

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1982

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1217

MJ - 1

The House met at 10:00 a. m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we get into the Orders of the Day, I would on behalf of the government - indeed the full caucus - want to express my deepest sympathy on the passing of a respected and very dear Newfoundlander, Mrs. Elizabeth Goudie. I particularly want to extend our deepest regrets to the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Deveopment (Mr. J. Goudie) and to the entire Goudie family. While most of us know Mrs. Goudie through the hon. minister, many Newfoundlanders have become familiar with her and the era in the Provinces history which she represents through her publication Women Of Labrador, her autobiography, in which she documents her early life and changes which Labrador has undergone. As any one who knows Mrs. Goudie with attest, and her book is further evidence of it, she was a true Labradorian and an exemplary wife and mother, a person who had that unusual strenght and character to deal with the difficult times and circumstances which the early undeveloped, even hostile Labrador presented. The wife of a trapper, the mother of five children, a person whose kindness and generosity is widely known, Mrs. Goudie departs with the affection of all those who knew her and, indeed, those who did not have the opportunity to be so fortunate. The Government of Newfoundland was very proud to recognize Mrs. Goudie's contribution to the heritage of Labrador by naming the government building in Happy Valley in her honour. We mourn her passing and again we extend deepest sympathy to the hon. minister and his family. I would propose that a message of sympathy

PREMIER PECKFORD: and condolences go forward for this House to recognize and to pass along our sympathy to the hon. minister and the family of the late Mrs. Elizabeth Goudie.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I second that motion on behalf of our caucus. I first met Mrs. Goudie in 1965 and practically since that time every visit that I have made to Happy Valley - Goose Bay I would take the opportunity and go and visit Mrs. Goudie when she was at her home on Hamilton River Road and when she was in the senior citizens' home. I remember it was only about two years ago that she said to me, she said, 'Although you and Joe are different politically, you are friends and', she said, 'that is the way I like to see you.'

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement I want to read in the record, it may take a couple of minutes but it really shows the appreciation that I have for the late Mrs. Goudie and I will read it, Mr. Speaker, from my text. In her now famous recollections of life in Labrador, Women Of Labrador, Mrs. Elizabeth Goudie wrote, "I am very proud of this country Labrador. The name goes very deep within me. The beauty of its rivers and lakes and the beautiful green forests and the hills and the great white Mealy mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I look over the hills on miles and miles of hillside untouched by man and I wonder how much longer we are going to be able to keep its beauty. I really believe this within myself and most of the old-timers I have talked to feel the same way. They say we will never have the same kind of peace anymore, but I hope our young people will pick up where we left off and try to keep peace and be proud of this great land."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in those simple words of astonishing eloquence, Mrs. Elizabeth Goudie has given all of us an enormous and worthy challenge, that is to restore this land to its once fundamental majesty.

Mr. Speaker, few words need to be said on the passing of Elizabeth Goudie. She has left behind her her own eulogy and words that cannot be equalled. Many tears will be shed today and tomorrow for this magnificent human being.

It has been said on occasion, Mr. Speaker, that it is too bad that we here in this country do not have Royalty. I think, Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth Goudie has proven us wrong.

Many of the members of this hon. House have never had the good fortune of meeting Mrs. Goudie. I want to tell you all, she was unique. She was a true bred Labradorian, a woman of Labrador. She was a fantastic wife and a fantastic mother, according to all reports.

On the passing of her dear husband, when Jim Goudie died in 1958, here are the words that she said about him: "We worked side by side for the past forty-two years together and it was pretty rough sometimes.

MR. WARREN:

"We respected each other, and when he was taken from me, I did not feel too bad. Life is meant to be that way. I think a person has nothing to regret when they are happy and we were very happy. So I am quite content now. There is always something to do and always something to think about."

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that each and every citizen of this Province could not have met Elizabeth Goudie and stood in the shadow of the warmth that surrounded her. She was a friend to everybody. She will always be with us, Mr. Speaker. I personally will miss her because she was a good friend of mine as well as everybody else's. She left us a message which I would like to pass along to this hon. House and it is the last message in her book The Woman Of Labrador. It says, I quote, "I will never change deep within my heart and I hope I can be a friend to all people. We should strive to live in peace with one another, and that is the only way to live right".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before we proceed with the business of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to especially welcome to the galleries Commissioner John D. Waldron the National Commander of the Salvation Army for Canada and Bermuda, who is visiting for the signing of the Centennial Scroll with the hon. Premier and to attend the graduation of the Nursing Class of the Grace General Hospital, and Colonel Albert D. Browning, Divisional Commander for Eastern Newfoundland. I welcome these two gentlemen to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is with shock and disappointment that the Government of Newfoundland has learned through the media that the federal government has delayed implementation of its new legislation that would permit a power corridor through Quebec for the transmission of Labrador power. The Newfoundland Government has for years tried to negotiate with the Province of Quebec on this issue and related hydro issues. Each time it was clear that Quebec's interests were to get even more from the people of this Province in exchange for giving up very little.

The Newfoundland Government negotiated during these years even though we firmly felt that one province should not have to negotiate rights and powers that other Canadians now enjoy by protection of the federal government. It was asked many times, why does not Newfoundland have the same protection

PREMIER PECKFORD: afforded it for the transmission of electric power across neighbouring provinces as other Canadians now enjoy in the transmission of oil and gas?

 During the last two years the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has been successful in persuading the federal bureaucracy and federal government that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador were not full Canadians in this matter. Yet we find today what Canada is all about, the strong and powerful provinces, especially Quebec, can dominate the weak - that the federal government can be manipulated by Quebec even though right is on the side of the smaller province. This callous disregard for basic rights and freedoms from coast to coast make a mockery of the Prime Minister's supposed interest in a Charter of Rights in the new Constitution.

 I propose, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to introduce the following resolution to this hon. House today: WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland have been second class citizens in the transmission of their energy products since the development of the Upper Churchill; AND WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland deserve the same rights as other Canadians in the transmission of their energy products; AND WHEREAS the federal government has now delayed implementation of Newfoundland's right of transmission of hydro electricity by a power corridor through Quebec in total disregard of the basic rights that Newfoundlanders should have automatically; AND WHEREAS this delay is being imposed without consultation with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn this action by the federal government to delay implementation of the power corridor legislation; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House call upon the federal government to stop procrastinating on this issue and give legal effect to the legislation now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I look forward to the unanimous support of all members of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me correct an error that the hon. gentleman made in the earlier part of his Ministerial Statement. It was not the Government of Canada that delayed the implementation of this legislation, it was the Parliament of Canada. As a matter of fact, the amendment -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: - there is a distinction, Mr. Speaker, the amendment was brought in by a Tory member of Parliament, the amendment

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not care what his colours are.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not care what his colours are. We the hon. gentleman should launch his attack on his own Party. It is his own Party that delayed the implementation. And, Mr. Speaker, all that is happening here is that the proclamation of the act will take place six months hence, that is what it means. There is no delay. As a matter of fact, I told the hon. gentleman in this House a couple of weeks ago that we should have been up there lobbying

MR. NEARY: night and day, we should have been fighting tooth and nail and supporting the Government of Canada for having the courage to bring in this piece of legislation. But what it does now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: You warned them of that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I warned him about it and the hon. gentleman would not pay any attention to our warning. But what it does now it gives both governments breathing space.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We do not need any breathing space over rights. We should not have to have breathing space over rights. Rights come by right, not by negotiation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are all Canadians and we are getting fed up and tired of hearing these anti-Confederate, these anti-Canadian utterances from the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: It will give both governments breathing time, Mr. Speaker, in order -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Why does Newfoundland have to negotiate rights? How come we have to negotiate rights?

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is what we should have today is a resolution thanking the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman told us a couple of weeks ago that this bill would not go through third reading.

DR. COLLINS: Have you heard about Unity '82?

MR. NEARY: The bill has gone through third reading. It will be proclaimed six months from now. In the meantime, instead of uttering these anti-Canadian and anti-Confederate remarks, the hon. gentleman should start negotiations

MR. NEARY: with the Government of Quebec.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No chance. We are not going to negotiate for our rights.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, the hon. gentleman is not going -

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have the rights the same as other Canadians.

MR. WARREN: Not a chance.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even if the act had been proclaimed yesterday, last night, negotiations with the Province of Quebec would still have to take place. The hon. gentleman is going down to Maine on the 21st. of this month to meet with the other premiers in Eastern Canada and the governors in the Eastern United States, and the hon. gentleman then should start his negotiations with the Province of Quebec.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I started in Vermont two years ago and got nowhere because they wanted the border changed and the five rivers to go through the Province of Quebec.

MR. NEARY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to get anywhere with negotiations in this Province on the transmission of power, or on the offshore, that he should remove the present Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) from the negotiations. There is the stumbling block, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to support this silly, foolish resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

We are tired -

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier has given notice of a resolution that is here, and he has given it under Ministerial Statements. The hon. gentleman is debating the statement. I know that the hon. the Premier has already indicated that he welcomes debate, but what I suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) what we could do is we could let the business of the House be suspended and now debate this resolution in the normal fashion, bring it to a vote at the end of the sitting this morning, and then we would have you know, a reasonable airing of the situation in accordance with the normal manner -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, let us put pressure on the federal government then.

MR. MARSHALL: -so everyone can have a say in the matter before we vote on it today because it is important.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to debate this resolution?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is up to the House -

MR MARSHALL: Yes, we make -

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is up to the Opposition. We could debate it right away.

MR. MARSHALL: We make the suggestion that

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are master of our own rules.

MR. MARSHALL: We make the suggestion that the resolution that is being placed before the House today by the hon. the Premier be subject to resolution now so that we can have a debate on it and then on the understanding that it would be resolved by the end of this morning because it is from the government's view of such import that it should be dealt with expeditiously and immediately.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It should be dealt with and voted on this morning so that we can get it off to Ottawa.

MR. SHEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all let me conclude my few remarks by saying again, by repeating what I said a few moments ago, we are tired and fed up with the anti-Canadian attitude on the part of this administration. We think this is a good piece of legislation. We commend the Government of Canada for having the courage to bring it into the parliament of Canada. We condemn the national Tory party, we condemn them for fighting against it, we condemn a Tory MP for bringing in this amendment, that the act not be proclaimed until six months from now.

MR. WARREN: You mean a Tory brought it in?

June 11, 1982

Tape no. 1222

AH - 2

MR. NEARY: A Tory brought in that amendment,

Mr. Speaker-

PREMIER PECKFORD: Lalonde, brought it in.

MR. NEARY: - under pressure from the Tory party.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They did not succumb to pressure from the National Energy Policy. How come they suddenly succumb to pressure on the power corridor.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. Leader of the Opposition is in the opinion of the Chair taking an extraordinarily long period of time in responding to the Ministerial Statement.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that as far as debating this resolution is concerned today we will not agree to that because my colleagues have to leave on flights around 12:30 today and they would not have time to participate in the debate. We think we should have more time, Mr. Speaker, to get more details on this because as I said the important thing here is that it gives the hon. -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. The hon. gentleman is obviously afraid to debate the matter but the hon. gentleman is not going to have the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Scared. Cover-up.

MR. MARSHALL: - luxury of debating it under

MR. MARSHALL:

Ministerial Statements. I think, Your Honour, the rule is quite clear that the Opposition is given one-half of the time to respond to Ministerial Statements.

MR. NEARY:

No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes, yes!

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman there opposite has consumed more time in responding than the Premierⁿ in giving his statement. So I would submit to Your Honour that he should be asked to take his seat. If he wants to debate it, you know, if he wants to debate it out in the open, fine. Instead what the hon. gentlemen want to do is weasel away into the burrow of Ottawa once again. Well that is their prerogative. But if he wants to debate it we will debate it, but he is not going to debate it in Ministerial Statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

It appears that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was entering into the realm of debate, and I would once again give him about one minute to finish up his remarks.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in that one minute the advice that I would give to the Premier instead of coming up with this kind of inflammatory resolution and the inflammatory statements that the hon. gentleman just made, it would be far better for the administration to enter into negotiations with the Province of Quebec to try to negotiate a settlement, a resolution of this transmitting of surplus power from Newfoundland to markets on the Mainland and in the United States rather than just continue the war, Mr. Speaker, that will accomplish nothing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Any other statements by ministers?

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, members of the House of Assembly will recall that earlier this year the government announced the implementation of a provincial building lot subsidy programme. This programme was designed to reduce the price of residential building lots in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Land Developments located in some eighteen communities across our Province. This action was taken in an effort to assist prospective homeowners and the residential construction industry on a Province-wide basis.

The problems being experienced by the residential construction industry are most apparent in the urban centres of the Province where the number of single-detached starts have declined considerably. Nowhere is this more evident than in St. John's where single-detached starts have decreased by almost 80 per cent during the first four months of 1982 as compared to the corresponding period last year. The problem is further compounded in the capital city as recently released figures show St. John's as having the highest rental vacancy rate of any urban centre in Canada. This will have a significant impact on the residential construction sector as it will virtually eliminate the construction of new rental projects during the foreseeable future.

Faced with these factors the provincial government, through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, reviewed various alternatives to aid residential construction in the St. John's area and, as a result, I now wish to inform the House of the introduction of a building lot subsidy programme for Area I of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation's Cowan Heights development.

MR. WINDSOR: This measure was contained in the 1982 Provincial Budget as presented by the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Today I wish to provide details of this subsidy arrangement to members of the House.

Effectively immediately unsold residential building lots in Area I of Cowan Heights will be reduced in price by 20 per cent. Area I in all consists of 207 single family building lots of which 50 were placed in the sales position in mid-1981 and due to economic conditions only 7 have been sold to date. This price reduction will remain in effect until November 30, 1982

MR. WINDSOR: and will mean savings of from \$5,000 to \$7,000 per lot. This will translate into a direct reduction in an individual's mortgage requirement of between \$75 to \$105 per month which in turn will amount to a saving of roughly \$23,000 to \$32,000 in interest over a twenty-five year term assuming comparable mortgage rates on renewal.

To facilitate the subsequent paying of the Cowan Heights development, this price reduction will be limited initially to the unsold portion of the original offering of fifty lots in Area 1. There will be no rebates offered to those purchasers who had acquired building lots in Area 1 of the Cowan Heights development prior to June 1, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, with the continuing refusal by the federal government to take action toward reducing high interest rates, responsibility again falls on the provincial government to take whatever measures it can given its limited financial resources to assist prospective homeowners and the residential construction industry as a whole. I fervently hope that the announcement of the lot subsidy programme for Area 1, Cowan Heights development will supply the much needed stimulant for the residential construction industry in St. John's in 1982.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, before responding to the Ministerial Statement, I notice the two distinguished Salvation Army officers in the gallery, Colonel Waldron and Major Browning, who are here as part of the 100th Anniversary of the Salvation Army in Canada.

MR. LUSH: I am sure all hon. members would want to congratulate the Salvation Army for their 100 years of service in Canada and wish them well in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, first of all, we should note the terminology here which says that this is a subsidy programme and we should remind all hon. members and the people of Newfoundland that this is not a subsidy programme, it is simply a drop in the price of land. It is just a drop in the price of land that was over-priced, Mr. Speaker, and has now dropped to market value.

The peculiar thing about this, though, Mr. Speaker, was that last year this party advanced a position with respect to housing owned by the government, by the Crown corporation, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. We advanced a position suggesting that mortgage rates should be dropped, and in that same statement, saying that land was a major problem. And the minister, in responding to that statement - just listen to this - the minister in responding to that statement said, "I should add, as well, that I am not convinced that the acquisition of land is a critical factor in the overall housing equation in the Province at this moment." So, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that the acquisition

MR. T. LUSH: of land was not a factor, and this morning, of course, he is doing just what we wanted him to do, to reduce the price of land. So in September, six or seven months ago, he did not think it was a major factor, Mr. Speaker, but this morning somehow he thinks it is a major factor. We happen to agree, of course with this policy, to reduce the price of land in St. John's and indeed right throughout the Province, but it does not go far enough. Again this fits in with an election promise made by the Premier that this provision would account for 1,900 jobs. I hope that is correct, but there are a lot of factors in the construction industry quite apart from land price. And the Home Building Association recommended that the government should reduce sales tax. That is another measure that the minister should have taken, that is sales tax on building materials. That would have assisted the construction industry as well, but so far the government have not seen the wisdom of doing this but maybe after a little while the minister will see the wisdom of this as well as he saw the wisdom of reducing the price of building lots. We hope also that the government will go a little further and reduce mortgage rates with respect to properties and real estate administered by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, as they have done in other provinces, Mr. Speaker. Other provinces have taken this measure to reduce the mortgage rate. So the minister has now seen that the price of land is a factor and the government now have reduced the price, it is not a subsidy, they have reduced the price. It was a matter of reacting to a crisis, Mr. Speaker, where the building lots in Cowan Heights were not selling because they were overpriced and now they have reduced them to the market value. Cowan Heights, I think, last year sold seven out of fifty, building lots, seven out of fifty, in phase one.

MR. T. LUSH: Right now in phase two I think they have only sold twenty per cent. So it is a matter of reacting to a crisis, but we say they have not gone far enough. They should reduce the sales tax on building materials, they should also look into reducing moragage rates.

MR. G. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, this is just a reaction to a crisis situation to land that was undersold and overpriced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure today that I will place under the appropriate heading and table before the House the Green Paper on Recreation, a document which was compiled by a Committee established under Section 17 of the Department of Tourism Act on December 4, 1980. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. R. Dawe), then held the Tourism, Recreation and Culture potfolio and in his announcement at that time relative to the formation of the Committee, indicated that the general purpose and nature of the Green Paper Study was to identify concerns and issues in

MR. SIMMS: recreation in this Province. The committee would then be required to categorize a number of recommendations for submission to government regarding the effects of the leisure delivery system and the provision of recreation services that benefit the people of our Province.

The committee was chaired by Mr. Frank Butler, an assistant professor with the School of Physical Education and Athletics of Memorial University, and I am pleased to say that Mr. Butler is seated in the galleries here this morning. Other committee members were Mr. Frank Clarke, President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Parks and Recreation Association, and a school principal; Mrs. Paula Smythe, Executive Secretary, Newfoundland and Labrador Parks and Recreation Association; Mr. Vic Janes, then with the Corner Brook Parks and Recreation Department; Mr. Bill Matthews, a physical education teacher from -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS: - Fortune and now, of course, our colleague, the hon. member for Grand Bank; Mr. Gordon Randell, a sports broadcaster with CBC in Happy Valley - Goose Bay; and Mr. Terry Harte, a broadcaster from Grand Falls as well as the Vice-President of the Newfoundland Amateur Baseball Association.

A series of public hearings were conducted around the Province from January through June of 1981. And in addition to these, written and oral submissions were also made by interested groups and individuals in private sessions.

Mr. Speaker, the "Green Paper", as the name implies, is a working document. It was formally presented to government in October, 1981 and since that time officials of my department have conducted a thorough review and study of the Paper's findings and recommendations.

MR. SIMMS: The Paper states and I quote, "The past decade has seen a tremendous growth in the number and magnitude of recreation oriented programmes in this Province. Services have escalated from simple low cost operations to complex programmes involving extensive budgets. The provision of community recreation services to consumers involves a large number of government offices and non-government provincial agencies as well as a wide variety of local organizations. Government, through various programmes, both professional and financial, has initiated and perpetuated a very rapid growth in community recreation."

There is a brief historical review of the Department of Recreation that I would like to give to hon. members of the House to emphasize the necessity for such a review. And it began in 1961 when the Fitness and Amateur Sports Act was passed in Canada. In 1964, the provincial government created the Physical Fitness Division within the Department of Provincial Affairs. In 1968, the Meeker Commission on Sports and Youth recommended the formation of a Recreation and Sports Division in the Department of Education. In 1969, the Newfoundland and Labrador High School Athletic Federation was formed. In 1969, as well, government created a Physical Education and Youth Division in the Department of Education. In 1971, the Newfoundland and Labrador Parks and Recreation Association was formed. In 1972, the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation was formed. In 1973, the Recreation and Sport Services Division was created within a new Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. A Youth Services Division was created and an assistant deputy minister with responsibilities for recreation and youth was appointed. In 1976, the Newfoundland Recreation Advisory Council for Special Groups was formed. In 1979 Recreation and Sports Services became a part of the then Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture. And in

MR. SIMMS: 1980, the division was aligned in the new Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth where it now stand. And also in 1980, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council was established.

Obviously with such rapid growth, it was obvious a review was required of the overall policies and priorities. The hon. members can see from this report when it is tabled that there are many recommendations covering provincial government involvement in recreation.

MR. SIMMS: And these recommendations involve Provincial recreation organizations, regional recreational facilities, educating for leisure, the role of service clubs in recreation, research and development, the role of volunteers, government financial programmes, and development of the arts as a leisure pursuit.

A number of major thrusts have been identified by the green paper and have been received, I might emphasize, by our department in a very positive manner, Mr. Speaker, and they include: a provincial master plan for facility development; new initiatives in outdoor recreation; a major conference on community recreation; a provincial sport congress; additional field staff enabling government to provide a better service to the people of this Province in the administration and delivery of recreation programmes; the need to develop riches in culture and ensuring that these riches are accessible and a right of all its people; and that there be a major review of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth to allow increased visibility and greater emphasis on youth.

In tabling the document, Mr. Speaker, I now ask the general public and those interested to review the green paper and to indicate if the recommendations reflect adequately their concerns in the area of recreation and sport and leisure services. And after receiving further input from the general public the department will again reassess its policies and programmes and refine them based on the positive recommendations received. This I feel, Mr. Speaker, is a major document and one that will serve my department well in the formulation of future policies in the area of recreation and sport and leisure services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say thanks to the minister for letting me review this document an hour or so before the House opened. I think probably all other ministers could learn a lesson from the hon. minister letting the Opposition see them in advance.

MR. HODDER: A good man. A good man.

MR. WARREN: This is a comprehensive document, Mr. Speaker, and again I only just had a very brief hour to go through it. And I think it is a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker. However, it is worth noting since the Committee was formed this government has gone through three ministers, this is the third minister since this Committee was formed, and noting that the former Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth had it presented to him in October, and the House was open for nearly a month there last Fall and he did not see fit to present it to the House, and now we had to wait until a new minister came in and I must admit that he has only been in the position for about a month or so and it does take time to get accustomed to these things. But I believe that this document should have been presented to the House back in November. In fact the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) believes the same thing, and

MR. WARREN: every other member on that committee. And I have to compliment the members on the committee. I think that they have come up with 241 real good, concrete, recommendations. Now it is up to this government to prove that this committee was worthwhile establishing in the first place. Mr. Speaker, going through the document there are two or three recommendations that I definitely would urge this government to take immediate steps to follow up. And number one is, throughout this Province - and part of the blame has to go to the federal government - there are a number of white elephants, there are a number of so-called facilities partially built by LIP grants and not even finished, and those white elephants have to be gotten rid of or brought up to a useful purpose. This is one of the recommendations that is in this report and I hope the minister and his department will see fit to follow that recommendation very closely and, to quote the recommendation, "that an immediate freeze be placed on new facility construction until existing dormant facilities can be bailed out and subsequently rendered functional." So, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the major, in my opinion, major recommendations in the whole commission report.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, another one there that is very dear to me, and in talking to members on the committee, is that the department, the minister should see fit, the same as the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has done, to make sure that their presence is known in Labrador. There are two parts to this Province, there is Newfoundland and Labrador, and often that big, vast

MR. WARREN: land up there with only thirty-five thousand people is forgotten. So I would strongly suggest to the minister that he would take steps as soon as possible to have a deputy minister or an assistant deputy minister stationed in Labrador with an office in Labrador with five or six field workers, because you are talking about a vast land and you need staff. And one of those recommendations I would also strongly suggest to the minister that he would seriously look at is having a division of his department established in Labrador so that we can carry on with sports and physical activities that are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said in his statement that these recommendations have been received in a very positive manner. I agree they have been received in a very positive manner and, Mr. Speaker, when you get a report with 240 recommendations, when there is a report with

MR. G. WARREN: 240 recommendations, Mr. Speaker, shows one thing, and that thing is, since 1949 - I will go back to 1949 - up to the present day the government has not done enough for sports and recreation in this Province. And these 240 recommendations shows that there needs to be improvements. So I have to say that right back since 1949 government has not paid enough attention to sports and recreation in the Province and I would think that with the ability and the physical condition of the new Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. L. Simms) that I am sure that the minister is going to bring his ability out and show the people of the Province that he is determined to put Culture, Recreation, and Youth, on a high level with any other department of his government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the concern in this Province about the safety of workers on oil rigs drilling off our coast, would the hon. the Minister of Energy (Mr. W. Marshall) inform the House now what set of regulations we are following as far as the seaworthiness of the rigs are concerned and the safety on these rigs are concerned? Are we still following federal regulations or are there any provincial regulations in place controlling safety onboard these rigs?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the regulations - the initial regulations I might state - have been passed by the Cabinet and they are in the process now of being promulgated in the Newfoundland Gazette in which case they will become law. But I should emphasize that what these regulations are these are the same regulations as have been followed pretty well

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1229

MJ - 2

MR. W. MARSHALL: since the drilling commenced out there on the offshore Newfoundland because of the fact that they encompass, in the main, the same criteria as were set down by the federal regulations themselves. There is no magic to this because both regulations strive to provide and require operators to maintain safety to the highest degree possible given the present state of the art. Since the Ocean Ranger tragedy there have been certain amendments that are being contemplated, I understand, in the federal regulations. We have made certain changes with respect to life boat provision and the occupational health and safety area in our regulations and we do not

MR. MARSHALL: envisage, by the way ,
Mr. Speaker, that the regulations that we now pass are going to be the final word because we are going to keep our eye on all activities throughout the world in this area and where there is anything beneficial that should be added we will add it and we will amend the regulations accordingly.

So the answer to the question from the hon. gentleman is that regulations have been passed, formal regulations have now been passed by Cabinet and these regulations really follow along the same lines as the practice that was followed prior to their passage.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the House know that it was virtually impossible for the Government of Canada to enforce its regulations prior to the Ocean Ranger tragedy. There appears to be a jurisdictional problem between Canada and the United States, and Canada will not recognize United States jurisdiction inside the 200 mile management zone, and vice-versa, the United States will not recognize Canada's right to inspect these rigs as to the structure of the rigs, the seaworthiness of the rigs and so on.

Now will the hon. gentleman tell the House in the light of the past experience with even the Government of Canada being unable to enforce these regulations until the jurisdictional dispute is ended, how does the Province intend to enforce provincial regulations?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, let us not get confused, The hon. gentleman's question might confuse between jurisdictional dispute. 'Jurisdictional dispute' is popularly known in this Province as jurisdictional dispute between the government and Ottawa. But he is talking about the international dispute and he acknowledges that.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the government of this Province is concerned we own that resource out there on offshore Newfoundland. And having a proprietary interest in the offshore Off Newfoundland, we determine who are the people or what operators, what licences are given, the validity of licence emanates from the Provincial Government. And the sanction that we will use, and the operators are well aware of the fact despite the fact that there may be some jurisdictional dispute internationally, they are well aware of our jurisdictional claim and they will comply with our requirements.

So consequently what we will do is that we will continue on to do inspections where they are required and at any time where there is any legitimate, and I underline the word 'legitimate' as well, where there is any legitimate complaint with respect to safety of any degree or any extent whatsoever that the government will act and will act quick swiftly to cause the operators to respond as they should respond and the sanction which have is a sanction we always have which is a proprietary interest

MR. MARSHALL: the same way as we had it before when we were enforcing it under Section 106 of the General Regulations.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is quite right. The jurisdiction that I am talking about is not who owns the offshore, that is not the kind of jurisdiction that I referred to in my question. There is a dispute between Canada and the United States over jurisdiction of semi-submersible rigs and ships that fly the United States' flag within the 200-mile management zone. And that is something, by the way, that should be sorted out quickly, that is causing a lot of problems. Mr. Speaker, so the question really I put to the hon. gentleman, he answered it by, I think, implying that permits would be cancelled if the drilling companies did not conform to provincial regulations, I think that is what the hon. gentleman meant. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the provincial government would go as far, if there was any doubt about the structure of these rigs, about the ballast control of these rigs, would the hon. gentleman go as far as to tell the companies to pull these rigs in and have them put on dry dock or their permit would be cancelled? Will the provincial regulations go that far?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the provincial regulations went that far and go that far now, and I emphasize before the passage of these drilling regulations through Cabinet they went that far in any event, because of the fact that we have already had general drilling regulations which give us that power. Yes, the answer is obvious in the

MR. MARSHALL: affirmative if we had, and again I underline the word, any 'legitimate' reason to suspect. I should point out to the hon. gentleman and the House that in actual fact we were on the threshold of doing this immediately after the Ocean Ranger, when the other two rigs that were out there were taken into Marystown. It so happened, and I continue to make this statement, that nobody can presume to have any claim of concern for human life, neither this administration, the federal administration, for that matter, the companies, the unions or anybody, everybody has an equal concern for the sanctity of human life. And we had made that decision as a Cabinet to haul in those two rigs before they were hauled in but it so happened that the President of Mobil at the time came to that particular same decision and ordered the rigs pulled in, I suppose, about maybe five or six hours before he was to have gotten the order from us to do exactly that. So we did not make anything of it at that particular time because of the fact, as I say, I think that Mobil were entitled to be able to demonstrate that they had this particular concern. So that is an example, Mr. Speaker, of the way in which we had acted and the way we will act in the future. I again reply that if there is any legitimate, and I underline the word 'legitimate', because we have to be awfully careful when reports are made from time to time with respect to the operations of the rigs. It is in the interest of everybody concerned in this Province that the confidence in this particular industry

MR. MARSHALL: not be shattered, and this can be done by rumours and by complaints that are made without any grounds. Whenever complaints are made, as I have always said, they are investigated and they are investigated very carefully. If there is any question at all with respect to safety, whether it emanates from the provision of life saving safeties under Occupational Health and Safety, or whether it operates on the matter of the structural condition of the rigs or the ballast, of course we will act and we would act very swiftly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some of the sincere, genuine complaints that were made to the hon. gentleman were treated rather lightly. And if they had been properly investigated, instead of taking Mobil's word, telling the administration everything was okay, maybe the situation could have been different.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem. In the case of an emergency there is a problem for the workers on these rigs to get off the rigs. There is a problem on these rigs of getting workers off the rigs in case of an emergency. That problem, in my opinion, has not been resolved. If we have a similar situation develop in a storm offshore on one of these rigs it is virtually impossible, so the experts say, people who know these rigs, that you just cannot get the workers off these rigs. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if part of the provincial regulations will be to make it compulsory for the oil companies to station a large helicopter on board of these rigs at all times? Is that part of the regulation? Or will the government see to it that that is a part of the regulations, to keep a helicopter at all times on board of these rigs?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the hon. gentleman first of all that there has to be recognized and I think everybody in Newfoundland, particularly Newfoundland probably moreso than any other part of Canada, would realize that there are certain dangers attendant upon the extraction of one's livelihood from the sea and we certainly have experienced that to our sorrow over the years in the fishing industry as well as in the Ocean Ranger disaster.

You know, whether or not it is going to be possible to provide in all instances an absolute guarantee of safety is extremely questioned. There are risks that are attendant upon this occupation. But having said that, may we say that with respect to the safety of the workers out there our present regulations have been altered from the previous federal regulations to the extent that additional life boats are required on the rigs themselves. That is put in the regulations themselves. There is also, and this comes back to the original statement I made

MR. MARSHALL: about the state of the art of this particular problem. There is also, we are aware, being developed a procedure for the launching of lifeboats, a different type of procedure than is now used. We are on top of that and we are examining that and as soon as that becomes feasible and if it is proven not only to become feasible but also feasible in the sense of being workable and beneficial for the safety of workers and that, we will amend our regulations to require that these procedures to be put on. As to the stationing of helicopters on them, that has been considered but it is not really considered to be a reasonable measure to be taken at this particular time. However, I would emphasize to the House, as I hope my remarks have indicated, that the matter of safety of workers on the rigs is a matter of real concern to this government. It always has been and will continue to be, and we will continue to review what I style as the state of the art, from time to time, and when there are improvements we will see that they are implemented.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I just have two more questions to ask the hon. gentleman and then I will let somebody else get in on the Question Period. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House now if the Cabinet, the administration have given any thought to barring drilling offshore, say from the end of November up to the end of March, during the hazardous Winter months? Has the administration given any consideration to not allowing drilling to go ahead at all during the

MR. NEARY: time of year when we have these savage storms in the North Atlantic? Will the rigs be pulled in, say, around the end of November and not permitted to go back drilling until sometime around the first of April?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I cannot answer that in the affirmative, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that that is one of the elements that is being considered and a decision on that will be made in due course, as will decisions with respect to other matters. Before we make decisions of that nature we have to be apprized certainly of all the facts and we have to weigh all the circumstances very carefully. This is what we are in the process of now doing. Everybody realizes that when these storms occur the situation becomes more aggravated, you know, as time goes on. So we are accessing that as well as we are accessing all other possible lifesaving developments. This is really an evolutionary process in a way, Mr. Speaker, that we had to weigh it and we had to take it and we had to take each step as it comes and weigh it very carefully. And as a part of that weighing I can advise the House that the regulations that have been passed by Cabinet will be tabled in this House, hopefully next week.

MR. MARSHALL: They have been in the process of being promulgated for the inspection of the hon. member and all members of this House in the matter of the public, and we will be happy to receive any suggestions with respect to same.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it was rather sad that people learned in this Province that the service vessels, the supply ships that were servicing these rigs twenty-four hours around the clock were not suitable to rescue survivors from the Ocean Ranger in the rough seas. They were just not suitable to rescue people who were in life-boats and in the water. As a matter of fact we are told that the supply ships that serviced the rigs twenty-four hours did not even have a safety net on board the supply ships. If they had to have safety nets on board, maybe they would have saved some of the victims.

But in the meantime, what I want to ask the hon. gentleman, we seem to be concentrating our effort on the safety of the rigs themselves. Now what about the supply ships and what about the rescue ships? Will the regulations make it mandatory for the oil companies to have supply ships servicing these rigs that are adequate to rescue survivors, and will they be compelled to have all the latest safety devices and techniques aboard these supply ships? Could the hon. gentleman address himself to that question?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you know, I appreciate the questions being asked by the hon. member. I know he will appreciate as well, I know he would want me to say this as well, that when you are talking about a matter, you know, of such importance as this is of importance in the future, but also very, very sensitive with respect to the Ocean Ranger, I think one has to point out that nobody knows at this stage. And the anticipation is that it was very unlikely that the presence of supply boats, as a matter of fact, there were supply boats there at the time in the raging seas that appertained on that awful night of February 15 that they would have resulted in any of the victims possibly being rescued. I mean, the seas were monumental at the time, and the general opinion is that it was impossible to effect any rescue in the circumstances from these supply boats.

But with respect to his other comments, with respect to the life-safety aids that may be there on supply boats this is, I would emphasize and tell the hon. member and I tell the House, a matter of consummate concern to this government. It is in the process of review and we have dealt with it to the greatest degree that we possibly can within the realms of the state of our knowledge that we presently have, and any further additions to the supply boats or the rigs or any other item, helicopters or what have you, any other vehicle that could be used for life-saving purposes, will be considered and if it is found that it could be of any help at all the companies will be required to implement it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

June 11, 1982

Tape 1234

PK - 3

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I know that
the minister said with respect to life saving equipment that
the regulations would now require

MR. LUSH: more lifeboats and the life rafts and the like. I think one of the people appearing before the U.S. hearings mentioned that it was terrible in this day and age when you can get a man to the moon but we could not get a person off an oil rig or a ship in stormy seas. So I am just wondering to what degree the regulations will require new methods of jettisoning, if you will, life rafts and the like, or is the minister just waiting for the company to come up with new procedures? Are the regulations requiring that there be new methods of jettisoning life saving equipment?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I can tell the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that there are new procedures being - or new experiments in the world today with respect to the jettisoning of life boats, and this involves shuttles from the rig itself. In these circumstances the boats go on shuttles and they come up some distance away from the rig itself. But how effective these are, and indeed if this mechanism would increase the danger rather than diminish the danger of launching is a matter that is presently under assessment. And indeed when that experiment has been developed to the stage where we can determine that it is beneficial we will require it to be put in, as I am quite sure the federal government will require it to be put in, and I am quite sure the companies and the unions and everybody will. Because in these areas, in this particular area I would emphasize, although there is a jurisdictional dispute and quite a hot jurisdictional dispute with respect to the offshore, there is no jurisdictional dispute with respect to the matter of the safety of the workers on the rigs, and the safety of the rigs themselves.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

June 11, 1982

Tape 1235

NM - 2

MR. LUSH: I noticed also in these US hearings that some matters came up with respect to suits, these - I do not know what the terminology is, but these life saving suits. And I am wondering again what the regulations are here because there was

MR. T. LUSH: I think, at one point and one has to very careful in quoting what one hears coming out of these things, but I think there was some suggestion that there might not have been enough suits aboard, there was not one for every crew member. And, secondly, I am wondering whether the minister is following this? There was a television story on last night about a Nova Scotian firm that is manufacturing a new type of suit and I wonder if the minister is aware of that and whether they are looking at that possibility? This seemed to be an improvement on existing suits to date.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: We are aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a matter of, really, general knowledge that there has been a requirement to increase the number of life suits as well as the number of lifeboats. And this will appear in our regulations.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That will be in our regulations.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman will have our regulations next week, as I say, to inspect.

The other question with respect to the firm in Nova Scotia, yes we are aware of that as we are aware, really, of all of these improvements or professed improvements. And whether the professed improvements are actually improvements is something we are testing. And if we find that suit in Nova Scotia is better than the suits that are presently used, we will -

MR. NEARY: Did you watch that last night?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. Not last night but I am aware of the situation.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have seen it before, months ago.

MR. MARSHALL: I have seen it before. So if these suits, in fact,

MR. W. MARSHALL: would more likely protect the worker better, the workers on the rigs than the present suits, we will require that they be used.

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

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again there has been some suggestion that many of the workers on these rigs were not trained to do some sophisticated jobs. I wonder if the minister can verify - I have heard coming again out of the U. S. hearings now that there were a set of regulations in effect, I suppose we can call them Canadian regulations, respecting preference for Canadian workers. Now, were our regulations separate from that? They are saying that there were a set of regulations in effect where there was an obligation to have Canadian workers. Were our own regulations in addition to that for local preference?

In other words, did we have two sets of preference regulations?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, our regulations, of course, related to legitimate preference for Newfoundlanders on the rigs. As for the Canadian regulations, they are regulations with respect to Canadians, as such, on the rigs themselves.

MR. MARSHALL: With respect to our local preference regulations, they have always been applied as the hon. gentleman knows, but one of the qualifications in the regulations is that before anyone is hired, where qualified, Newfoundlanders have to be used. And this is the basis upon which our local preference regulations were applied so that there would be no way anybody could indicate that because of our local preference regulations there were people on that rig or on any rig at any time who are not qualified. Because the regulations quite clearly indicate that the personnel who are hired they have to use Newfoundlanders, and they have used- I think 962 Newfoundlanders as a result have gotten a job from it. But the fact of the matter is, and this should be very clearly known, that it has never been the case where this Province has indicated to the companies that in any job where a Newfoundlander was not qualified that a Newfoundlander had to be hired. What we had to do and what we are successfully doing, and we are determined to do in the future, is to get over the psychology that if you are from Newfoundland you cannot possibly be qualified for certain jobs. We will end up then being hewers of wood and drawers of water for the next 500 years of our history. But we have been very careful when we have applied those regulations and in all cases, while we have requested that Newfoundlanders be on it and saw where they are qualified and they have discharged their duties admirably, there has never been an instance where a Newfoundlander has been forced into a job on a rig where he has not been qualified.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I guess I only have time probably for about one more question so I would like to make it a

MR. NEARY: double-barrelled question.
Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if his department ever had any complaints from Mobil or ODECO in being forced to hire untrained men for these rigs? Were there ever any complaints in writing or orally, on the telephone, or were there ever any complaints made about these workers being untrained who had to work especially in the control room, in these very sensitive jobs? And would the hon. gentleman also tell the House if the new regulations address themselves to one of the big problems on board the rig, who was in command of the rig? Will the new regulations make it compulsory for the company to state who is in charge of the rig? Is it the captain or is it the toolpusher, is it the man who has the experience, the master mariner, or is it the landlubber who is only interested in drilling for oil? Who is in charge of the rig, will the regulations address themselves to that problem?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge we have never received any complaints of that nature from the operators of the rig. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, all to the other extreme, we have received compliments, because what has happened is that Newfoundlanders have been put in position and as a result of these local preference regulations the companies, you see, have been forced to train

MR. MARSHALL: Newfoundlanders for jobs, to give young Newfoundlanders the opportunity for employment which they would not have had but for these regulations. And having given them the opportunity then, given that they have the capacity, which they have, they have equal to anyone else, they have been trained, and there are many Newfoundlanders today on oil rigs, not just in Newfoundland but throughout the world, as a result of those local preference regulations, where the young Newfoundlanders have been given an opportunity. And we are very, very proud of that. So in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, we have not received complaints, but what we have received instead, we have received compliments.

With respect to the other question which has been asked by the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman knows, and I think the general public knows, that the whole matter of the command of an oil rig is a matter that is under consideration by the U.S. Coast Guard hearing, number one, and it is under consideration as well, and it will be, by the joint federal/provincial thing.

MR. NEARY: We will not know for another two or three years.

MR. MARSHALL: But we are, as I say, in this and -

MR. NEARY: These rigs are out there now -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you know, the hon. gentleman is the expert on everything. I am trying to give rational answers to his questions now. The thing is that both commissions are seized with this. It is a matter of concern and assessment by them. And just the same, as if anything definite comes up it is shown that there is a necessity to be any change at all with respect to the operation of the rigs, or the provision of life saving devices on them or what have you, and once it is proven that changes have to be made we will see that they have to be made.

MR. MARSHALL: In the meantime, I point out to the hon. member that the question he rises is very complex, and it is one, you know, that the Coast Guard enquiry as well as the federal/provincial enquiry will be seized with.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The rigs are still out there drilling and they should know who is boss.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final question, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to say that we have x number of Newfoundlanders on board these rigs, but I am wondering what monitoring procedures the government have in effect to check on the training procedures, to check on the training methods, to check, indeed, to see if Newfoundlanders are receiving the proper training. It is one thing to say we have 900 workers there, but that does not at all relate to the kind of training they are receiving. So the question, I am wondering what kind of monitoring measures, what kind of monitoring procedures are in effect to ensure that Newfoundlanders are being properly trained?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member does not agree with local preference from the start. He does not agree with -

MR. NEARY: This is a serious matter now.

MR. DINN: And I will treat it serious if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be quiet for a moment.

MR. LUSH: Do not be so inane.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so silly.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, can I answer the question?

June 11, 1982

Tape 1238

NM - 3

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

MR. DINN: The fact of the matter is that just last year, if the hon. member is interested, we went through a very extensive training programme here in Newfoundland. We trained

MR. DINN: over 553 people for offshore related jobs. We have, as the hon. member knows, courses at the Fisheries College. These courses are filled every time that the courses start. We doubled the amount of training in certain courses at the Fisheries College in January and, Mr. Speaker, it is an ongoing thing. It is obvious if we had a new Fisheries and Marine Centre we would be able to train more people and so on.

But right now as an example, Mr. Speaker, we have over 9,000 people, 9,685 people registered. Many of these people are trained. They have all the experience required. Just as an example, our people were so good on the drill off Labrador, on the Pellerin last year, that thirty of them remained with the rig request and as a result of negotiations with the department. They want to keep the people on the rig year-round, they were so impressed with the training that they had.

With respect to, for example, ODECO, when they came in here first to have a look at what we had here with respect to people, when they were bringing rigs in, the gentleman who has been on T. V. just of late opened an office on the 5th floor of the Beothuck Building, and the first day that he opened the office it was filled with people looking for jobs in the offshore and he was shocked and amazed and surprised and, as a matter of fact, went on CBC Television at the time complimenting the Newfoundland people and the people who had come in with their certificates of the amount of time spent on rigs, for example, on the Beaufort Sea and in other areas of the world, and the experience that they had. He actually went on CBC Television and was on there for some minutes complimenting the numbers of people. As a matter of fact, just after his

MR. DINN: first drill off our
coast came into the -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - Department of Labour
and Manpower complimenting us on the workers -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member.
If he would like to finish up the answer to the question, I will
permit him another minute to do so.

MR. DINN: So just to clarify, the
people that we have, as the hon. member can see - there is
a monthly report that comes out on this, the number of
people we have, what their training is, how many people
are trained, and so on. And we have an oversupply of
qualified people in Newfoundland right now, and it is up
to the company to get the best -

MR. LUSH: That is not what is coming
out in the hearing.

MR. DINN: - of this pool of people.
Well, Mr. Speaker, it is
funny when an hon. gentleman or a gentleman comes into
Newfoundland, gets people, goes out in a drill and comes in
and compliments them, and when all of a sudden when something
happens these people are not trained. I find it rather
peculiar.

MR. NEARY: Sit down! Go on you
bluff, boy, sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Please! Before we proceed with
other business

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): I would like to welcome to the galleries the Deputy Mayor of Springdale, Mr. Fred Goudie and councillor Mr. Max Goudie who are in the galleries now. I welcome them to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to report that the government's Resources Committee on the estimates which had referred to it five departments, namely, Head VI Development, Head VII Mines and Energy, Head VIII Fisheries, Head IX Forest Resources and Lands and Head X Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, have considered all these departments and have passed them without amendment.

I would like to thank the members of the Committee at this time, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) Vice-Chairman, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the member for Twillingate (Mrs Reid) and the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid). And, also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a special thank you to the ministers and their officials for their co-operation during our deliberations. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Under Standing Order 23 I move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent and public business. As I indicated in a Ministerial Statement a few minutes ago, we have had a decision by the federal government to amend a certain part of their energy legislation to delay the implementation of a law which would allow for a power corridor through the province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, under Standing Order 23 this matter must be a matter of urgent debate, it must be urgent that it be debated now and I submit to Your Honour that it is a matter of urgent debate. The issue itself is urgent, there is no question about that, because we are losing, as a Province, about \$2 million a day every day that this gets delayed. And although one can say after six months the power corridor will not be built or we will not be transmitting power through Quebec, it does delay, the six months does push everything back six months down the road. So the issue itself is extremely urgent because we are losing over \$2 or \$3 million a day, if not more, in the sense that the power is not being transmitted and the people of Newfoundland are not getting the benefits. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in the matter of urgency of debate, because if this legislature does not deal now, immediately, with this issue and transmit to the Government of Canada and to the parliament of Canada the wishes of the Newfoundland people as translated through this House of Assembly so that we can counteract this measure of delay right

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1240

ah-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: now, then we will have failed to ensure that this legislation goes through immediately and that the interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are protected.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So it is extremely urgent that this matter be debated today, now, so that this Legislature can go on record as opposing this delay in the legislation and go on record as trying to get the federal government and the Parliament of Canada to reverse their decision and allow this amendment to go ahead immediately so that the people of Newfoundland can have an extra six months, when the development is ongoing, of monies available to them the same way as other Canadians would have it if the laws applied to us as they apply to other Canadians. So it is a matter of pressing urgency that this Legislature today debate this matter because the matter has just come up in the House of Commons, last night, and the amendments have just been made. And there is time, if we get on the ball today and debate this matter and get this resolution passed, to influence the Parliament of Canada to change the legislation that is presently before the House of Commons to allow for this matter to be dealt with and to allow the legislation to go ahead immediately rather than six months from now. I am still waiting, Mr. Speaker, for some of the details on the delay, because I am not sure in my own mind, for example, to show you the urgency of the matter, I am not sure in my own mind that the amendment allows for the mandatory implementation of the law after six months or whether the federal government still has the power to delay beyond six months. So that is a matter we will have to get cleared up momentarily. But the urgency of debate is here, Mr. Speaker, because we need now to deal with this matter while it is current and while it is before the House of Commons. And I submit, therefore, that under Standing Order 23 this House adjourns normal - I move, under Standing Order 23, the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, that is, the intent of the federal

PREMIER PECKFORD: government to delay implementation of the power corridor legislation which is so important to our Province. And if we get at it and deal with it now, that is why it is urgent, it is before the Parliament of Canada, we can influence it then and, therefore, I would wish to discuss that now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I think, first of all, the motion and then the statement is passed to the Chair who has to decide whether it is a matter of importance, enough to necessitate an immediate reply.

The Chair has considered this matter and does feel it is a matter that requires urgent public debate and is prepared to recognize the hon. the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was a put-up job.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not the way the thing works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Questioning the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we move that your decision be overruled.

MR. MARSHALL: What is the motion?

MR. NEARY: We are voting against the ruling of the Speaker, that his ruling be overruled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: You are appealing it. In other words, what you are doing with it is deliberately appealing the Ruling of the Speaker.

MR. NEARY: We are appealing, that is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld. Those in favour of the motion, 'Aye'.

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1242

SD - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

"Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The motion is carried.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, can we have a standing

vote?

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

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

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Development, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister Responsible for Communications, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Environment, the hon. the Minister of Health, Mr. Reid, Dr. McNicholas, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Carter, Mr. Peach, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Reid, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Butt, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Woodrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the most please rise.
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition,
Mr. Callan, Mr. Warren, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Lush.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The result of the vote is twenty-eight
for and six against, the motion is carried.

I recognize the hon. the Premier.

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1244

MJ - 1

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed a display of - what shall I call it? It is hard to know what words to use to describe what has happened in this House in the last few minutes. The members of the Opposition have been caught out, Mr. Speaker, on this one. This morning on the media we learned, by way of (The) Daily News and by way of the electronic media, that Mr. Lalonde, the Minister of Energy in Ottawa, introduced a number of amendments to The Energy Act that was going through the House of Commons. That Energy Act had in it a component which allowed for the transmission of Labrador electricity through the Province of Quebec by way of a power corridor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as everybody in this House knows, from the day that the Upper Churchill Contract was signed and power went over the lines from Upper Churchill across the boundary into Quebec, that was the day that not only did we sell out a resource at a very cheap price to another province and thereby lose, now around \$500 million to \$700 million a year, but at the same time as that was done a great principle was destroyed in this nation. And that principle was and it was condoned by the federal government of the day and has been condoned by federal governments ever since, PC, Liberal, NDP or whatever they were, it does not make any difference to me, a great principle was denied the people of Newfoundland. Which is not to say that Newfoundlanders themselves and the Government of Newfoundland was not to blame for what occurred. Because there was supposed to be and is under the Constitution a principle which is supposed to apply to all Canadians who live in this nation and that is, in the transmission of energy products whether they be oil and gas or whether they be hydro electricity,

PREMIER PECKFORD: that the same rights of transmission should apply from the origin of that energy product through neighbouring provinces, that there was not one law for oil and gas transmission and another law for hydro electric transmission. And from that day to this day, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders have become aware of what has happened to this very valuable resource. Not only, of course, did we have a power contract which was signed for forty years and then reopened and the price actually go down for sixty-five years in selling that, not only was that contract bad but there was on behalf of all the parts, and the federal government has to take its share of blame, condoning the rights of transmission not to exist for Newfoundlanders as they exist for other provinces and Canadians in the transmission of hydro electric power being the same as oil and gas. And so, Mr. Speaker, we have laboured under that situation right up to this present day.

 This particular administration when it came into power in 1979,

PREMIER PECKFORD: decided that it was time to really take the bull by the horns and to try to do something about this inequitable situation and, therefore, we established a task force of lawyers, Newfoundland lawyers who examined all the alternatives that were open to us. And we have a result of that task force report introduced into this Legislature a very , very significant piece of legislation called The Water Reversion Act. And it was debated in this House and passed. And we indicated to Wall Street and to all the financial community that we would, before we would proclaim that legislation in which the bottom line says that Newfoundland has control over the water within the boundaries of the Province, that we would have it tested by the highest court in Newfoundland and tested by the highest court in Canada before it would be proclaimed.

And we were joyous indeed to listen and read and hear of the adjudication by the Appeal Court of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland three to nothing that this legislation was valid and sound. And now it is on its way to the Supreme Court of Canada for final adjudication, so that we can, perhaps, change, change over time the present inequitable situation that exists in that contract. That is number one, and we have taken that initiative.

Simultaneous with that initiative of trying to change that inequitable situation that exists in the contract, there was the important overriding principle that in the development of additional hydro resources in Labrador, as well as the Upper Churchill resources which we would hopefully get back, that we would be able to transmit all of that power without having to bargain and barter it away to the neighbouring province which would then

PREMIER PECKFORD: become the middleman and make all the money off it. So that we could get our rights reestablished, not only the existing Upper Churchill contract would be changed to benefit Newfoundland but the overriding principle of being able to transmit energy products through neighbouring provinces the same way as they do with oil and gas through pipelines would be recognized.

So we began discussions, this administration, with the federal government and we did that through the Prime Minister's Office and through the Energy Minister's Office. And we had meetings in Newfoundland, secret meetings in Newfoundland and we had secret meetings in Ottawa. And we persuaded, Mr. Speaker, we persuaded the federal bureaucracy, we embarrassed the federal bureaucracy, they did not have a counter-argument to our proposal that they must, if they are going to maintain that they are a national federal government, that the same constitutional rights are available to the people of Newfoundland as are available to the people of Alberta, that they must make amendments to appropriate legislation to allow for transmission rights for Newfoundlanders who want to transmit their electricity through the Province of Quebec. We embarrassed them and we embarrassed them so badly that at end of all the meetings it was clear to us that this team of federal officials would be recommending to the federal government and to the Energy Minister and the Prime Minister to make changes in legislation which would allow us to not be in the hands of Quebec and to barter away our additional water resources and even the ones will get developed if The Water Reversion Act is upheld in the Supreme Court of Canada.

June 11, 1982

Tape 1245

PK - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And so we were very,
very pleased, Mr. Speaker, very , very pleased to learn
that when the federal government opened the

PREMIER PECKFORD: House of Commons and statements from the Energy Minister, Mr. Lalonde, and others, and Mr. Rompkey, our representative in the federal Cabinet, that they were going to introduce this legislations. It is not exactly what we wanted, Mr. Speaker, because we wanted not only a corridor but we wanted to have, if there is capacity on the existing lines in Quebec, on the existing lines from Upper Churchill through Quebec to the other side of Quebec, that if there were facilities there available that Newfoundland should have the right to use these facilities, pay for them, pay for their charges, but be able to wheel our power through that existing line on into the New York State or into Ontario or whoever bought it. We did not want it free. And if you wanted to have total equality, absolute and total equality, then you should be able to use those existing lines through a decision by the National Energy Board. You would apply to the National Energy Board and if you could prove that there was capacity left on that line through Quebec, then the power from Newfoundland could use that line, pay for its use, whatever the cost was determined by the National Energy Board, by an objective group, determine how much it would cost and to flow on through, Quebec would get paid for the wheeling charges, for putting it through, and then we would sell it to New York State or to the Province of Ontario or whatever customer it was we were going to sell it to. So if you want total equality - because that is what happens now if there is excess in the pipeline coming from Alberta over to even the Province of Quebec, there is a big pipeline and it is not being used to the full, what happens? A utility that has gas or oil out in Alberta can go to the National Energy Board and say to the National Energy Board, 'We, the utility of Trans-Canada Pipelines apply to the National Energy Board to pump so many cubic feet of gas a day in the pipeline

PREMIER PECKFORD: called, whatever it is called, and whoever owns it. And they apply to the National Energy Board and then, if the capacity seemed to be there, they can transmit that additional gas and pay the price that the National Energy Board sets down. So if you want total equality and that is, of course, what any people deserves by right, then we would also have in that legislation a chance to wheel our power through existing lines if the capacity existed there, if there was a surplus there for us to do. Of course, the federal government did not go along with that so they have denied us total equality, but they have taken a step in the right direction and allowed in the legislation that they presented, they have allowed for a power corridor. So we would have to have a piece of land through Quebec on which we could build a line and transmit our electricity on to markets in New York State or the Province of Ontario or whatever customer it would be, as I said earlier. So there has been movement by the federal government and, Mr. Speaker, let it be said loud and clear that it was an embarrassment for the federal government. They have condoned the second-class status that Newfoundlanders have enjoyed on this matter for quite a number of years, all parties. And we were happy to see that at least, although we have not achieved full equality in our

PREMIER PECKFORD: transmission rights, there had been positive, significant movement by the federal government, and in their ominous energy bill they introduced a component in that which would allow for the power corridor so that we could go ahead and get on with some developments in Labrador and have an opportunity to sell it at a reasonable price so that we could make some money off our power rather than just the people of Quebec.

So away it went, and the energy bill was presented to the House of Commons and unfortunately it was the great, large ominous energy bill which many MPs, Opposition MPs argued against. They did not argue against the power corridor but they argued against the great powers that this act would give the Energy Minister in other fields, in the oil and gas field, and so on. Because it was a very large bill that had many, many components to it. And our Conservative MPs from Newfoundland were criticized for objecting to the bill. But what they were objecting to, Mr. Speaker, was not the hydro corridor legislation, or component of the bill, but the rest of the components of the bill which would give wide-ranging powers of ministerial discretion to the Minister of Energy, in the same way as the Minister of Energy now has wide-ranging powers under other acts of the Parliament of Canada. The oil and gas industry are extremely upset with the federal government because of this ongoing ministerial discretion which creates a lot of uncertainty into the investment community and therefore retards the development and exploitation of our resources.

In any case the proposal was there, the component was there and we figured, Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no problem. We had the acknowledgement of the federal bureaucracy, we had the acknowledgement of the federal minister. He went so far as to introduce the legislation. And we were of

PREMIER PECKFORD: the opinion that there was no question, the legislation would be introduced, passed, the legislation proclaimed and then we could go this Spring and make an application to the National Energy Board. As a matter of fact, the Minister Responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall), with the President and Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and their people have been very, very busy in the last two or three months preparing that submission to the National Energy Board, so that the day that the legislation was proclaimed, the next day the Newfoundland Government would be in Ottawa with an application to the National Energy Board, hand it to them, asking for them the movement of some power through the Province of Quebec, and through this corridor which this legislation would provide for.

So we were watching the legislation very carefully. We were getting some signs. The Opposition had indicated that there were members in Quebec who were agitating against it, that the Premier of Quebec and some of the ministers of the Party Quebecois Government were arguing against it and so on -

MR. MORGAN: Going to Ottawa and having big press conferences.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, having press conferences in Ottawa and lobbying. But we did not think that the federal government would ever back down, do a flip-flop on this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that it was clear to the federal government that

PREMIER PECKFORD: we supported this legislation, the Minister of Energy (Mr.Marshall) went to Ottawa and appeared before a Parliamentary Committee on which our position became abundantly clear to all the parliamentarians and to the Government of Canada. It was clear anyway, it was just a facade, it was just a red herring to maintain that the Government of Newfoundland did not want this. We were the ones who had been fighting for it for ten or fifteen years, we were the ones who had embarrassed the federal bureaucrats to recommend to their political leaders to go ahead with this. So anybody who could allege that somehow the Newfoundland government were against the very thing that they had been fighting for for ten or fifteen years must have rocks in their headsto start with. But those allegations were made and we responded to them and so we went to Ottawa. Now during the last meeting,I think it was,that the Minister responsible for Energy had with Mr. Lalonde on the offshore,which was not a meeting at all - this was after the election of April 6th,we get this call from the Energy Minister, Mr. Lalonde indicating that he would like to have a meeting with our Minister of Energy (Mr.Marshall) on the offshore and,of course,we were willing to meet at any time, we have an open invitation out right now for the members of the federal government to meet with us on our proposal,and so we agreed heartily and warmly and quickly to the meeting. And in that meeting I think there was some mention - and the minister responsible for energy can speak for himself later, but I think there was some indication then Mr. Lalonde made,I do not know if it was a threat or a sentence or a phrase,to the extent that,well,the

PREMIER PECKFORD: hydro corridor legislation and so on, you know, almost hinting that there could be problems with it, and so that led us to accelerate our efforts and for the Minister of Energy to appear before this Parliamentary Committee. And, Mr. Speaker, to hear Mr. Lalonde on the radio this morning you would swear that Mr Lalonde was into intensive and extensive negotiations with the Province of Newfoundland and the province of Quebec to try and bring both sides together. And I heard his own voice this morning on tape, on one of the radio stations saying that in consultation with the Government of Quebec and the Government of Newfoundland that , you know, we are going to delay implementing this legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely dangerous, this is something else, because the amendments that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde) put in last night to that bill which delays by six months the coming into force of the power corridor part of the bill, there is no duty or obligation to proclaim that legislation ever. They have nothing put in that legislation which says that it has to come into effect after six months, nothing in that legislation to say that it has to come into effect after six months. It does not have to be proclaimed. There is no obligation in the piece of legislation to proclaim it, so who knows what will happen after six months, Mr. Speaker? If the Liberal MPs - and this amendment was moved and introduced by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde), not introduced by anybody else. They have a majority government so they can talk about how many PCs were against it, and I condemn every single Progressive Conservative in Canada who is against this

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1248

ah-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: hydro corridor legislation, I
condemn every NDP MP who is against this hydro corridor
legislation,

PREMIER PECKFORD: I condemn every MP, of whatever political colour, who is against giving us the same rights as other Canadians. I could not care less what his political philosophy is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And it was moved by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde), and it was seconded by Mr. Lapointe, a Liberal member from Quebec. Now that is who introduced that amendment and that is who seconded that amendment, two Liberal MPs representing the Government of Canada. And they have a majority in the government. So no matter what Mr. Clark, or Mr. Lasalle, or any other PC MP or NDP MP says - you know, you hear the Opposition saying, "Well, some of the Opposition members were opposed to this as well." Well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government in Ottawa in the last year or so has not been very sensitive to what the members of the Opposition have been saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They have not been very sensitive. How come they suddenly got sensitive to the Opposition members on this matter? So, I mean, that is just a red herring of the first order and, as I say, I condemn any MP who stands in his place, who makes known that he opposes this hydro corridor legislation.

Now this was introduced, Mr. Speaker, last night by Mr. Lalonde and seconded by a Liberal member from Quebec. And, as I understand, it has been passed and there was no consultation. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde) was on the radio saying he had consulted and so on. That is completely wrong! We were not aware that they were going to introduce these amendments. And I cannot understand for the life of me how a government in Ottawa who pretends and who

PREMIER PECKFORD: got all kinds of mileage during the constitutional discussions, forgetting about all the other parts of it, all the unilateralism, who got so much - what shall I call it? - so much positive response from articulating that the government and the people of Canada should have a charter of rights, of basic freedoms, democratic freedoms and rights and powers.

Just imagine, here is a government in Ottawa who proclaims and professes to be all in favour of a charter of rights, so you have an individual living in Coquitlam has exactly the same rights as a person living in Toogood Arm. I mean, this is the whole idea of a charter of rights, that everybody under the law is to be treated equally. Well, Mr. Speaker, how can a federal government articulate that position during a constitutional debate and sustain it, when at the same time they are preventing the people in Canada, who live in Newfoundland and Labrador, from having their basic rights of transmission of hydro power from going through the Province of Quebec, while that same Province of Quebec allows an oil and gas pipeline to come from Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Ontario? The hypocrisy of it all, the callousness of the way they can deal with us. And what does it demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, what does this demonstrate? This demonstrates that Canada is not working today because of that Liberal Party of Canada. It demonstrates that the powerful have more rights than the weak, that there is no charter of rights for provinces, that the powerful can dictate to the federal government, the powerful get all the rights and the weak have to pick up the crumbs. That is what is happening in this country today, that because Quebec has seventy-five seats in the Parliament of Canada and Newfoundland has seven - only really two, we only really have two seats, because there are only two people up there standing up for Newfoundland, the other five have sold out long and merry ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But seventy-five is greater than seven, not only quantitatively but qualitatively, that rights do not mean anything anymore. And so now we see amendments brought in last night by the Minister of Energy which will delay the coming into effect of this power corridor legislation. And more importantly and dangerously, if the Government of Quebec and the MPs from Quebec can affect this kind of change so easily in the last couple of months, what can they do in the next six months, Mr. Speaker? They can make sure that this amendment never get through forever and there is no obligation on behalf of the federal government under this legislation to ever proclaim those amendments, to ever see those amendments be destroyed and the power corridor legislation go through. That can be delayed again, there is no obligation to proclaim it. So here we are today in Newfoundland and Labrador, after all the things that we have talked about for years, for decades, facing a Liberal government in Ottawa which has blatantly refused to deal with our offshore dispute with a proposal on the table since January 25th which everybody still ignores. I have not seen anything in the press analyzing our proposal, in any one of the newspapers, on any of the radio stations or the television stations. I think there was one programme done on the chronology of the offshore by CBC television, their special events group, one time, which did a pretty good job on the chronology of events of the offshore dispute. But who has taken our proposal? Some newspapers on the mainland have and done it. And so here we are today with a proposal on the table to solve a very thorny issue which will give Newfoundlanders some chance to be equal to other Canadians which everybody ignores like the plague. And I still hear, everywhere I go now, 'How come, how come you are not sitting down to the table?' And we still hear people attacking the government

PREMIER PECKFORD: as if we are the ones who are holding up some resolution of the offshore. And we are supposed to now succumb to this pressure, we are supposed to succumb to this pressure now, Mr. Speaker. And somehow it is a personality conflict between myself and Mr. Trudeau, that I am the stubborn one, that I am the obstructionist, that I am the confrontationist and all the rest. And we have a proposal on the table, a reasonable proposal, which involves two major concessions by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, that we will forget about our ownership and that we will agree, at some point in the future, we have to get less of the revenue split. Two major concessions are ready and yet we are still being attacked as being somehow unreasonable. Well, Mr. Speaker, so there we are on the offshore and now we have before us what we thought might be a chance to reach some kind of equality in this Confederation over the next ten or fifteen or twenty years, by having this amendment go through, having the power corridor, giving us an opportunity to perhaps, when the Water Reversion Act is declared legal and valid, to have a lot of power on our hands which we could then transmit ourselves through Quebec, pay our charges on the power corridor and make some money, \$300 million or \$400 million a year perhaps into the coffers of the Treasury of Newfoundland. And now we are denied and stymied from doing that by the Liberal government in Ottawa and by any of the other MPs on any side of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: House who have opposed this kind of an amendment from going through.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was why this morning after hearing this on radio, I, in my Ministerial Statement, asked to have the following resolution passed in this House today so that we go on record as soon as is possible to let the people of Canada and let the Parliament of Canada and let the Government of Canada know where we stand. WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland have been second-class citizens in the transmission of their energy products since the development of the Upper Churchill; and WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland deserve the same rights as other Canadians in the transmission of their energy products; and WHEREAS the Federal Government has now delayed implementation of Newfoundland's right of transmission of Hydroelectricity by power corridor through Quebec in total disregard of the basic rights that Newfoundlanders should have automatically; and WHEREAS this delay is being imposed without consultation with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn this action by the Federal Government to delay implementation of the power corridor legislation; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House call upon the Federal Government to stop procrastinating on this issue and give legal effect to the legislation now.

That is the resolution that I want this House to deal with, Mr. Speaker, and to go on record as supporting so that we can send a signal to Mr. Lalonde and to the MPs in Ottawa, on either side of the House who are against this hydro corridor legislation, that this is a sad day and this is a backward step in our efforts to achieve some kind of equality in the way we have to develop our resources in this Province and to provide some finances to get on with the job.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The most dangerous part of it all, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this delay does not necessarily come to an end. It is not mandatory that this delay be six months. This legislation does not have to be proclaimed. There is no obligation for the Federal Government to proclaim it, so we do not know whether the six months is going to be the end of it or what. And every day that goes by, Mr. Speaker, this is the other thing, I mean, they are really rubbing our noses in it, every day that goes by we are losing \$2 million or \$3 million a day on this business of the Upper Churchill and having some way to transmit this power through the Province of Quebec without having to sell it to them. We need this power corridor legislation so that if our Water Reversion Act is successful, then we have the ability to be able to recoup more money from the Upper Churchill development, forgetting all about the Lower Churchill, we can recoup some more money from the Upper Churchill development than we are at the present time, because we will be able to sell directly to New York and other places, with that power that we will be able to get back if The Water Reversion Act rules in our favour, and we have every indication that that will happen, given the Supreme Court of Newfoundland decision.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So here we are again today, Mr. Speaker, once again today into a situation of having something thrust upon us from outside which demands a response from the people of this Province and demands a response from the Legislature of this Province, an action by the federal government totally inconsistent with what they told us they were going to do, they would introduce this corridor legislation, that it would go through and be proclaimed and then we could go to the National Energy Board and make application to get on with the job.

And now we see it delayed six months and perhaps delayed beyond that. So, Mr. Speaker, you know, the long and short of it is simply that we are going to be poor forever more, that this Province will never have a chance to go anywhere, that we are not equal Canadians, that we are still being treated as second class citizens,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and that we just have to stand up and be counted. I guess the easiest thing to do, Mr. Speaker, is just forget it all, let them take the caplin or let them take the squid, let them do what they want with the Northern cod, let them manage the nose and tail of the Bank how they like, let them play games with the fishermen of Newfoundland on the backs of foreigners, let them do what they want on the offshore, let them do what they want on the hydro corridor through Quebec and just sit down and resign ourselves to our poverty-stricken state and every time we get in trouble just apply for another grant from Ottawa through equalization to keep us going. That is the easy way out, that is the out of resignation. I do not believe that the people of Newfoundland, who have suffered through so much since 1497 to this day, want this government or want its leaders in this Legislature to suddenly bow under and cave in to another blatant initiative to keep us from being equal in this country. We are going to fight this and fight the offshore and fight the other issues, and the charges of being unfair, the charges of being selfish, the charges of being confrontationists can come at us from all sides, Mr. Speaker. They can come at us from all sides. We will respond in a rational, decent, reasonable way but we do not intend to relinquish our efforts in establishing those principles - it is, Mr. Speaker, there is no question, we are trying to effect a revolution in this Province without firing a shot. I have said it for the last five or six years and I reiterate it here today. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to change the structural nature of this economy and this society so it will have the same chances of success and affluence and standard of living that other Canadians now enjoy

PREMIER PECKFORD: by right, and that is a revolution of the first order. We have bowed under and governments of the past have bowed under. We do not intend to bow under today, tomorrow or ever until the people of Canada, and Central Canada in particular, and the present government in Ottawa realize that you just cannot do that to a people. You cannot keep a people down forever. I guess the Russians are learning that in Poland, I guess they are learning that in Afghanistan, and I guess throughout the world where there is an oppressed people, people who are not being treated equally to others within the same nation or within the same group, learn that you cannot. Human nature, the human personality, the human soul, will now allow itself to be spurned under through equality forever. The individual personality is such, the nature of the Homosapiens is such that it will not allow it to happen. It will bow under for a short period of time, it will succumb for short periods of time, but in the end, right and truth will win out and in this cause that we have, right and truth will win out. Unfortunately, we have to suffer while that right and truth is winning out. We have to suffer.

So, Mr. Speaker, there it is. I want this hon. House to go on record as condemning this action by the federal government. I want to see us

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1253

MJ - 1

PREMIER PECKFORD: as legislators and as leaders of the Newfoundland community, and representing the Newfoundland people, loudly and clearly proclaim our total displeasure and disgust with a delay to an amendment in the House of Commons last night which will further exacerbate and aggravate an already difficult situation for the people of this Province and for the government of this Province. We are not ones - I have to go in a few minutes, five minutes from now, for a number of meetings. One with the hon. Mr. Gray on the phone, to try to negotiate some agreements for the Province. We will negotiate reasonably and sensibly, but we cannot under any attack from anybody who will try to attack us as being confrontationists, we cannot bow down under principles which are so elementary, really, in the development of any democracy and surely in the development of Canada. How can Canada stand up, how can Mr. Trudeau be in Yugoslavia today and proclaim that he comes from a democratic country. Mr. Speaker, how can he do? He cannot do it. He cannot do it as long as we are oppressed on this kind of legislation. As long as we are oppressed on being treated the way we are on the offshore and on the fishery and the other great issues that face our Province, then this country cannot clearly and unmistakably call itself a democracy nor can it call itself a country that has a Constitution with a Charter of Rights which means anything. They cannot. It is impossible.

So, Mr. Speaker, again we are involved in a debate, critical and historical debate in the history of our Province. We must and we will succeed in persuading the federal government and the authorities in the Parliament of Canada that once again they are doing the people of Newfoundland, the people of Canada, a great disservice in delaying what would have been a great reform in energy in this country which would

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1253

MJ - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: allow for the people of this Province to be treated in the same way as other Canadians have been treated since 1867.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, I have, I guess, formally done it. I propose that the following resolution be addressed and passed in this House:

WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland have been second class citizens in the transmission of their energy products since the development of the Upper Churchill; AND WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland deserve

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the same rights as other Canadians in the transmission of their energy products; and

WHEREAS the federal government has now delayed implementation of Newfoundland's right of transmission of hydroelectricity by power corridor through Quebec in total disregard of the basic rights that Newfoundlanders should have automatically; and

WHEREAS this delay is being imposed without consultation with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn this action by the federal government to delay implementation of the power corridor legislation;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House call upon the federal government to stop procrastinating on this issue and give legal effect to the legislation now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this resolution. I will make them a few words because I know there are colleagues on this side of the House—unfortunately there are none on that side of the House. Of course there are no colleagues of mine on that side of the House, but there are no members, I will say, on that side of the House who will speak.

Can I first deal, because I think I would like to deal with -

AN HON. MEMBER: The former member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is in the gallery.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, perhaps we should ask the former member for Grand Bank to come down and speak but I do not think that the former member for Grand Bank, knowing that he is the person he is, would speak in support of his former colleagues on this anyway. Because I think the former member for Grand Bank is a Newfoundlander and he would see that this is a Newfoundland issue and not a small political issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, can I just spend a few moments talking about the reaction that occurred, that we have seen this morning from the members on the other side of the House, the Liberal reaction. This motion is quite properly put before this House. One of the big problems that we find in conducting the affairs of this House is that the hon. gentlemen there opposite do not know the rules of this House and because, when they do not get their own way, they act in a fit of pique, and they act in the manner that they have this morning through their own consummate ignorance, which really, in the long run, what it does is it just derogates this institution. The hon. the Premier, as any member of this House, got up in this House and made a motion under Standing Order 23 to move the adjournment of the House to consider a matter of urgent public importance that we are now discussing. He gave the reasons for moving it. He passed the piece of paper to Your Honour as he was supposed to do. And I just want to refer briefly to Standing Order 23 (c), "He," that is the mover of the motion, "then hands a statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave." Now, in effect, the rest of the proceedings of that order were carried out, because they were carried out, really,

MR. MARSHALL:

directly as a result of the disturbance that was unjustly kicked up or caused by the hon. gentlemen there opposite in appealing the ruling of the Speaker which, in itself, was an act against the order of this House itself. It should never have been done, it should be done in very limited circumstances and it certainly was not warranted in this case. And Beauchesne says, the House of Commons rules say on page 91, Standing Order 26, 'which is the counterpart of Standing Order 23,' gives considerable discretion to the Speaker in deciding if a subject is a proper matter to be brought before the House! Now the Speaker exercised his discretion and it is a matter of consummate regret that the hon. gentlemen opposite reacted in the way they did. Now the reason why they reacted and decided to attack the Speaker the way they did was not because of the rules - partly because they do not know the rules. They want to invent the rules according to Neary instead of the rules according to Beauchesne or the Standing Orders. But the other reason was because they did not want to debate this resolution, they did not want to debate this resolution. They indicated this this morning when the Premier made his statement under Statements by Ministers. And when the Opposition was offered the possibility, or it was suggested to them that why do we not debate this now this morning and if we debate the resolution then we will come to a vote on it and if it is passed it will be sent to the Parliament of Canada? But they did not want to debate it because it is embarrassing to them. They are out of this House because the resolution is

MR. MARSHALL: embarrassing to them but the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they are really, in sum total, an embarrassment to this House by the conduct which they have chosen to adopt.

Now with respect to this news which comes today, this is another real attack on this Province by the government in Ottawa. We had the feeling that it would happen, as I indicated to the House when I came back from the last discussions directly with Mr. Lalonde on the offshore. We were talking about the situation with respect to the offshore and the possibility of resumption of negotiations. and the basis of resumption of negotiations, and when it was put to him quite clearly that this Province was not prepared to negotiate unless the basic foundations of the negotiations which they choose to call pre-conditions were adhered to, that is that ownership be set aside and set aside permanently in the event that an agreement was reached and that they address themselves to the proposal, when he saw that there was no way that he was going to be able to wheedle and weasel through that and to try to get us off on a different track from that, and he saw that he was not going to bring about what he had hoped to bring about, which was the capitulation of the government he said in the course of the conversation and it was almost like an non sequitur, he said.

'By the way, this power corridor legislation that is encompassed in Bill C108,

MR. MARSHALL:

I have heard no support coming from the provincial government'. And, you know, this came as a bolt from the blue, It was not related to our particular discussions then and it came as a great deal of surprise as to how any minister, any minister in the federal government or any minister in this government or any person in Newfoundland, any person connected with the Government of Canada, could possibly make a statement like this as to the support of the people of this Province for the power corridor legislation. Because was it not before the House in actual fact? And they well knew it was before the House because of the pressures that had been exerted over the years by this government and its predecessor. So there was no doubt-at the time my immediate reaction was to him, 'Are you telling me now, are you advising me now that the power corridor legislation is not going through?' And he in his usual way, he said, 'I am advising you of nothing'. He looked out the window then, I do not know what he was contemplating, he was contemplating something. And I do not think the hon. gentleman can see us for reasons, but I will not get into that, But he was contemplating something. And then I added a few extra words as to ask him how anybody in the Government of Canada could possibly make a statement like that, that it was a travesty to the people of this Province that we did not have the rights to transmit electrical power in the same way as oil and gas, that each day that this was delayed was an act of injustice against the people of this Province. So it was made quite plain to him and it was put to him quite plainly, as the offshore issues were put quite plainly to him, yet, be that as it may, I had the feeling, which was reported to the House and the record will show it, that I had thought that this was the beginning, and I hoped it was not, that this was the beginning of them pulling back from their undertaking to

MR. MARSHALL: provide a power corridor through the Province of Quebec. And I am very much afraid that the news that we have received this morning not, mind you, from the Government of Canada to the Government of Newfoundland on a matter of great importance to the Government of Newfoundland, not by that method, no, that is not the way in which they deal. There has been no call, there was no call to the Premier, there was no call to the Department of Energy, there was no call to any minister of the government with respect to their considering that after having given us their undertaking that they would supply it, no, we had to read it in the press. And we heard it the same way as Mr. Chretien, or whatever his name is- they still have not learned from the excesses and the arrogance that Mr. Chretien did when he came down and talked to the Liberal Opposition. That is the way in which they did it. Perhaps they talked to the Liberal Opposition, I do not know. Maybe that is one of the reasons why the gentlemen departed the House today, because they were afraid when they get up on their feet that they would be found out, that they were in league with them. I do not know what the reason was, but certainly there was no direct comment.

MR. MARSHALL: on this very important matter with the people of this Province.

Now it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note, to note the difference in their judgement, the judgement of Central Canadians toward this Province as it does with respect to other Provinces. The power corridor is contained in Bill C108, I have a copy of Bill C108. And when we refer to Bill C108 we have a tendency to say, 'Oh, yes, that is the bill with the power corridor legislation'. And so it is, it has a section in there providing for the transmittal of power. But it contains much more than that, Mr. Speaker, it contains sections in this for the benefit of the federal government, for the federal government, in other words, to accumulate additional power, discretionary power to itself in the energy field, over industries in Canada, and over generally the entire area of Canada. It also contains a provision there asserting jurisdiction to the offshore off this Province, it refers to offshore Newfoundland and it gives the Governor-in-Council power to make regulations with respect to the offshore.

So it has various elements, one of which was the power corridor legislation. Now are the other elements not being enacted I wonder? Are they being delayed for six months? Are they not being proclaimed? I dare say that they are being proclaimed, Mr. Speaker, because it is in the interest of the federal government to proclaim them. They want that but they do not want the power corridor legislation.

Now, I do not know by what mechanism the six months has occurred. I know the bill passed second reading. The bill was in Committee. At this date I assume that the bill went through third reading. And, I would assume, that what has happened is that Bill C108

June 11, 1982

Tape 1257

PK - 2

MR. MARSHALL: is going to be proclaimed with
the exception of sections pertaining to the power corridor.
I do not know whether, because, as I say, we have had no
official communique from them, whether or not

MR. MARSHALL: there is any procedure whereby there is automatic proclamation in six months. Perhaps it says that sections relating to the power corridor will be proclaimed in a six month period of time, I do not know. But even at that, the federal government can make the change and they can withhold it. The very fact that they are withholding proclamation of this for a period of six months is a crime against the people of Newfoundland and a continuance of the tragedy which is precluding us from the purpose of bringing an effective energy policy insofar as the same can be brought about by the development of our hydro resources in this Province. And it is just totally and absolutely unacceptable.

All we are asking, all we have always asked the federal government and all that is ingrained in this bill is the right for this Province - and I underline the word 'right' as the Premier has said - to have the same ability to be able to transmit its hydro power as oil and gas, in other words, the same rights to be able to market its commodities of commerce as other provinces have. If that is going to be delayed to us - and not delayed, I wonder whether it is just going to be delayed or whether it is going to be denied? If I had any bets to put on the table, I would say that this is a backing off by the federal government forever, not just for six months but forever from their commitment to provide the power corridor legislation. And for what purpose? There are two or three purposes that we have heard of from time to time and in one case Mr. Lalonde, when he was speaking some time ago, actually offered that he could be the mediator between Quebec and Newfoundland. Now, the hon. gentleman -

MR. MARSHALL: after we consider Mr. Lalonde actually to have made an offer that he be the mediator between Newfoundland and Quebec, I wonder whether there are too many people in the Province of Newfoundland who would want Mr. Lalonde, knowing the way Mr. Lalonde and his fellows, Mr. Chretien and Mr. Trudeau and these people have dealt with us in our relations, and the difference in which they deal with their fellow Canadians in the Province of Quebec, whether the Province of Newfoundland would ever accept the mediation of Mr. Lalonde. I doubt it very much, And I doubt very much, unless his head was very much inflated at the time, that he really proffered it seriously.

The other reason, Mr. Speaker, was, if you will review the Committee hearings before the House of Commons on this bill, there was a Mr. Baribeau, the Chairman of Hydro-Quebec who appeared before the Committee and gave certain comments on the effect of the corridor amongst other things. He gave also comments about the general bill itself and disagreed, as most

MR. W. MARSHALL:

provinces do, with the discretionary powers in that bill. But with respect to the power corridor legislation, what the hon. gentleman did - and at the time it was rather interesting, I think it is an indication of the way the Committees of the House of Commons were operated. Mr. Simmons who was very interested, by the way, the day before being on the Committee, and he was not a member of the Committee, when I was there, in order to try to paint and push the federal line on offshore which he supports, and which is going to attempt to take away from the people of this Province their rights and the way in which - he wanted to be there that day, but the next day, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Baribeau was there and as a Newfoundlander he could have added a great deal of weight if he wanted to cross-examine Mr. Baribeau, it was not convenient for Mr. Simmons to be there so he stepped aside for one of his colleagues, to Quebec, who went in. Mr. McGrath, the member for St. John's East, the federal member, was there at both hearings and acquitted himself admirably.

Now with respect to Mr. Baribeau and the statements made by the members of the Committee, the nature of his refrain was a power corridor is not going to be economic, you know, we are not really worried about this power corridor. And this is the tactic that the gentlemen in Quebec are attempting to portray that, 'Oh it does not really matter.' Because they are trying to derogate our efforts and our plans, and they are trying to show that they are not feasible and what have you. But that is not the information which we have. But there is no doubt about it that if you read the transcript of that hearing you will see that the feelings of the Quebec members were able to be soothed quite a bit by statements along this line.

So, I have no doubt that Minister

MR. MARSHALL: Lalonde and his tribe in Ottawa have told their seventy-four members in Quebec, 'Do not worry about it. They are kicking up a fuss down in Newfoundland, they are kicking up a fuss for rights, we will start to delay it now for six months but there will be further delays, the thing will never go through, and we will proclaim it at some time when it actually becomes economically feasible.' And that is the purpose, Mr. Speaker. I would say that that must be the purpose of their so-called delaying tactic. Their delaying tactic is just being put there. We warned the Liberals that this is what was going to happen, that they were going to delay and they were not going to pass the bill and now it has happened. And I will predict that they will do, they being, Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau who are in league with Mr. Baribeau and Mr. Duhaime and Mr. Levesque and our Mr. Neary and Mr. Simmons, they are all in the same unsavory barrel, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: And Mr. Rompkey.

MR. MARSHALL: And Mr. Rompkey, yes. Mr. Rompkey very aptly named Mr. Rompkey, because the key is there and it is the rump, and it is the federal rump and Mr. Rompkey

MR. MARSHALL:

knows where to find it and he kisses the rump of the federal government every day, and Torngat Mountains and the whole, you know, and the whole tribe, Mr. Speaker, who are not speaking up for Newfoundland on this matter. This is the aim, as I say, of Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues, it is to deny Newfoundland. And let there be no mistake that this is another black day again for Newfoundland, that what we had been promised and what had been held out to us that we were going to get we are not going to get, and this particular action by them is disgraceful, it is insupportable, and it is another indication of the fact that the federal government is prepared to treat us not as equal Canadians in the Canadian Confederation.

Obviously we have to have that power corridor. We happen to be - aside from PEI that has no hydro potential, we are the only province in Canada that does not border on the United States, aside from PEI. So we have to have a power corridor through the Province of Quebec. And how can you plan anything like applications to the National Energy Board, talks with the Power Authority, State of New York? We have had those. We brought all the plans, Mr. Speaker, along as far as we possibly can. But how can this Province in a meaningful way go any further unless we have that power corridor legislation? And where does it give them the right to turn around and deny us this particular right? This right that we have, it is a right that we should enjoy as all Canadians. It is not for them to sit down and say that a project in Newfoundland is not going to be economically feasible. It is not for them to say that Newfoundland cannot find markets for the hydro power. It is not for them to turn around and say it is engineeringly infeasible and these things, these are considerations that we have. Certainly there are going to be problems in the development

MR. MARSHALL: of the hydro power. But our fellow Canadians in other parts of Canada have no right to preclude us from making these plans and proceeding with these plans.

By this particular act today they once again delay it, and I have no doubt at all, because I have no trust and no regard for the way in which the federal government is operating towards this Province, and the way in which they think that in the colour of the Minister of the Crown of the federal government that they can make statements, and they can make statements which do not comply with the facts, and they feel that because they are ministers in the government that they are going to be accepted as such.

That is the type of cynicism that we have seen throughout their regime, particularly in the past two years. It is the type of cynicism that has been evidenced by this action because this is once again, make no mistake about it, a broken promise to the people of Newfoundland. Now I wonder what Mr. Rompkey, and I wonder what Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Rooney and Mr. Baker, and Mr. - what is his name?-Mr. Tobin, are going to do with respect to this I wonder if the hon. gentlemen having seen, and having sat in a caucus in the federal government- which is attempting to take away from us our birthright on the

MR. MARSHALL:

offshore, and they have been crowing about this power corridor, I wonder what they are going to say now? Are they going to continue to sit and support the federal government against the people of Newfoundland? They talk about the two federal members of Parliament, the two Conservative members on the federal side, and their abstention. There was a very good reason. They did not abstain from the power corridor, these two members, they are on record, and the record is quite clear, of supporting it and supporting it just as vigorously as anyone on this side of the House and as 90 per cent of the Newfoundlanders. And they have pushed for it as hard as anyone.

But the fact of the matter is, anyone, anyone looking at a bill like this Bill C108 would have to vote against it. How can they vote for a power corridor on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, which they know is going to be full of pitfalls in the future and under the control of the Federal Cabinet, in any event, and at the same time - but even if they voted for the power corridor, they would be voting in this bill under Section 83 of the bill, in agreement to the user pay thing by the federal government and of Ottawa of offshore ownership jurisdiction because it gives them power to make the regulations with respect to the offshore. It also gives them powers, as they have already indicated and others have already indicated, with respect to discretionary powers over the industry itself which is bad. So they were presented with a bill which was not a bill with respect to the power corridor but which was a bill which was against the Province of Newfoundland on the offshore. And make no wonder they would have to abstain, something good put in and something disastrous. So what do the gentlemen do? There is no doubt as to their position, but there is doubt as to the position of the five federal members.

MR. MARSHALL: Now I wonder if the five federal members are going to be putting up with this, if they are going to continue to put up with the assaults against the Province of Newfoundland; or whether they are going to stand up with the people of Newfoundland at long last? And their only course of action that they can take is to depart from the Federal Caucus. Here we have

MR. MARSHALL:

promise after promise heaped on this Province, we are going to have a power corridor, we are going to have this, we are going to have that, we are going to have the other thing. They do not come to pass, sir. They were going to negotiate and they refused to negotiate - this is on the offshore, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lalonde comes down and he looks the people of this Province in the eye and he says, 'Oh, we are not pushing the offshore jurisdiction in court', when at the very selfsame time their lawyers were in the Federal Court of Canada to his knowledge, and pressing over the objections of the other parties to the offshore issue. We have Mr. Chretien who comes down here and, you know, the disgraceful conduct with respect to the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. And we have that act by the Supreme Court of Canada that this government is not through with yet, by the way, but which is not subject to this debate. But let us not forget, when we are thinking of the acts against this Province, that particular decision, and we will be dealing with that in due course, in another clime and another time. And then we go on and what happens? Mr. Chretien gets on VOXM the other day and he says there were twelve- - what did he say? - there were twelve -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Precedents.

MR. MARSHALL: - precedents, he said, twelve precedents. He tells the people of Newfoundland there were twelve- there were not twelve precedents, he was caught out once again in the House of Commons on that by the member for St. John's West, the member for St. John's West researched it. The fact of the matter is, certainly there is right for direct reference to the Supreme Court of Canada by the federal government but it had never been done. And we say again and we underline, it has never been done by a federal government, when a matter of important of this nature has already been referred to the highest

MR. MARSHALL: court of the Province by the Province so vitally concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: So that is not only news for Mr. Chretien, that news for the five judges of the Supreme Court of Canada too. If they want to take that, they can take that and digest it as well.

MR. SIMMS: Who believes Mr. Chretien anyway?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) so very ably says, 'Who believes Mr. Chretien,' and that is the reason for my remarks. Who believes Mr. Lalonde, who believes Mr. Chretien, who believes Mr. Trudeau?

MR. SIMMS: Rompkey.

MR. MARSHALL: - well, Rompkey is only a little camp follower. Who believes, you know, these three wise men who, dressed up in their panoply of ministers of the Crown of all of Canada, of all of the Canadian ministers feel that because when they speak, they speak so *ex cathedra* from their seats as ministers of the Crown that every one is going to believe them? Well, the fact of the matter is I dare say, Mr. Speaker, now, that not even the deepest Liberal except the blackest ones on the other side-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - that not even the most deepest Liberal in the world will believe a single, solitary word of these three ministers or the Government of Canada. And if anyone needed any reason to disbelieve the Government of Canada and its intent and its sincerity to the people of Newfoundland, and I think the heads of the churches could well take note of this as well, the heads of the churches could well take note of this as well, if they want any manifestation of their capacity to believe in the federal government and the federal government's

MR. MARSHALL:

attitude to the people of Newfoundland, just look at this one final act that the federal government, the latest act, the latest knife in the back in the nighttime that has been dealt to the people of Newfoundland, yesterday, in this power corridor legislation. The time has come for the people who represent Newfoundland in this Province, in the federal caucus as well as the hon. people there opposite, but at least we have them under control, that the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - members the creature is a Chretien and they should stop being creatures of Chretien, creatures of Trudeau and creatures of Lalonde and stand up on their own two feet for the people of this Province. Because if we had people in the federal caucus who were prepared to stand for Newfoundland, we would not today have this fiasco on the offshore, we would not today have this business of denial once again of the power corridor legislation, we would not today have a Province that is the poorest province in Canada, we would have instead a province that is ascending towards an income equal to the average income of Canadians, with employment at the same rate as we proposed in our proposal, the taxes down to a reasonable level and what have you. But we have not got that, Mr. Speaker, we got - the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), I always refer to her when I refer to the male but I know she will appreciate, she will allow me to say this, that we have boys in men's jobs, Mr. Speaker, and it is time to flush them out of it.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.CARTER: Before we address the question, I think, although the hon. Premier and the President of the Council have discussed this in very wide-ranging terms, I do feel there are a couple of points that they have left out and a couple of very important points. I would like hon. members to consider for a moment if they would what it would be like if the shoe were on the other foot. Imagine if it were feasible technologically to transmit power from Quebec to Nova Scotia across Labrador, and imagine if this Province were blocking efforts by Quebec to do that. You can imagine the outcry, you can imagine the all night sittings in the House of Commons in Ottawa while we were put in our place.

SOME HON.MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR.CARTER: There would be no hesitation whatsoever in putting us down as quickly as possible and, by the same yardstick, if New Brunswick were blocking

MR. CARTER: the transmission of Quebec power to New York State. Now I understand that New Brunswick has made an amicable arrangement with Quebec to transmit their power through to New York and, you know, it has not been broadcast very widely because this deal was made very quickly, quietly, and sensibly. And I just think it is a great tragedy that we cannot do the same thing.

Of course there are seventy-five reasons why Ottawa will not enforce this legislation.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Well, actually I think it is seventy-four, seventy-four Liberal members in Ottawa elected from the Province of Quebec. And I do not wish to pour salt on the wounds of Canada because we are divided between French and English. I think it is one of the great tragedies of Canada that such division has occurred. I suppose the reasons for the division initially are historical, but the reasons for the intensity of the division is the present Liberal Party in Ottawa which has been pandering to Quebec, because the Ottawa Government is really a Quebec Government and it is really a French Canadian Government and that is very unfortunate.

You see, I have often wondered why we cannot make a deal with Quebec. It is not because they are stupid, the people in Quebec are as intelligent as anyone else. It is not because they are criminals, the Mafia are able to make deals, the various families of the Mafia in New York State apparently are able to make deals with each other. It is not because they are criminals, it is not because they are stupid, it is not because of any reasons like that, it is because we operate on a different wave length than they do. The Province of Quebec sees itself as owning or having the

MR. CARTER: major ownership of most of Eastern Canada. All of the Province of Quebec, all of the Province of Labrador, half the Province of New Brunswick, a large portion of the Province of Nova Scotia, a considerable portion of the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, everywhere where there is a French Canadian minority and where there is a French Canadian majority, as there is in Quebec, they see as the natural part of the Quebec state, and, therefore, for them to even consider in their wildest dreams that they would allow power from Labrador to be transmitted through the Province of Quebec it just does not make sense to them. And it disagrees with their deepest thoughts in their psyche.

Now I am very sorry that the Opposition decided to boycott this debate.

MR. CARTER: We have a collection here of thirty pieces of silver, taken up from a number of the members of the government. In fact, I did not happen to have quite thirty pieces of silver on me so I went around and collected the balance. So this represents, by and large, a donation from the members of the government, and I would like the page to put this on the Leader of the Opposition's desk, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: I would suggest that they do as Judas did, go out and hang themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: However, I think it is a tragic day for Newfoundland, that the Opposition should carry on like this. And so I certainly support this resolution. I only wish I had ten votes instead of one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this matter. It will be recalled that this morning when the Premier asked for unanimous consent to have this resolution debated it was denied by the Opposition, and they went on and said that they said that they welcomed this six month postponement and said that this would provide a breathing space to negotiate. Now I think what needs to be pointed out is that since the first Conservative Government was elected in this Province in 1972, that was with the Moores Administration, and continuing with the Peckford Administration,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: negotiations have been on and off but there have been numerous negotiations for the past ten years since the first Conservative Government was elected. Negotiations with the Bourassa Administration, the Liberals, and negotiations with the Levesque Administration, the Pequistes. And in the negotiations there is always one matter which becomes paramount and that is the border between this Province and Quebec, the question of the head lands of rivers which are located in our Province. In other words, the negotiations always centre in on the question of our territorial integrity and after ten years that has never ceased. The only point I want to make in reply to that point made by the Opposition, they welcomed the fact that the power corridor legislation was not going through, they welcomed it because they said it provided a breathing space to negotiate. Ten years has been a long breathing space, and every time the question has come down to the territorial integrity of the Province. And certainly one can negotiate all kinds of things, but why should this Province have to bargain its territorial integrity which was recognized in the 1920s by the Privy Council, which is recognized in the Terms of Union, and which, because of the strong position taken by this government, by the Premier and by this government, cannot be changed now in the new constitution but which under the old unilateral formula, under the unilateral action could have possibly been changed because there was no guarantee that the amending formula would not be changed. So it is only through the initiative taken by this Premier and this government that the constitution gives iron guard, absolute protection to our territorial integrity, if not there would have been the possibility, under the Trudeau unilateral constitutional

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

initiative there would have been the possibility of a change to a border without the Province's consent. So even now that is finally recognized in our constitution. And the only point I wish to make is how absurd it is to expect Newfoundland - no other province - but for Newfoundland to have to negotiate its own territorial integrity with Quebec or anybody else. We were not willing to accept a constitution which would have made it possible - how likely I do not know - which would have made it possible for our borders to have been changed without our consent because there was not a requirement for unanimity in the amending formula. That is the way it worked, there was in the Trudeau - the unilateral constitutional proposals supported by the Opposition opposite, supported by them, because there was no guarantee with respect to the amending formula. It could have been altered. The amending formula now is unanimity, there can be no change in the amending formula of the constitution unless every province agrees. Previously, with the unilateral Trudeau proposal, supported by the Opposition, that would have been possible.

The only point I wish to make is this, that it is absurd after ten years of negotiations, which have always come to the same thing, that is our territorial integrity, to think that we are going to barter our territorial integrity to be the only people in Canada who should be required to put their territorial integrity on the line when that is never discussed with any other province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Any other differences -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: it never has come to a question of the territorial integrity of a province, and to suggest that they welcome this postponement of the power corridor legislation to give a breathing space when there have been negotiations for ten years which have always focused in on our territorial integrity, is to be totally blind to history and to what has happened in the past and, I would even go so far as to suggest, to the inherent right

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

of Newfoundland to its territory of integrity and that is not something which has to be bargained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, even though our friends opposite are not here, I think there may be a number of people who would want to speak. I certainly did want to say a few words, because this is a resolution which will go to the Federal Parliament and I think the Federal Parliament should understand that there were strong feelings and people wished to voice them. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much time. But one is stuck by the similarities again of the Upper Churchill situation, the Labrador power situation but particularly the Upper Churchill situation and the offshore situation. When Labrador power situation and the offshore situation. When we just look at the Upper Churchill the first desire was to develop. We had a resource, we wanted to develop our resource. Now to develop the resource we needed to transmit the results of that development. And what happened? It was blocked. And who blocked it? It was blocked by commission, by an active intervention by the Province of Quebec, and it was blocked by omission by the federal government in that they did not at that point in time say to Quebec, 'You have no constitutional right to block the transmission of power from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to other parts.'

So there was blockage there by two agencies, the Province of Quebec actively, and the federal government by neglecting our constitutional rights. And I must add, Mr. Speaker, that the other problem was that the provincial government at that time did not stand foursquare in favour of our rights and push the point.

DR. COLLINS: Rather than that they went ahead with the development under blackmail. That is all one can say, that the Upper Churchill was developed but under threat of blackmail. And the only thing we got out of it were the jobs at the time and all the continuing benefits went to someone else who did not own the resource, i.e. the Province of Quebec.

Now, as I say, the similarity with the offshore is very striking. We have a resource out there and we have a desire to develop it. But now to develop it you have to control it and manage it, and this is what we want to do. We have a desire to develop, and necessarily we must have control and management. And what happens? We were blocked. And who blocks us? We are blocked by the federal government.

We then accommodate. We say, all right, well, we will not totally,

DR. J. COLLINS:

ourselves, manage and control, we will do it jointly. And again what happens. We are blocked, we are blocked by the federal government. Now we have two moves to make next. We can do like what happened up on the Upper Churchill, we can throw in the towel and say, all right, we will do it under blackmail, we will get a few jobs now, but the continuing benefits, who knows.' Or we can stand up for our rights, and that is what this government has done over the offshore. We will say, 'We have been as reasonable as we can, we have accommodated, we have compromised, we have come more than half way, and if you are still blocking us we are not going to just lie down and play dead, we are going to stand up for our rights! And that is what we are now trying, by this resolution here, to do with the Upper Churchill now. That showed have been done right at the beginning. We are now saying that we are going to stand up for our rights on the Upper Churchill just as we have demonstrated all through the piece that we are standing up for our rights on the offshore. We are saying to the federal government, 'It is a piece of nonsense to say that we will agree to a six month hoist just so that some nebulous, global agreement can be made over Labrador power! We say that is a piece of nonsense, because what is a global settlement? The global settlement is that Quebec will perhaps give a little on the Upper Churchill but then take more on the Lower Churchill or the Five Rivers or whatever. You know, what nonsense is that. Why should we, to get our rights on the Upper Churchill, have to barter away part of our inalienable rights on the Lower Churchill and on the rivers. We should not be taken in for one minute by this global settlement- That is just to obscure the fact that we are again being asked to give away part of the rights that no other province, as the hon. the Minister for

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1268

MJ - 2

DR. J. COLLINS: Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) said, 'No other province has ever been asked to give away.' So I wholeheartedly support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P. WALSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up to much of the time of this hon. House.

Some months ago when this bill, C108 was introduced in the House of Commons, I predicted then and I predict again, it will die on the Order Paper for many reasons, one of them being we have five individuals who claim they were elected to represent Newfoundland in the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, that was the most untruthful thing they have told the people of Newfoundland and ever will. They are there to protect and aid the social policies of the Liberal Government of, Mr. Trudeau.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: I do not know how to say this, I may be kicked out of this House. I do not know if the public of this Province is aware that Mr. Trudeau some years back spent two and a half years in the University of Peking. And that university, Mr. Speaker, teaches only two things, Socialism and Communism. Now we see what is coming at the end of his studies at that university, him and his colleagues. Now

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the gentlemen in the Opposition chose to walk out on this debate, very unfortunate. They too have conned a certain percentage of the people of Newfoundland, That they would represent the people in this Province in this House, untrue! They also got themselves elected to support the policies of the Trudeau government in Ottawa and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my citizenship from this Province and this country if this House or if any member of this House, and very obviously we have them in the Opposition, refuse to deal with the 500 years of punishment, starvation and cruelty this Province has gone through. And I do not want to stand here and let anyone believe that this government or any other government or any other person standing in this House would go through that and allow it to happen again. I am not a very effective speaker, Mr. Speaker, but there are a few things that have to be said. Now the hon. gentlemen have not got the intestinal fortitude to stand in their places to defend Newfoundlanders and the future of Newfoundland, their children, their grandchildren, and their children. Well, that is too bad. They all should resign. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they should be all deported from the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: I am just sick and bloody well tired of the rhetoric that these people get on with over there. They have never stood up, from the time that I came in here, yet, truthfully, and defended the rights of Newfoundlanders, not one of them. What is gone is gone and the present ones are doing the same thing

MR. WALSH:

now.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH:

And, Mr. Speaker, we can go back to Churchill Falls and the original contract. Some of the people of this Province and maybe some of the members of this House do not know the facts. There was not even a politician that signed that agreement with hydro Quebec. And there is a letter from the then Premier who sat up in that Chair, still alive, giving the contractor, the main developer, the authorization to go ahead and make a deal with hydro Quebec. Now we want a simple thing— we have the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls ready to be developed and the only reason why we cannot development them is because of the blockage by the province of Quebec and the federal government who are all as one— So we can make a decent living, not mentioning they give us back—and sit down and renegotiate the contract on the Upper Churchill, which was the biggest giveaway in the history of this whole world, the whole universe, never heard of it before, the biggest joke, political joke in the history of politics in the universe. It will never happen again. It only could happen in Newfoundland with the aid and abetting of the federal government and the Quebec Government. And these people over there and their cohorts in Ottawa, Newfoundlanders they call themselves, are still abetting the same policy. Now what in the name of God

MR. WALSH:

are we supposed to do, go out and hang ourselves? No, we are the whipping people of the Trudeau policies. It is very simple, Mr. Speaker, they have lost their destiny to be self-sufficient by the '90s. The only way to become self-sufficient in this country of Canada is through Newfoundland Hydro and offshore oil. They have got us on our knees, they are going to keep us there if humanly possible. And these people over there and their cohorts, the five in Ottawa so-called representatives of the people of Newfoundland, are doing the selfsame thing. It is despicable, Mr. Speaker, disgraceful! They should all be flogged! As to my hon. friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and his forty pieces of silver, I would gladly contribute to it and the rope to go with it. There is a meaning for it for any of these people who have the audacity to stand and call themselves representatives of the Newfoundland people. There are certain words you are not allowed to utter in this parliament, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, and there are ladies present on top of that. But I can assure you I could ream off some beautiful descriptions of the human beings they call themselves, and what they represent, they claim to represent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough before I blow my top and say the things I am not supposed to say.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, just to add my support to the resolution, since I heard the news report this morning I was giving some thought to why, I think the question is why the federal government wants to delay the implementation of this bill for six months. It is quite interesting, because we have here in Newfoundland which we claim as our

MR. ANDREWS: property, two of the greatest energy resources in Canada, one is under water and the other one is water. There seemed to be no delay in the federal government's desire to take us to Court on the energy resource that we have under water. As a matter of fact, they almost tripped all over themselves to get into the Supreme Court of Canada as quickly as possible. I find it rather more than passing strange that they now are willing to wait an extra six months with the tremendous energy shortage that we have in this nation today. Once again the question is why? Obviously I would suggest that it is the power of the seventy-five Quebec M.P.s who sit in the House in Ottawa, and, as the Premier said, it is the power of a strong Province to be more equal under our new constitution in this country than a weak province. That must be totally unacceptable to us as Newfoundlanders, or to any Province in Canada that would find itself in a similar circumstance. Bill 108, had a lot of debate in the House of Commons, it was, and still is

MR. ANDREWS:

hopefully, the solution to ten years of impasse between one province of Canada and the other. We are unfortunate that we are situated geographically in the position that we are. We do not have a common border with the United States, we have a common border with only one other province which, once again, happens to be Quebec. And I think it is despicable that the nationalistic feelings of the Province of Quebec are being used to block the development of another province and also to block the development of hydro-electric energy for the whole nation of Canada.

We have always said, with our resources that we have, and in particular the offshore resources on the Continental Shelf, that we will not block development; as a matter of fact, we are quite willing and eager to share with the rest of Canada. It is for the benefit of Canada, because we are Canadians. Even though we are Newfoundlanders. We are Canadians. I would remind the people of Quebec and the French politicians in the Province of Quebec who sit in Ottawa, the M.P.s, that they are also Canadians and they have a responsibility and they have a right to share with us and with the rest of Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS:

We cannot let this so-called global package be the basis of whether or not this corridor through the Province of Quebec takes place or not. Once again, as has been said this morning, it is infringing on our territorial integrity. That issue has been put to bed, put to bed on at least three occasions right now, and I do not think it can be brought to the public again. There is no need of it. We are certainly

MR. ANDREWS: not going to give in any way.
The actions taken by the
Leader of the Opposition and his seven followers today
are an indication of the short-sightedness that that party
has had in dealing with the hydro resources of Labrador
since the early 1950s.

I think that is all that has
to be said. Their actions speak for themselves. But
I would suggest that this government and the people on
this side of the House will not give it away as it was
given before.

I, personally, would like to
see the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls flow into
the Labrador sea forever before we give one inch of
Labrador soil or the concessions that we will be asked to give
by the Province of Quebec.

That is all I have to say,
Mr. Speaker, and I support the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRETT: I do not think it is necessary to get into any lengthy debate on this particular point. There is no question that we on this side of the House are very supportive of the resolution put forward by our Premier.

It certainly, Mr. Speaker, shows up what I have viewed as the sinister thirteen who represent this Province in the Liberal Party. We have got five gutless wonders in Ottawa, and now we see the confirmation of five gutless wonders in Newfoundland. Here we have a situation again being presented to us whereby this Province is being sold down the drain, is being ignored, its rights are being forgotten, torn up, and yet these people, presumably here representing the people of this Province, or some of them, not even having the decency to sit in the House of Assembly this morning, to engage and be a part of this debate.

This resolution that is so important to the lifestyle of this Province, a resource that is flowing into the sea untapped, that we should have access to markets to allow the development of that not only to bring benefit to this Province but to bring benefit to a lot of society in North America, and we are now being blocked on this particular issue and here we have supposedly eight legitimate representatives of some of the people of this Province who have not got the guts to sit here this morning and stand up and tell it the way it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, we have been very fortunate in this Province, and we have got four major God-given resources that our people can use if given half a chance to eke out some kind of a living within this

MR. BARRETT: confederation of ours. We have got fishing, we have got forestry, we have got hydro, and we have got offshore.

Mr. Speaker, all but one of these involve federal government consent for us to properly take advantage of these resources. We have seen the members opposite and those in Ottawa condone the federal government dealing away our fish stocks at the expense of Newfoundland fishermen, at the expense of the Newfoundland economy,

MR. H. BARRETT: seeing our fish plants shut down because they cannot get enough stock, seeing our fishermen unemployed, and at the same time deal away this fish stock, deplete the stock, the resource of this Province, without any consultation, without any regard for the lifestyle of the people living in this area of Canada. We have these people across from us who are absent now this morning, condoning this action, allowing it to go on, perpetrating this insult to the people of this Province. We watch them condone and sit in mute silence while Trudeau, and Lalonde, and Chretien, these federal bunglers try and pillage away our rights on the offshore, not allow us to have a fair share in the development or in the economic gains that could come from it. We watch them sit over, the normal flip-flop artists, supporting that federal position. It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker, how they have got the nerve to come in here and represent people who are part of this Province? Now, Mr. Speaker, we see a further degradation to these so-called Liberals, They further perpetrate this Province's inability to share in the equal status that other Canadians do. We see that now they do not even want to be a part of a resolution condemning the federal government on putting in abeyance not just for six months, probably forever, this Province's right of access across another province for an energy resource matter that is unheard of in any other Province in Canada, would not be condoned in any other part of Canada, it would have the whole country up in arms, the whole bloody country, not just this Province, not just some people in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.

MR. BARRETT: I will guarantee you, if they took that right away from Ontario, if they took that right away from Quebec, you would hear the noise and the clamour, and you would hear the press and you would hear the radio and the television.

MR. BARRETT: They would be in the United Nations about it, not in Ottawa, not up talking to Trudeau, Lalonde, and Chretien. Mr. Speaker, these people have turned their backs on not only Newfoundland, they have turned their backs on the very people who put them here to represent them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, words would fail to express the contempt that we should have for these people, who are supposedly representing this Province in the federal government, the federal cabinet, and here in the House of Assembly on the Liberal side.

MR. TOBIN: It is shameful.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I must suggest to you that me, on behalf of my district of St. John's West, fully support this resolution.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Pleasantville.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this is another

MR. J. DINN: sad day for Newfoundland. When this administration came to power in 1979, wisely or unwisely, fortunately or unfortunately the Premier made me Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. BARRETT: A good move.

MR. DINN: And day in and day out I get calls from people in Newfoundland about jobs, I get the monthly report and the statistics in Newfoundland about the highest unemployment rate in Canada, and I see with the resources that we have, the forestry, the fishery, the mining, offshore oil and gas, hydro resource in Labrador, I see the fact that daily we are being robbed of just about everything.

MR. SIMMS: Right on.

MR. DINN: You cannot put it any simpler. Robbed is the only term that you can use that adequately identifies what is happening. Forestry we have some control over and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that since 1979, a better management regime for forestry could not be put in place a has been done by my colleague the hon. the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Fishery we have very little control over. And what is happening in fishery? During the election last month, I was in St. Lawrence where they wondered why their fish plant was not open. I was in fifteen districts during the election and saw in many of the fishing communities, plants closed because there was a lack of supply, and low and behold, we found out a few weeks ago that a 159,435 metric tons of our fish was given away, robbed and given away. It amounts to about 3000 man-years of jobs in fishery alone, about 3000 man-years of jobs, one little item. It has nothing to do with the federal government sending down a few crumbs or a few handouts,

June 11, 1982

Tpe No. 1274

MleP-2

MR. DINN: it has to do with a policy of giving things away. The hon.the Minister of Finance(Dr.Collins), when he stood up to say his few words talked about the few jobs that we got for the Upper Churchill. The Premier spoke about the dollars that are going daily, \$2,000,000 a day, because we do not get our rights. Mr. Speaker, this is going to continue

MR. DINN:

if we let it. If we had every member in this House of Assembly with the same ideas and policies as eight hon. members Opposite, this would go on forever. But it is not going to go on forever. We are going to win it, not because just Newfoundland indicated that they are totally opposed to what this federal government is doing to us but it is going to become increasingly aware to our fellow Canadians that it is just not right, it is just not reasonable, it is just not human, it is not dignified for a democratic country to operate that way. So, it is not going to go on, Mr. Speaker. In Western Labrador we have iron mines and virtually the same thing happens there. We have our 3500

or so jobs in the mines, but they farm out work to Quebec. That is not going to go on much longer, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow it, we cannot let it go on much longer. So, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things that we can do and certain things that we cannot do. I would suggest to the Premier that we just get on with what we are doing, continue to oppose these inequities, these disgusting things that are happening. We just got a constitution that guarantees certain rights for provinces, and certain rights for the federal government. One of our rights is education. And they have a bill before the House Bill C-115 that ignores provincial rights in education, ignores provincial rights. There is not a province - I have talked to all my colleagues. I spent yesterday afternoon talking to Ministers of Labour and Manpower across this country. There is not one of them who agrees with this bill that is before the House. So, Mr. Speaker, it is going to stop. Unfortunately, I do not have enough time to outline all the other things that are happening, the

June 11, 1982

Tape No. 1275

RA - 2

MR. DINN: Premier has to clue up the debate, but I will say this, they will never get our offshore, they will never get the Lower Churchill, it will flow into the sea. And we will get our rights and it is going to come pretty soon. Because not only the people of this Province are sick of it but the people of Canada are becoming more aware of it. And we just have a couple of years to get rid of the dictator that we have in Ottawa. He thinks this is a kingdom and it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): If the hon. Premier speaks now he closes the debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House very long. I just want to make three points in the closing of the debate. Number one is the statements by the Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) as it relates to - he is going to give six months for Newfoundland and Quebec to try to get together. You know it is incredible. We have been negotiating with Quebec from about 1974-1975 to 1981. Mr. Lalonde talks in his statement this morning about a global agreement and all of that. The last time I had detailed talks with Mr. Levesque was a couple of years ago in Vermont, where the Premier of Quebec talked the same way, about a global agreement. They have always talked about a global agreement. But a global agreement to them is doing some minor adjustments on the Upper Churchill, nothing significant at all and then allowing for the five rivers to be developed mainly by Quebec and the power passed over to Quebec. There has even been some talk of changing the border between Labrador and Quebec and talk about joint development of the Lower Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been down this road long enough with the Province of Quebec on trying to do a global agreement. We spent five or six years trying to do a global agreement. We cannot get an agreement which is acceptable to the Province. Besides which, by entering into agreements again or negotiations with Quebec, you are acknowledging that the rights of transmission for electric power are not the same as they are for oil and gas. And why should we have to negotiate rights? Rights are rights. Everybody should have the same right all the way across this Nation. So to even acknowledge any additional negotiations is to acknowledge that we are somehow second-class citizens when it comes to

PREMIER PECKFORD: the transmission of our electric power. So that is a basic, fundamental principle that has to be recognized here.

So what Mr. Lalonde is really saying is that, 'I really do not recognize that the people of Newfoundland have the same rights to transmit electric power as the people of Alberta have to transmit oil and gas'. Because by indicating that he wants negotiations to go ahead, that is what he is indicating. There is no time for negotiations. It is time for action by the federal Government of Canada to implement fair play throughout all this Nation. That is number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, since I opened the debate I found out on some investigation that up until last night there were three things in the bills that were presented to the House of Commons, the hydro corridor legislation was part of two other components. The amendments that were being realized were part of two other components of the Energy Bill, three things together, hydro corridor and two other things dealing with energy policy in Canada. But when they brought in the amendments last night the two other components were taken out and hydro corridor was left by itself to be at least six months and longer if they want it to be. So, what they have done is - in other words, they can within a six month period, go ahead with the other two components of the Energy Bill and make it law, but they reserve the right not to make the hydro corridor component law after six months. Right up until now hydro corridor component was part of those other two components. But by

PREMIER PECKFORD: taking a positive action to differentiate between the two components and the hydro corridor component, they are showing their hand, and their hand is that they will reserve the right not to even declare that law in six months.

The other point is just the length of time. If we had the hydro corridor component passed today by the House of Commons, then we would have to apply to the National Energy Board, we would have to go through public hearings and that would take a year or two years. This delay now puts any kind of development or transmission through Quebec back another couple of years, not six months, because the process that is in place after the legislation goes into effect in any case means a long process of public hearings through the National Energy Board and then to the federal Cabinet who has the final decision in any case.

So, Mr. Speaker, those three points should point out the necessity of this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Is the House ready for the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ready.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the resolution 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against 'Nay'.

MR. BARRETT: It is unanimous.

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution is carried unanimously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Division! Division!

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

All those in favour of the resolution please stand:

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); the hon. the Minister responsible for Communications (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews); the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House); Mr. Reid; Dr. McNicholas; Mr. Aylward; Mr. Stewart; Mr. Carter; Mr. Peach; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Barrett; Mr. Walsh; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Butt; Mr. Hearn; Mr. Woodrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: All those against the resolution please stand:

I declare the resolution carried.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, before moving a motion to adjourn, in respect for the passing of Mrs. Goudie and knowing that a number of members of the House wish to attend her funeral on Monday, I move that the House adjourn until 3:00 p.m. Tuesday.

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