paraphrased his comments by saying it is just as well to give it away anyway.

MR. STAGG: That is what he said.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is exactly what he said, Hansard will prove me right, that the gentleman for St. Barbe said "That it is just as well to give it away anyway because the economy of the Province is stagnant, has been stagnant and is going to continue to remain stagnant, so what does it matter? It is just as well to give it away anyway". Now, Mr. Speaker, hopefully, I assume that that is - I assume that he is mouthing the philosophy of people on the other side, I assume that he is mouthing the philosophy of the party on the other side. I assume he is doing that. Obviously, he said it, it is in the public record, so it cannot be denied. The member for LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, we were interested in his position because we had heard the position or lack of position of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: And when the member for LaPoile stood we were wondering what he was going to say. Well, you know, other than accuse the Premier of suffering from vanity, he said nothing else.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: And I would say better vanity than capitulation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is exactly what we heard from the gentleman from LaPoile. He said that in about a minute and a half and took eighteen and a half minutes to say nothing else. So that is exactly what happened from his point of view. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BENNETT: Are you going to come back here, 'Tom'?

MR. RIDEOUT: Never, Mr. Speaker,  
never. Entrenched forever on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing, really,  
in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition to respond  
to. The Premier spoke immediately after him and the Premier  
never had any trouble, he never had to go to any great  
intellectual exercises in attempting to destroy the feeble  
argument, the feeble effort that was put forth by the Leader  
of the Opposition, so there was nothing in that. I made a few  
notes, and it was almost difficult to make a note on what the  
hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say because there was  
absolutely nothing in it. Now, the other - two other people  
spoke from the other side, including the hon. gentleman from  
Eagle River, and he wanted to put us in an excellent frame of  
mind by reminding us that sixty cents of every dollar we  
spend come from Ottawa. And I could only come to the conclus-  
ion after he said that, that he wanted that to remain that way.

MR. STAGG: Yes, yes!

MR. RIDEOUT: He wanted us to remain forever  
poor, he did not want that position to change, so we should  
take that and be great benefactors, say thank-you, Mr.  
Ottawa, and try to do nothing to improve our own lot. Now,  
I do not put too much credence, Mr. Speaker, in what that  
hon. gentleman says anyway, because that is the same hon.  
gentleman who only a few weeks ago was telling voters in  
certain parts of this province that the Premier was a  
separatist. He made no bones about it, he told them, we know it,  
and not only that, but he went on to tell them, that same hon.  
gentleman went on to tell them that if they voted Tory, that  
if they voted PC, they would certainly lose their jobs on the  
Canada Works Project, in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, that is the kind - you know,  
how can you pay much credence -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that? Bellevue, was it?

MR. RIDEOUT: How can you pay much credence, Mr. Speaker, to anything that that hon. gentleman says, when he will go around this Province and tell that kind of thing -

MR. STAGG: And he is worming his way here.

MR. RIDEOUT: - and tell that kind of thing to voters.

AN HON. MEMBER: And he is worming his way over here, look.

MR. DINN: Worming his way over here, look.

MR. STAGG: Do not talk to him. Put him in coventry.

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentleman for Eagle River, that is who it was.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what?

MR. RIDEOUT: So what? Well, the hon. gentleman, should hang his head in shame.

MR. DINN: He should listen, listen, flip her back, read Hansard -

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, we saw what the hon. gentleman from LaPoile thought about-

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) development projects.

MR. RIDEOUT: - we saw what the hon. gentleman, from LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, thought about our -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) strategy.

MR. RIDEOUT: - present representation in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: We saw it, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Lapoile last week, told us exactly what we have representing us in Ottawa. It was not somebody on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

May 13, 1981

Tape No. 1537

IH - 4

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member wishes to make a point that loudly, perhaps it would be more convenient outside the House. I do not like to hear shouting across the House because we cannot hear the member speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it was not anybody on this side of the House last week who made cracks or said anything derogatory about the kind of representation that we are getting in Ottawa, it was a gentleman on that side of the House who said, 'We may as well have elected seven Tories'. So that goes to show, Mr. Speaker, how much faith that some people, at least, on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that goes to show how much credence they put in the type of representation that we are getting when it comes to solving this kind of very delicate problem on the national level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes making some replies to the official energy critic for the Opposition. He started his remarks, Mr. Speaker, by - he stated -

MR. WHITE: Who was it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I will get to that, Mr. Speaker. He started his remarks, Mr. Speaker, by referring to me as the former energy critic for the Opposition and took me to task for not enunciating Opposition policy on this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House something and let me tell the people of this Province something: There was once, once and only once in the history of the Liberal Opposition since I have been in this House, in that party in this House, that the Opposition tried to formulate policy, and that, Mr. Speaker, was under the leadership of the hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is when we all as shadow spokesmen were asked to draw up policy papers for the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I

MR. RIDEOUT: then drew up a policy position for occupational health and safety in this Province. There are gentlemen on the other side who drew up positions on other things like transportation and other things of that nature. The truth hurts.

MR. STAGG: Barry's theorem. Barry's theorem.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: First of all the member opposite is not telling the truth. He is not telling the truth. First of all he is not telling the truth -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Secondly, that quisling -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - that traitor opposite -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: If he wants to talk about the time he spent with the Liberal Party I -

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

MR. HODDER: I will come to my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is what I was going to ask the hon. member. If he has a point of order, please state his point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we have seen the member get up here and talk, we see what type of an energy critic he was when all we have heard in ten minutes of his speech is nothing only innuendo and, Mr. Speaker - I am coming to my point of order.



MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): I would ask the hon. member to state his point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, he has not yet gotten around to anything concrete as to what this government is doing to resolve the offshore question. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that he should confine his remarks to the motion which he placed on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule there is no point of order in this particular case.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: As the hon. gentleman was rising on his point of order he referred to the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) as a traitor and a quisling. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously out of order. It requires immediate retraction, Mr. Speaker, and I know the hon. gentleman will wish to immediately do that.

MR. PECKFORD: Sure, boy. Yes he will. Of course he will, he is a gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair I am sorry, did not hear those references. I will have to check Hansard, unless the hon. member for Port au Port wishes to make a comment on it now. I am not aware of it.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the hon. House Leader opposite said -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order was raised.

MR. HODDER: - but everything I said I meant. And whatever I said, if what I said was true, then I would not be able to withdraw it anyhow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

I would have to check the reference in Hansard to be assured that the words quoted by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) are accurate. The Chair did not hear them and so we will leave it at that until I get a chance to address Hansard.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, all I said was in reply to a statement made by the hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I did not raise this on my own initiative, I just replied a statement of fact, that there were attempts to draw up policy and there was policy drawn up. But that is the one and only time that I saw a major attempt to do it, under the leadership of the hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I was not the one who made the statement, Mr. Speaker, I just respond to it in debate as it was made in debate in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was another concept put forth by the hon. gentleman for Windsor, Buchans, and that was the LCDC Concept, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes!

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentleman wondered aloud a few times in his speech, why we did not look to the LCDC Concept for development of the offshore resources. He said it was the same as the Churchill Falls situation, but Mr. Speaker, I have to remind him that Churchill Falls is on land that this Province happens to own.

MR. FLIGHT: And offshore can be treated as such.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, yes the offshore can be treated as such. The Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, happens to be on land that this Province happens to own, and we, as a result of that, have 51 per cent controlling interest in LCDC. The federal position, Mr. Speaker, the federal position enunciated in this Province only a week or so ago, is still that we do not own the offshore. Is the federal government - the real question is is the federal government prepared to give us 51 per cent controlling interest in and over territory that they say we do not own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, has anybody asked him that question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. STIRLING: Yes, The answer is yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am sure - the answer is yes, the Leader of the Opposition says. They say we do not own it, Mr. Speaker, but they are prepared to become partners in a corporation with us having 51 per cent control over land and territory which happens to under the seabed, that they say we do not own and that we say we do own. Well, Mr. Speaker, how naive do they think we are? How naive do we think they are? And

MR. RIDEOUT: - then, of course, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. STAGG: And where did they say it?

MR. RIDEOUT: - then of course, Mr. Speaker, there is the problem that nobody over there referred to in their speeches. There is the problem of the Canada Lands Act. There is a real problem with the Canada Lands Act, the Canada Lands Act treats that territory out there as then belonging to the people of Canada, with no control, with no say to the people of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing, there was absolutely nothing said in the speech by the hon. gentleman in proposing his ammendment that you could even consider thinking about in changing the position. Now, we have said time and time again over the last couple of days, on this side, that this debate has been on that this government is prepared to go to any ends if the Prime Minister wishes to talk about a settlement. The Premier said that here today, he said it in the House last week. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been no official communique yet. There has been nothing, yet. There has been nothing, yet. Should we just bend that - should we just jump a plane and hop up to Ottawa because the Prime Minister was down and spoke at -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. RIDEOUT: - a rent-a- Liberal dinner?

Is that what we should do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT: Call a dinner meeting.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is that what we should do call a dinner meeting and suddenly, you know, become scared, become frightened and we got to head off up and see what we can do about it? Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: - there are certain other people - Mr. Speaker, there are other people in the Province who had some very interesting ideas, and wrote them - not only in the St. John's paper, Mr. Speaker, but in papers in Grand Falls, and

MR. RIDEOUT: papers in Corner Brook on the West Coast, wrote editorials about what they thought and about how they thought that the position had been put, and about how they thought that we as a Province ought to respond to it. It would make some very interesting reading for people on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to read those editorials before they come charging in here as if all heaven had opened up and the flood was coming down just because the Prime Minister happened to land in Newfoundland last week. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to move adoption of this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is the House ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I was out in the corridor when I heard the exchange here a few minutes ago between the member and the House Leader and just before it gets beyond some kind of control, I wonder if the member, now that he is settled down, would like to withdraw the remark that he made, that caused my colleague to make the comment. It is despicable for somebody to make a comment in caucus but the former Leader asked that man to give the information, that he has now said he did not get. Now, he is not here to defend himself. He is not here to defend himself and I wonder -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: -if the member would

like to withdraw that before this gets carried away to a point where people cannot withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, before I put the motion - to the point of order, the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay -

MR. RIDEOUT: Since I was the topic of discussion of the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am just as calmed down now as I was when I began. And I made no reference to the former Leader of the

MR. RIDEOUT:

Opposition, it was a former, former Leader that I was talking about -

MR. STAGG: No, no, former, former, former.

MR. RIDEOUT: - and the development of party policy, because the accusation had been made, the accusation had been made by a member on that side in relation to me, so I made no reference to the former Leader. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. RIDEOUT: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to -

MR. SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. member I think I have heard enough debate to show clearly that there is no point of order in this particular situation.

Is the House now ready for the question on the motion? Those in favour of the motion signify by saying aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

Oh, oh!

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

I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Let us go to division on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DIVISION

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

MR. MARSHALL: When Your Honour has called -  
I am rising on a point of privilege - when Your Honour has called for a division, I would point out in the interests of the order of the House that members are not allowed - particularly as, unfortunately, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) seems to wish to do now - to shout back and forth his views across the House. He is completely out of order, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, here is the new House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might, I want simply to point out to my learned friend, who occasionally lets his enthusiasm get away with him, perhaps for understandable reasons, the one time in this House when we are allowed to engage in banter is when Your Honour had to call a division and the time is running. We have three minutes, which it is under the rules -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - before the Whips report we are ready, and that is the one time we are allowed to banter except that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), for some reason, does not want to banter. I thought my friend from St. Mary's-The Capes was being temperate, given the unreasonable fabrication which he has had. There is no point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: In respect to the point of order, I think that the House is in a state of -

MR. ROBERTS: Suspended animation.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): That is as good a word as any, I guess. The original point of order about shouting across the House, I have already ruled on that twenty thousand times and hope that members will continue to adhere to the rules of the House, that is all I can say at this point in time. Are the House Leaders agreed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
Those in favour of the motion  
please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook); the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Youth and Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews); the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
- the hon. the Minister of  
Education (Ms. Verge); Mr. Walsh; Mr. Butt; Mr. Rideout;  
Mr. Stagg; Mr. Barrett; Dr. Twomey; Mr. Doyle; Mr. Aylward;  
Dr. McNicholas; Mr. Stewart; Mr. Baird.



May 13, 1981

Tape No. 1540

GS - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Those against the motion please  
rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition (Mr. Stirling); Mr. Flight; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Roberts -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
- Mr. White ; Mr. Bennett;

Mr. Tulk ; Mr. Hancock; Mr. Hiscock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
In favour of the motion, twenty-one;  
against the motion, nine. I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

It being six of the clock this  
House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three  
of the clock.