

Vol. 2

No. 6

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
MARCH 11, 1983
10:00 A.M - 1:00 P.M.

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I know the gentlemen in the Opposition will be glad to know that I have another few Telexes. I will summarize two of them and read two of them. First of all, yesterday, after the statement made in the House during the day, I received a Telex from Mr. Mason of Mobil Oil responding to our stop drilling order, which indicated that Mobil and its participants had considered the matter, they had previously, as you know, had given indication that their rigs had moved off the Banks. But he did state in his Telex quite clearly, and I think the press already had it, 'We again ask both of you' - this is addressed to myself and Mr. Chretien - 'as Ministers of the Crown to convene a meeting to be attended by yourselves, your technical representatives and Mobil as operator for the purpose of discussing our respective technical studies on safety and attempting to reach a consensus on Winter drilling.'

Almost immediately, within ten minutes of receiving that, I extended an invitation to Mr. Chretien to attend such a meeting, and that has already been given to the press as well. Another Telex came in from Mr. Chretien, I believe it was last evening, and the press are aware of it. I will just read it, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want anyone to think that there is any comma or anything that I am leaving out of it. So I will read it; it is relatively brief as opposed to the type of Telex that I send.

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, it says, "Prior to receiving your Telex and Mr. Mason's Telex of this afternoon" - prior to his receiving mine, he received Mr. Mason's - 'my officials in COGLA' - COGLA is the federal counterpart to the Petroleum Directorate - 'had already convened a technical meeting to be held tomorrow morning in St. John's to discuss matters related to safe operations of the two drilling rigs which have temporarily moved off the Grand Banks while waiting for pack ice to pass. This meeting will be similar to those which have been held on a regular basis over the past several weeks and to which your officials have always been invited. Mr. Leo Brandon, Chief Engineer of COGLA, has invited experts from COGLA, the Coast Guard, and the Newfoundland Petroleum Directorate to meet at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning' - this is now, at the present time. 'This will be followed by a technical meeting with specialists from Mobil, Smedvig, and Sedco, which are the companies directly involved in the operations offshore.

"The type of issue to be discussed include

MR. MARSHALL:

frequency of ice reconnaissance by flying vessels, distribution and numbers of stand-by vessels, methods to free rigs and anchor chains, improvement of ice detection by radar, and preparations for towing rigs. You will note there is no reference to search and rescue.

"I believe that a technical meeting with this type of agenda is best left to experts without the presence of ministers. I have spoken to Mr. Mason about this and he is in full agreement". After Mr. Mason's telegram to me, Mr. Mason, all of a sudden, is in full agreement. "Therefore, while I would be happy to see you again, I do not think that it would be appropriate in the context of highly technical discussions. I will, of course, receive a report about the outcome of the meetings, and I will be guided by the advice of my officials in any decisions I might have to make once the present temporary pack ice conditions change. At that time, I would be more than willing to see you if you so wish." So the meeting then is left up in the air.

I have responded, Mr. Speaker, with the telex that is presently going to Mr. Chretien, and it is as follows, and I will read it to the House in total. "This is in response to your telex of last evening replying to my invitation to meet in St. John's on Winter drilling. I have to express extreme disappointment that for the second time in a week you have declined my invitation for a timely meeting over the matter. You indicate in your telex that Mr. Mason concurs with your position that such a meeting is unnecessary. With respect I feel Mr. Mason is quite capable of speaking for himself. He did just that in his telex of yesterday when he suggested a meeting be convened with both of us in attendance to reach a consensus

MR. MARSHALL: on Winter drilling. In response to this suggestion and with a sincere desire to see a resolution of this critical matter, I immediately extended the invitation for an immediate meeting which you now reject despite the obvious desires of Mr. Mason, the other participants, myself and any person interested in a speedy, rational resolution of this matter. A meeting merely of our technical representatives is no substitute. When a previous technical meeting was requested for the purpose of assessing the advisability of issuing our order to cease drilling and return to port, we stated we had all the technical data necessary upon which to base a decision. Your response now forces us to state the obvious fact that events of the past few days conclusively prove the wisdom and correctness of issuing that order."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: "We certainly do not need further technical meetings to understand Winter drilling must cease this year. Indeed, we can all be thankful that the obstinacy of the oil companies and the federal government did not purchase this understanding at the expense of yet another tragedy and that there was a sufficient weather window to permit these rigs to moved out of the path of oncoming ice flows.

"While we believe a technical meeting to be no substitute for the meeting with ourselves and the companies with technical advisors, I have, nevertheless, directed officials of the Petroleum Directorate to attend this meeting. It is my hope that the Directorate can impart its obviously superior knowledge of conditions so that there can be a full appreciation of the situation. It must be understood, however, that my officials' presence is not to be construed as an indication on the part of the provincial government of any

MR. MARSHALL: diminishing of confidence in its conclusion as to the inadvisability of continuing Winter drilling in presenting forecasted weather and ice conditions in its resolve to see the rigs remain in port until these conditons abate. In the meantime,I feel it extremely important that our meeting take place as quickly as possible. When we have the experience of rapidly deteriorating weather conditions and advancing ice flows and difficulties in bringing the rigs to port, surely we do not need further technical data to deal with the matter. Surely neither of us can permit drilling to take place with the spectre of oil rigs fleeing advancing ice packs and ice bergs looming before us.

"We have the data of the International Ice Patrol indicating this to be the extremest year in recent history for ice. No sane or rational conclusion can be drawn other than that the rigs must remain in port until ice and weather abate sufficiently. I am alarmed by statements reportedly coming from your office the rigs will return. Surely, in view of what has happened you are not going to force Mobil to return merely to prove the federal government is in charge.

"It is obvious we need an immediate meeting to discuss these self evident facts. We can then determine when the rigs should return, discuss the necessary questions of adjustments and reassessments of guidelines, the effective presence of search and rescue and other necessary points. Most of all, we can try to establish a co-operative basis and understanding which is so badly needed to deal with offshore matters. I therefore once again tender an invitation for that meeting.

MR. MARSHALL: "Regrettably, events require me to deal with another matter in this Telex and this relates to the reported removal of the rigs to Nova Scotia. The first public suggestion of this came from your colleagues in the Opposition of the Newfoundland Legislature yesterday in Question Period when they rose the matter. Indeed, they seemed to positively exalt in the possibility. This was followed by statements reportedly coming from you and your assistants stating the rigs would be moved South to Nova Scotia. There is no reason why these rigs should not be brought to Marystown. It is an ice free port. It is the nearest port. It is the port to which rigs off Newfoundland have always been brought for servicing and inspections. This was pointed out to Mr. Mason yesterday who appeared to readily understand it.

"I can only conclude the federal government has once again given directions to Mobil as you so obviously flex your muscles with your newly perceived power. It is obvious that if the rigs are taken to Nova Scotia instead of their customary port it will be at your direction. What a distastefully spiteful act and attempt to punish Newfoundland for being right."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: "If this is a ploy to attempt to garner support among the very few of the business community who have been advancing your cause here, I can assure you it will not be condoned by the majority of the commercial community here.

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly all Newfoundlanders and particularly the people of Marystown, will view the action as an act of retribution against Newfoundland merely for persisting in its rights and what has proven to be in the interests of safety and welfare of its people. A copy of this telex is being forwarded to the member of parliament for Burin-St. George's, who undoubtedly will wish to assess how he can possibly support the Government of Canada and represent the interest of the people of Marystown on the Burin Peninsula at the same time in view of this action."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: "I regret that your reactions force me to reply in this vein. It is a matter of record that yesterday I treated the decision magnanimously and refrained from styling it as a victory or vindication. Where, however, I see the interests of the people of Newfoundland being run over in such a roughshod fashion, I must respond accordingly. It is our desire to be co-operative and I trust you will reciprocate accordingly.

"In summery, therefore, I wish to make it clear"-and this is practically in baby talk, Mr. Speaker, so the hon. gentlemen there opposite can understand it in crystal clear fashion - " Number one, We agree to attend any technical meeting and to freely exchange relevant data. Two, there must be a political meeting between us, the oil companies and officials to develop and refine joint guidelines on Winter drilling. And, three, the rigs should be taken to Marystown, the nearest ice free port, and the customary place for servicing and inspecting rigs off Newfoundland."

Now that constitutes the telex, Mr. Speaker. And I can only say this, and I can

MR. MARSHALL: say this in all sincerity, as soon as that wire came in from Mr. Mason yesterday, right here in this House I dictated an answer to it by sending a wire to Mr. Chretien. I extended for the second time a very sincere invitation for him to come to St. John's. Normally I would go anywhere else, but St. John's is obviously the obvious place to discuss this matter. Unfortunately he has not seen fit to accede to this particular request. And I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of some regret, because the gentleman had no problem at all coming down to Newfoundland when he was Minister of Justice to announce that they were referring the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Neither did he have any problem at all of coming down like that, zip-zap, as soon as the negotiations were over to try to castigate the position of the Province of Newfoundland. But yet he cannot find his way clear to come down on such a matter of obvious importance and safety and security to the drill rig operations out there. It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker, it certainly makes you wonder, it has to make us all wonder

MR. W. MARSHALL: what Newfoundland is in for for the future. It is quite obvious from our point of view that perhaps we should reassess our position. On the one hand, if this is what is going to be meant by total management of the resource by the federal government, we have got an example of it here. We have contended very generously that there should be joint management. Maybe we should reassess it, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened and say that the only way that the offshore can be operated effectively at all is going to be through sole management by the Province of Newfoundland because obviously from 2,000 miles away -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - from 2,000 miles away, Mr. Speaker, one's perspective is somewhat blunted and it obviously is blunted and it obviously, Mr. Speaker, in view of such a critical situation as this we have seen the person who is the head of the department, who should be here and should have responded to this invitation without any reservation whatsoever, who should be here we have seen does not have the time to come down here. Now he never had time to sign the permits for the British Petroleum offshore - we know that - until the last minute, and if they do not have time, Mr. Speaker, to spend the necessary time and attention to the offshore of this Province, I think their best bet would be to cede to the people who have shown in the past few days that they know how to operate it and manage it effectively.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is blunted is the hon. the gentleman's thinking. What

MR. S. NEARY: we have heard, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. the gentleman is the latest chapter in the ongoing controversy between the administration and Ottawa. It is getting to be like a soap opera, Mr. Speaker. Every day now in this House we have telexes, and Ministerial Statements that are designed for two reasons. Mr. Speaker, all this week what we have been hearing is Shoe Cove and the oil rigs, and why are we hearing this, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will tell the House why we are hearing statements similar to the one just given by hon. gentleman. These are diversionary tactics. These are tactics that are deliberately designed to distract from the real issues in this Province. We have not yet this week, we are meeting a week -

MR. G. TOBIN: Stuck with your friends in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence please from the lap dogs?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are here one week in this House and we have not heard about Burin or Gaultois or Ramea, we have not heard about Corner Brook or Buchans or Labrador City, we have not heard about the crisis in the fisheries, we have not heard about any of the real issues facing the

MR. NEARY: the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is deliberately bringing in these telexes and ministerial statements to divert attention from the real issues that are facing the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman gets up and speaks as if he was in complete command and control of the offshore. The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that three judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court, three Newfoundland judges -

PREMIER PECKFORD: He is happy about that.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am sad about it because -

MR. TOBIN: A judge wrote a report about you but you do not have the courage to resign.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants to speak, I will give the hon. gentleman the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Appeals Court, three Newfoundland judges in their opinion stated that the offshore belonged to Ottawa. Now the hon. gentleman is ignoring that fact completely. The hon. gentleman would prefer to play politics with this very serious matter rather than face up to the fact that the Newfoundland Appeals Court said to the whole world, 'Ottawa, you own the resource.' The hon. gentleman took a unilateral decision, no prior consultation with the people whom the three Newfoundland judges said own the resource. The hon. gentleman is proceeding as if he was the boss and he is flexing his muscles and he has no muscles to flex,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker. The administration had been stripped of their authority, they gave it away, the Premier threw it away. When the Premier referred the matter to the Newfoundland Appeals Court he gambled with our offshore treasure and he flung it away. And now, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to make amends by dragging in these red herring issues. They are trying to flex their muscles and they have no muscles left to flex.

I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that this is no way to carry on negotiations to try to resolve the settlement of this matter. It is no way to come -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do you want a meeting?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says he wants a meeting. Mr. Speaker, a number of meetings have been requested by the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) and the Provincial Minister (Mr. Marshall) refused to attend. Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was invited to a meeting convened by the Federal Minister of Energy.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!
The hon. President of the Council, on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is out of order. As a matter of fact the hon. member is always out of order. The fact of the matter is I was never requested by the Federal Minister of Energy to attend a meeting, I have always attended - the only meeting that was attempted to be convened at a certain period of time was to be convened for the purpose of trying to give the public impression that this

MR. MARSHALL: Province was going to reassess the decision it made after assessing all of the cold hard facts, and we would not do that, Mr. Speaker, we could not do it and the events of yesterday proved why we would not do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

I have to rule it is not a valid point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, all these

ministerial statements and

MR. NEARY: inflammatory political statements that are being made by the hon. gentleman, mean and nasty political statements made by the hon. gentleman, are getting us nowhere. It is not bringing about a resolve of the problem. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can waltz in here day in and day in, make ministerial statements, release Telexes that he sent to Ottawa and to the companies, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is that the rigs are coming in and unfortunately they are not coming to Newfoundland because of the hon. gentleman's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh,oh!

MR. TOBIN: Because of your friends in Ottawa, the clique in Ottawa.

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

MR. NEARY: - because, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier threw away whatever rights we had to the offshore. Instead of sitting down and negotiating an agreement, the hon. gentleman gambled with our offshore treasure and he lost and his name will go into the history books.

MR. TOBIN: Is this not typical of what the federal government will do (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could you keep the Burin lap dog quiet?

MR. TOBIN: Burin finally has a voice in this House.

MR. NEARY: The Premier's name will go into the history books as a loser, as a failure and, Mr. Speaker, it

MR. NEARY: seems to me that they will never learn. They are still on a disaster course as evident by the so-called ministerial statement made by the hon. gentleman today, who has the face to talk about joint management and then goes off and makes a unilateral decision. Joint management, how are you? All they are interested in is playing politics, Mr. Speaker, and when the hon. gentleman hints at the administration reassessing its position we all know what the hon. gentleman is driving at. We all know about his anti-Canadian, anti-Confederate attitude. We all know about the Premier's separatist statements. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the next thing we will hear is separatist statements from the Premier again.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Order, please!

The time for the hon.

Leader of the Opposition has expired.

Before we proceed, I would like to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the North Harbour-Colinet-Harricott-Mount Carmel area, led by the Development Association of St. Mary's Bay North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is on the run, let us really make him run. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to table in this House a further telex that I have sent to the Prime Minister of Canada as a follow up to a number of other initiatives that we have been taking over the last number of weeks.

The telex reads as follows: 'My dear Prime Minister: In the last few weeks I have contacted you requesting that you intervene in a decision made by your government to close the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. I have gone as far as to suggest that if it means saving the valuable facility the Government of Newfoundland is prepared to assist in funding the operating cost of the Station. To this date you have not responded to my proposal. I understand in the next week some of the equipment will be removed if action to save the station is not taken now. Many of your own agencies have expressed in writing support for keeping this Station open. I just cannot understand why your government insists on this closure. If you will not agree to our latest proposal that both Governments help in the operating cost, and while this remains our preferred position, I am now proposing that the Government of Newfoundland is prepared to operate the station totally on its own.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'All we request from your government is that the Station, with the equipment now in place, be passed over to the Government of Newfoundland for a nominal sum.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, let it just be said as a follow up to the Ministerial Statement earlier this week explaining the valuable function that this facility now plays and, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the valuable contribution that this facility can play years and years

PREMIER PECKFORD: down the road, it is not for now that we are putting this proposal on the table, It is not for now, it is for the future, Mr. Speaker, that we put this proposal on the table. We have some private sector companies who have a proposal now in to the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) to assist us in operating the station. We have a number of proposals which show that after five years this station can

PREMIER PECKFORD: pay for itself. So here we have a very high technology facility which with some modest upgrading over time, over the next three or four years, can pay for itself and help contribute to the high marine technology that we are trying to develop through C-Core, NORDCO and all the other private industries that are around that we now have a special programme for. So I am appealing to the Prime Minister of Canada that if he will not through his government jointly help us operate it, because they say they have no money - they have a \$30 billion deficit, they have money for building convention centers in Windsor, Ontario, but no money for keeping a very valuable, high technology station open in Newfoundland. It does not seem right to me, Mr. Speaker. That is all right, we have no money either, but we will scrape the money somewhere, Mr. Speaker, And now we are putting it on the table for the Prime Minister, so let him show his sensitivity now to Newfoundland. We will, this small, tiny Government of Newfoundland, will operate this facility totally on our own if they will leave the equipment where it is and give it to us for a nominal sum. That is all we ask of the federal government. We will operate it, we will get private enterprise, we will somehow get the thing working the same way as we did with the synchrolift the same way as we did with NORDCO. Who has been operating NORDCO? NORDCO is going to break even this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: They got out of NORDCO three years ago, now it is breaking even. They are getting out of the Satellite Tracking Station in Shoe Cove now, five years from now we will stand here, with fifty to two, and say that the Shoe Cove Tracking Station is breaking even.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I were the Prime Minister I would answer the hon. gentleman in the affirmative. I would say that we would be very glad to pass this over to you for one dollar and have you spend hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions of taxpayers' dollars of Newfoundland on an obsolete, worn-out, inadequate tracking station.

Mr. Speaker, it just goes to show how far the hon. gentleman will go prove his point. The hon. gentleman has been wrong on that tracking station so far, he has been completely wrong. The tracking station cannot penetrate the clouds, it cannot penetrate after dark, it cannot track ice, it cannot track icebergs and in their wisdom the scientists -

MR. H. BARRETT: Why did the Feds put it there for in the first place?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman.

PREMIER PECKFORD: What I said was sound.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was proven by the media and by this House, by the Opposition, to be wrong, incorrect. He misled the people and now he is going to further try to mislead the people by his theatrical antics in this House, Mr. Speaker. It will cost the taxpayers ultimately millions of dollars and they will have nothing in return for it. How will the people in Burin how will the people in Ramea and Gaultois and Fermeuse and

MR. NEARY: Bell Island and Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Labrador West and Corner Brook, how will they feel, Mr. Speaker, when they hear this statement from the Premier that he can find the money to keep an obsolete tracking station open when here you have communities threatening to be wiped out, Mr. Speaker? How will they feel? How will Harbour Breton feel? How will Grand Bank feel? How will all the communities on the Premier's -

MR. WARREN: How will all the people on welfare feel?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how will the people on welfare feel when they hear this? How will the sick people feel when the budget is brought down and they are forced to close hospital beds? How will the professional people feel when they get a tax wacked on them in the budget by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. Leader of the Opposition's time has expired.

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, on March 31st, 1983 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, on March 31st, 1983, in just twenty days-time, the Canada-Newfoundland Subsidiary Agreement for Rural Development will expire. It is my purpose today to report to the House of Assembly on the status of negotiations towards a renewal of federal and provincial support to rural development in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, fifteen years ago the rural areas of our Province were in a state of economic decay and social trauma. This was a time when governments, both federal and provincial, tried to transform our Province into a replica of North American urban industrial life. The conventional wisdom of the day was for governments to assist in the process of rural decline by offering residents incentives to move to towns and cities. Between 1953 and 1975 more than 28,000 people became the subjects of a radical forced migration experiment, called the Resettlement Program, and more than 200 communities disappeared completely. What governments were saying to our rural people was that their skills and their way of life was redundant, an anachronism that could not be tolerated.

It was the rural people themselves who sent a clear message to their governments that they valued their way of life and wanted it to be preserved, not as a museum piece, but as a prosperous and viable alternative to urban life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOUDIE: It was through organizations like rural development associations that this message was communicated, and it was through these same organizations that the prospects for rural economic revival came to be identified and pursued.

In 1974 the federal and provincial governments signed an extremely important compact, the general development agreement. This agreement, which was to last for at least ten years, specified the direction which government support to economic development was to take.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the primary objective of that general development agreement to the House today. The agreement states: 'The broad objectives of this agreement are to increase the number and quality of

March 11, 1983

Tape No. 249

SD - 3

MR. GOUDIE: long-term employment opportunities
and improve access to these opportunities by the people of
Newfoundland' - I will add Labrador - 'and to

MR.GOUDIE: increase opportunities for people to live in the area of their choice with improved real standards of living."

Our two governments had recognized, in this objective, the legitimacy and reasonableness of build the economy upon the traditions and values which characterise us as people, not in spite of them.

Since 1974 the federal and provincial governments have cost-shared their respective commitment to this objective through the ARDA 111 and the Canada-Newfoundland Rural Development Subsidiary Agreements. During this time Regional Development Associations have grown to 51 in number representing more than 508 communities and 45 per cent of our population. In the last five years rural development associations have assisted more than 14 departments of government in economic development and expended in excess of \$37 million on development projects, creating more than 1,200 jobs and enhancing the productivity of a further 5,000 jobs- in 1981/82 alone.

The support to small businesses provided through our federal-provincial agreements has stimulated more than \$8 million in investment and created more than 800 long-term jobs in the private sector. The crafts marketing programme which helps our more than 800 crafts producers overcome the marketing costs for their products, in 1982 was directly responsible for \$700,000 in sales.

The rural development programmes extend employment, income and economic opportunity to all of the Province so that people can "live in the area of their choice with improved real standards of living." The rural communities of this

MR. GOUDIE: Province are not a backwash or a poor cousin to the towns and cities. While elements of our rural lifestyle are under attack from external elements like the seal hunt protestors, we have been able to say that both governments have tried to direct public investment for economic development to support our rural way of life.

We have also been able to say that both governments have co-operated and collaborated in rural development despite differences which exist in other areas of intergovernmental relations. Both governments provide financial and implementation support to rural development programs and officials from both governments manage the decision-making boards and committees involved in the allocation of funds. It has been, Mr. Speaker, a singularly effective partnership between the federal government, the provincial government and the rural people of our Province.

In June, 1982, our government submitted "A Proposal for Integrated Rural Development" to the Government of Canada. The five-year proposal calls for the expenditure of \$39 million in support of rural development associations, crafts development, co-operatives and small business. We have yet, Mr. Speaker, to receive a formal response to our proposal which has now been in federal hands for almost ten months.

Since the time of our original submission both the Premier and I have had several meetings with federal ministers in an attempt to elicit a response on federal intentions for a continuation of our rural development programmes. We have been advised that the federal government might look favourably upon a two-year extension to our existing

March 11, 1983

Tape No. 250

ah-3

MR. GOUDIE:

programs at a value of
\$3.5 million per year, to afford the federal government
with sufficient time and opportunity to review

MR. GOUDIE:

the impact of their recent reorganization in regional development strategy.

While the assurances we have received for an agreement extension are encouraging, we have but twenty days remaining before all rural development funding will be discontinued. There are 2,000 rural Development Associations volunteers, 50 co-ordinators with the Associations, hundreds of people working on Association sponsored projects, 800 craft producers and numerous small businesses who are anxiously awaiting a firm indication as to what will happen.

Mr. Speaker, our government, my department, stands ready and willing to sign a new agreement. Our commitment to rural development and to the objectives of the General Development Agreement is unrelenting and without reservation. The ten years of federal/provincial co-operation in rural development has been to the benefit of the people of this Province, and so it should be, for they are our masters. The purpose of governing is to serve the people whom we represent. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that our federal government stands by its commitment to the General Development Agreement and to the rural communities of this Province. A firm indication of the federal government's intentions on the Rural Development Agreement will be an act of service to our people. It will remove the fear and insecurity which has been created by the absence of a firm statement that the partnership between both levels of government and our rural communities, which has matured over ten years, is the compact for the future which we had all understood it would be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Another phoney issue.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised
that the minister would come in today with such a statement,
knowing full well that the agreement will be extended for
at least six months or a year. The minister knows full well,
and the members on that side know full well that within twenty
days time that agreement will be extended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Talk about twenty days,
MR. Speaker the oil rigs moved off the Grand Banks within
twenty days. So the twenty days do not mean a thing, Mr.
Speaker. All it means, Mr. Speaker, they are
playing with words and the minister knew full well before he
brought in this Ministerial Statement that the agreement is
going to be extended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised
with all the lap dogs on that side commenting back and
forth, The minister has admitted that the 1,200 jobs and the \$37
million from the last agreement are about to expire.
Does the minister realize that those Big Bad wolves in Ottawa
are paying 90 per cent of this? Ninety per cent of the
Rural Development Agreement is paid by the Big bad wolves in
Ottawa. So what have this government done with the rural
areas of this Province? This government have not done
anything for the rural areas of this Province.

MR. NEARY: I did not think you wanted
Ottawa money.

MR. WARREN: All this government is worried about is the Shoe Cove station. Would the Premier -

MR. NEARY: Joint! Everything is joint! Ninety/ten is joint.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder is the Premier going to send a telegram or a letter to Prime Minister Trudeau now if this agreement falls through and say, "We will pay for rural development." No way! The Premier has not got the intestinal fortitude.

MR. NEARY: Take the money you are going to spend on Shoe Cove and give it to the Rural Development Association.

MR. WARREN: The Premier does not have the intestinal fortitude to come out publicly and stand up for the rest of Newfoundland outside of the Overpass. The Premier does not have that much fortitude, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the hon. House, in fact the minister already knew it, that this agreement is going to be extended. There has to be a restructuring of the way the money is going to be administered. There is going to be a restructuring. And it needs restructuring, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Ninety/ten is joint.

MR. WARREN: It needs restructuring, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is all cocky, the Premier is all cocky because he cannot get his own way for a change. Too bad. I say too bad, but the people who are suffering are the Newfoundland people, not the Premier. And the Premier should be ashamed of himself.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for the hon. member for Torngat Mountains has expired.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement on the Report of the Auditor General pertaining to my department. Before I get into that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his friends over there, I am still somewhat in the dark as to what their position is on the closing of the satellite station, and I would certainly invite them to join me in another protest when they are moving out the equipment, if they would like to.

MR. NEARY: No. I am going down to Burin, Gaultois, and Ramea, that area.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, I see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there are some people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there are some people working on the offshore from Burin and Trepassey and from all of those places whose lives are at stake and who are at great risk, and where that satellite station could be of great benefit now and in the future to ensure a higher degree of safety.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the hon. gentlemen opposite do not know where they stand from day to day and they have to take their directions from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) on the skids.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I make this statement because of some confusion in the statement by the Auditor General with regard to overpayments in my department.

Before dealing with the statement by the Auditor General, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that I read an editorial in The Evening Telegram yesterday which goes to show just how far the statement by the Auditor General has been misunderstood; in fact, it is astounding. It say, "Welfare and Overpayments". "The Social Services Department of the provincial government" -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but if the hon. gentleman is making a Ministerial Statement, that is great. We welcome a Ministerial Statement from the hon. gentleman, it is his first since the House met on Monday, and it looks like what we are going to see in the future in this House is a whole series of Ministerial Statements.

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

MR. NEARY: Hold on now, I am coming to my point of order. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman is reading an editorial and the former speaker knows that that is unparliamentary, that you cannot read from newspapers or editorials in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can quote from it and he can refer to the statements but he cannot read it. I mean, even a kindergarten student knows that.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have never been known to be difficult to get along with. I will repeat the editorial from memory if that would help the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Well, do it right, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before the hon. minister continues, a point of order was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). And it is the opinion of the Chair that maybe the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) was quoting from an editorial.

MR. NEARY: He said that he was going to read it.

MR. HICKEY: In other words, Your Honour, I can quote from it. That is good.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial takes out of context completely the statement, i.e., the Auditor General. As a matter of fact, it has to be the greatest misinterpretation of a statement that I have ever witnessed. It accuses the staff of my department of making all the mistakes amounting up to \$4,135,000. It calls on me to be very compassionate with those people who have had small amounts of overpayments of, say, \$200 or \$300 or \$500. And it calls upon me to nail to the cross those who have overpayments of \$5,000 or \$10,000 and over.

MR. NEARY: Another attack on the media.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is no attack on the media. It is pointing out a very blatant, a very unnecessary discrepancy, a very unnecessary editorial when, in fact, the person writing the editorial was not in possession of the facts and did not bother to go check. And this is not the first editorial. There was a similar editorial about the closing of the satellite station.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you know, the editorial should really stick to the subject per se. If the gentleman writing the editorial wishes that I be compassionate with somebody who has an overpayment of \$500, but out of the other side of his mouth wants me to nail to the cross somebody who has an overpayment of \$10,000, he is apparently under a great misconception. The person who has an overpayment of \$10,000 also has children who are innocent victims. Am I not to show compassion there? Am I to disregard the fact that there are children in that home and just wipe that family right out, right off the map?

MR. S. NEARY: You are nit-picking.

MR. HICKEY: I am not nit-picking at all. The hon. gentleman is losing all his battles these days, that is why he calls it nit-picking.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the editorial refers to the fact that it is the blunder of the bureaucrats in my department and he calls upon me to reprimand them, and, as I have said, he calls upon me to have compassion. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I am not dealing with that editorial in a more scathing fashion is because of the fact that I am drawing on my compassion for the individual concerned who wrote it. If I were not so compassionate I would have a number of other things to say, but I will chalk it up to ignorance of the facts or, as one said one time, 'A little knowledge is very dangerous.' Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the \$4,135,000 in overpayments was built up since Confederation, not in the fiscal year 1981-82. The fact of the matter is for the fiscal year covered by the Auditor General there were overpayments to the tune of \$1.6 million, not \$4,135,000. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in that same

March 11, 1983

Tape No. 254

MJ - 2

MR. T. HICKEY: fiscal year my department staff
recovered \$1.1 million of that \$1.6 million, leaving a balance
of \$500,000 not \$4,135,000. The fact of the matter is that
by now, Mr. Speaker, the greater portion of that \$500,000
which was on the books at the end of 1981 - 82 has been
recovered through

MR. HICKEY:

5 per cent deductions. Now, Mr. Speaker, what causes overpayments? What are we talking about when we talk about overpayments? Another branch of the media, shortly after the release of the report of the Auditor General, interpreted what the Auditor General had to say as though I had overspent in my department for the year 1981-82 to the tune of \$4.135 million, in other words, spent that much money outside of my budget while in effect we stayed within our budget that year. So there is just total confusion about the statement by the Auditor General.

Mr. Speaker, those overpayments are made up in the following manner; 23 per cent of that amount of \$1.6 million for the year 1981-82 that I referred to is brought about through overlapping of federal programmes such as unemployment insurance, workers' compensation - I am sorry, unemployment insurance and Canada pension, and a very small amount because of workers' compensation benefits. How much error, Mr. Speaker, is reflected through administrative error by my staff that the editor draws attention to and wants me to reprimand and calls them bureaucratic errors? How much are we talking about of that \$1.6 million? Four per cent, Four per cent, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that is too bad when you acknowledge the fact that as in no other department, as in no other agency that I know of in the world, I do not hire people of perfection, we do not have people who are perfect. They are human beings, they make some mistakes too.

Mr. Speaker, the other fact is that while the editorial deals so harshly with the bureaucrats and calls it bureaucratic blundering,

MR. HICKEY: I am surprised that the editor is not pleased by the fact that a fair portion of the money involved in the year 1981-82 deals with unreporting of income, or people who have beat the system, for which they have been uncovered and collections of the overpayments brought about by the uncovering of such blatant abuse of the system has been made. In other words, the recovering of taxpayers' dollars which were spent on people who were not deserving of the benefits that they received. One would expect the editor to hail that as a positive thought. But, no, Mr. Speaker, there is no mention of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, finally the editor need not worry about our compassion. The compassion of this government, the compassion of my department and my staff is most adequate.

MR. HICKEY: So adequate is the compassion of my staff, through the enlightened policies of this government - and by this government, Mr. Speaker, I might say, because this is a new thing, this is a new policy in the last three or four years, it was not in place before - we pay light bills for people. We are not allowed to pay light bills, nor do we have a policy or a regulation which allows us under the law to pay light bills, but because our compassion is such for little children, because where there are homes that are without heat and light and appliances to cook to look after the children, my staff will pay a light bill after there is a cut-off notice. That cannot be done legitimately under the regulations, so it is done on an emergency basis. An overpayment is set up. In other words, there is an advance provided to the family, the light bill is paid, the electricity is turned on, and the family continues on. And that amount of money, Mr. Speaker, is recovered over a period of time through the withholding of 5 per cent of the person's cheque.

So, Mr. Speaker, really it is very unfortunate that this kind of editorial seeks to smear, as it were, a dedicated, competent staff, and blame all those mistakes, supposedly, which indeed are non-existent, on my staff.

Mr. Speaker, my final comment is this. I do not fault, and far be it for me to question the right of the Auditor General to make any statement. The Auditor General in his figures and in his statement is accurate. If I have any criticism, if I have any disagreement with the Auditor General's statement it is in fact that he probably did not go far enough to explain that that \$4.135 million was in fact not

MR. HICKEY: for the fiscal year 81/82, but in fact had built up over the years. And the Auditor General used the term in his statement, "as at March 31st., 1982", and one would have assumed that people would have understood that. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, which has come to my attention is that people do not understand that jargon. So my only point is that it is important that the issue be clarified. My budget was not overspent, nor was there over-payments to the tune of \$4.135 million during any one fiscal year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister speaks about compassion. During the last sitting of this House, and in his first ministerial statement, I must say that he has not shown very much compassion

MR. WARREN: for the members of the Opposition, because he has not even provided a copy of his statement so I can respond. So, Mr. Speaker, it is only talk about compassion that comes from the minister.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Social Services, on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, but I cannot produce a copy of a statement when there is no written statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my point of order, if I am allowed to make it under the rules of the House -

MR. NEARY: No! Sit down!

MR. HICKEY: You would like for me to sit down, I am sure you would.

I started to read from
an editorial -

MR. HISCOCK: You made a speech.

MR. HICKEY: - a section of the newspaper. My Ministerial Statement was verbal. That is my right under the rules, Mr. Speaker. Some people read statements, some people do not read statements; sometimes I read statements, sometimes I do not read statements. Today I did not read the statement. I do not have one to read because I did not have time to put one together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman, you know, is not able to get what I said, I will repeat it. I will play the tape.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition, to the point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I was going to raise a point of order myself but I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to page 87 of Beauchesne, Statements by Ministers, number 262, and I believe Your Honour had Beauchesne already opened, because I think everybody in the House was rather shocked at the hon. gentleman calling that a Ministerial Statement.

Ministerial Statements, this is the description in Beauchesne. "Statements by Ministers have now been given a recognized place in Routine Proceedings. The Standing Order is specific but considerable latitude has been left to the Speaker to set limits on the participants. The Speaker has emphasized that both the Government and the Opposition contributions should be brief and factual." Should be brief and factual. "The purpose of the ministerial statement is to convey information, not to encourage debate." And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made an inflammatory political statement, a rebuttal to an editorial in The Evening Telegram, that did not convey any information, but certainly did encourage debate. There seems to be a trend developing in the House and ministerial statements are being made now every day mainly to divert from the real issues in the Province, the crisis in the fishery and so forth and so on, and I believe it is about time Your Honour took a hard look at these ministerial statements to see if indeed the rules of this House are being abused by ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an apology.

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

MR. HICKEY: I apologize very sincerely for my statement. It was long, I agree, and I apologize. But it was very factual, for which I do not apologize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

First of all, the Chair would like to say that the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Social Services is not indeed a point of order. The Chair will certainly take under consideration ministerial statements.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General mentioned a \$4 million overpayment. The minister,

MR. G. WARREN: has admitted that \$1.6 million of it was over the past fiscal year. That \$1.6 million in rough calculation is around 33 per cent. It is surprising to find out that of that \$4 million over the past twenty-five years, \$1.6 million was for the past year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the editorial either. As far as I am concerned the minister's department should take steps to write off a lot of these overpayments that were given to welfare recipients. God knows under the present situation they are finding it difficult enough to get enough food to put on their tables. I believe that the minister should make every effort not to collect from those who are presently on social assistance, but to write off the overpayments, Mr. Speaker. I think that is the proper procedure to follow, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have the highest regard for the staff of the minister's department. There is one problem, Mr. Speaker; they are overworked and underpaid. The minister needs more staff out in the field because many of those social workers, Mr. Speaker, through no fault of their own, are issuing welfare cheques without sufficient information. It is due to the fact that they are overworked and they cannot do the home visits, which are very, very important, and the minister has to agree with that. But the social workers out in the field do not have the opportunity, time and resources available to do home visits to everyone on social assistance, and this is the cause of overpayments. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I again beg the minister to go to Cabinet and obtain permission to have them overpayments written off. Next year let us hope that the Auditor General will not report overpayments of \$4.5 million, that the Auditor General will report that the minister, for the sake of compassion and humanity, has forgiven many of

MR. G. WARREN: those on welfare and has written off the outstanding balances that were owed. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

MR. W. CALLAN: We hope not, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) could give the House some information on the helicopter contract? Are the bids in, have they been opened, who is the lowest bidder, etc.? Would the hon. gentleman tell us about the helicopter contract?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion, I guess, publically about the fact that the tenders were opened on March 4. There

MR. DAWE:

were two options asked of people who were to bid on those tenders. One option was to bid on the five sites as a package. The other option was to bid on them individually and then government would decide which of the two scenarios would provide it with the best economies. It turned out when the bids were open that one company had actually the same price on both scenarios. It came in with the lowest tender bid on the package and it also came in with the lowest aggregate on the individual sites. Government will decide in due course, as it does with all of its contracts, when the awarding of the contract will be. As soon as it happens I will inform the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what kind of a time span are we talking about for the awarding of the contracts? Can the hon. gentleman indicate to the House at what time we can expect to get the decision on who the successful tenderer was?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that will be in a matter of hours.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would presume then that the hon. gentleman is going to make the announcement today.

MR. SIMMS: Within forty-eight hours.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman said hours so I am assuming from his answer it is today. Would the hon. gentleman indicate if there will be a clause written into the contract that Newfoundlanders will be employed by the successful helicopter company, Newfoundlanders will get preference if they are available for these jobs? Will that be one of the conditions of the contract?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the employment of Newfoundlanders in the helicopter industry in this Province is a very high ratio. As a matter of fact, all companies involved, especially with their pilots and mechanics and so on, have a very, very high percentage of Newfoundland working for them. And it has always been government's position that it would encourage this to continue to occur whenever possible.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was very vague and evasive on that question. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not understand the question. The question was will it be written, will it be a condition, of the contract, one of the conditions of the agreement, that the successful company, whoever gets this contract, will employ Newfoundland pilots, will employ Newfoundland mechanics if they are available? Will this be written into the agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the position of this particular government has always been to advance local preference in the

MR. DAWE:

employment field, particularly as it relates to employment of Newfoundlanders where they were qualified to do the job on the offshore, unlike members opposite who were against that particular policy of local employment. And it seems strange that all of a sudden now that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would come forward with that request. This government has always placed the employment of Newfoundlanders foremost in any of its discussions and contracts with anyone who provides government services, and we will continue to do so.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Just for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, the members on this side of the House are not opposed to local preference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is the hon. gentleman's friends, the NDP, who were opposed, if the hon. gentleman will recall. It is the Premier's new buddies, the Premier's new socialist friend, the NDP.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Good Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Yes, good Newfoundlanders. That is right. Well, I do not know about the Leader of the NDP whether he is a good Newfoundlander or not, but at least he is living here. Now that the hon. gentleman has befriended him, I do not know how they are going to reconcile the fact that the NDP are opposed to the government's local preference policy. But anyway I still did not get a straight answer from the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have to work that out with Mr. Fenwick.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No problem.

MR. NEARY: Well, I hope there will be no problem. I could not think of two hon. gentlemen to get in bed together because I know who is going to come out on top.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He might be the next Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I could only see the hon. Minister of Transportation over there. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the court cases that have been initiated by Sealand Helicopters, if these court cases will delay any awarding of the contract?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated publicly, through the media on a number of other occasions, that the indication by one of the contractors that it

MR. R. DAWE:

was going to take some legal action against the company which was the low bidder on the tender really has no bearing on the awarding of the contract. We will continue to award contracts based on the information and the advice from officials and the amount of money on a particular bid.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman undertake to provide the House with the information on the number of bids, the amounts of each bid and any other information that he can lay on the table of the House in connection with this contract?

MR. J. MORGAN: It was on television the other night.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want in this House. I am so busy sometimes that I do not get the time to watch television, I am not like the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must be delighted now he will be able to get his free rides again, him and his sealing buddy, they will be able to go down to Argentinia Saturday mornings and have a look around.

So, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman undertake to lay this information on the table of the House at an early a date as possible ?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I

am somewhat reluctant to be a messenger or a secretary for the acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary), but that information on March 4th was made public at a public opening of the particular tenders and all the various hourly rates and the package rates submitted by each of the

MR. R. DAWE: companies that bid on the contract is full public knowledge. However, if the hon. gentleman does not have wherewithal or the time to do it, I will see it that before the House closes today, Mr. Speaker, that that information is available to the House.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. L. SIMMS: It is public.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not understand the simple rudiments of the British Parliamentary procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I would like to remind hon. members that I have recognized the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains and he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. In the Ministerial Statement the minister made earlier, he mentioned that his department on occasion has paid light bills for welfare recipients. Could the minister advise the approximate number of welfare recipients whom he has assisted in paying their light bills? I might add, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am asking this is that in my district alone there is roughly 35 to 40 per cent of the people on social assistance and their light bills range anywhere between \$80 to \$150 a month. I am just wondering if the minister is considering also

MR. WARREN: assisting those recipients who are finding it very, very difficult to live?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there is an amount contained in the welfare cheque, the social assistance cheque, covering the issue of utilities, and families are therefore expected to pay their light bills, as a first requirement, as they would their rent, their mortgage or anything else. It is an essential expense and a very necessary one to deal with first. There is no provision, no special provision in the regulations or in legislation to pay light bills per se. Out of the \$1.6 million in the year 1981-82 that was under the heading of overpayment, 10 per cent of that is determined to have been for utilities or payment of light bills which created some very severe problems and severe hardships for families through cut-off notices. We will not pay a light bill per se. The only time we will become involved in it is when in fact there is a cut-off notice or an actual cut-off, and then we will pay it as an emergency move, an emergency measure out of desperation and we have to recover the money over a span of time.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: That is the reason why I asked the minister the question, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure the minister left the impression with the media this morning that they were paying light bills for social assistance recipients which the Minister, I understand, has now clarified. He has made it clear that all he is doing

MR. WARREN: is making an advance and collecting it afterwards. I would like to ask the minister a further question. This has come up in the last two years in correspondence between myself and the minister and it concerns a fuel allowance for Labrador residents. Now I understand that there is a measly \$29 allowance. Now, \$29 probably would probably go a long way to alleviate the cost on the Island, but considering the harsh climate conditions in Labrador, and considering a client can only get four and a half days from one drum of fuel oil, which costs \$97,

MR. WARREN: I am just wondering is the minister considering, without letting any secrets out of the bag, an increase in the Budget for the fuel allowance for our Labrador recipients?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me concede the point to the hon. gentleman that his point about fuel costs in Labrador is a legitimate one, one that my department and I and indeed, the government have been concerned with over the last few years. I am sure he appreciates that we are near Budget time and I am not at liberty to state what is going to be in my colleagues Budget Speech.

Let me say to him, however, that I have recognized the difficulty in Labrador with regards to fuel costs, so much so that in fact there is a special arrangement. I also acknowledge that that special arrangement probably does not cure all the ills or solve all of the problems. I have taken that into account. What ultimately will happen in the new fiscal year remains to be seen. I will say one thing, that while the Province, like all other areas and all other provinces, is in a very difficult period of financial constraint, I am happy to say that this government has shown its social conscience insofar as my department is concerned. There are Departments of Social Services, I suggest, in parts of the country receiving much worse treatment than this department in this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms)

MR. WARREN: during the past number of years we have heard a lot of negativeness pertaining to Northern Labrador about the health conditions in Davis Inlet, about the lack of a water supply in Makkovic, about murders in Nain and so on. However, Mr. Speaker, it is worthy to note that Nain, a small community of less than 1,000 people, will be performing in the Newfoundland Drama Festival this year. I know, also, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$5,000 to \$7,000 to get those eleven actors and actresses, eight of whom are Inuit people, to perform in the Newfoundland Drama Festival. I am hesitant to ask this of the minister, but knowing that it is very difficult in a town of only 900 people to raise sufficient funds to participate in such a well-known drama festival, I am just wondering if the minister could arrange some transportation, probably through government charter rates or government aircraft available at the time to bring some of those contestants into St. John's to perform in the Drama Festival.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the request that the hon. member is now making in the House because, of course, as he is aware, we discussed it yesterday. First of all I want to congratulate the drama group from Nain. It is a very significant thing for them to be appearing in the provincial Drama Festival and, as a matter of fact, it is my intention, hopefully, to attend that particular evening to see their performance.

As we discussed yesterday outside the House, I am prepared to discuss the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and

MR. SIMMS: Northern Development (Mr. Goudie)
to see if there is some way in which we may be able to assist.
We do provide some assistance, or we did last year at least,
to the provincial Drama Festival Association to assist in
some travel. As the hon. member is aware, we have no
specific programme to assist individual drama groups of that
nature, but I will undertake to discuss the matter further
with my colleague, the minister, who is a very sincere
individual himself and I am sure he would want to do all
he can to support a request of that nature.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question
for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) but he is not
in his seat. Most of the ministers seem to be out of the
House. I do not know if they have another emergency Cabinet
meeting or a Planning and Priorities meeting so I will
direct my question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).
Would the hon. gentleman inform the House under what
authority funds have been allocated

MR. NEARY: to rent an apartment on behalf of the government in Tiffany Place? Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the authority is for that?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any funds have been paid out to rent an apartment in Tiffany Place.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the hon. gentleman if any funds had been paid out, I asked the hon. gentleman under what authority the government has allocated funds. I presume they will have to pay rent. I presume there is furniture in the apartment, drapes, etc., and so forth and so on, the bills will be coming in. So is the hon. gentleman saying that the government has no authority to spend money for rental at Tiffany Place; that we will have to wait until the budget is brought down before we get a subhead for renting an apartment on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province in Tiffany Place? Is there authority to spend money or is there not authority? That is the question I am asking the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works and Services is, shall we say, the renter for government departments. In most instances government departments do not rent under their own authority. I do not know if there are exceptions to that rule, there may well be, but by and large the Department of Public Works and Services rents government departments and that authority is there and that allocation is there. So if the Department of Public Works and Services feels it is appropriate, and if it is desirable to rent space for itself or for any other department,

DR. COLLINS: or for any other branch of government, it has the authority to do so and I am sure we will carry out its duties and it sees fit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I am not sure I understand the answer the hon. gentleman gave me to my question. The question I am asking the hon. gentleman is is there authority at this moment to spend taxpayer money, to spend funds on Tiffany Place, either for rent or renovations or drapes or furniture or anything else? Is there a subhead, is there an authority, to spend money on rental at Tiffany Place for an apartment for the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no limitation on where the Department of Public Works and Services may rent space if it feels that it is in the best interest of the operations of government to rent space. It can rent space in Tiffany Place, or Atlantic Place, or any other building in the city, or outside the city. There is no limitation on that and the Department of

DR. COLLINS: Public Works and Services is at liberty to see where it should house whatever part of government needs to be housed in rental space, if the government does not own space for it. It will sort of validate its authority to do so by referring its recommendation appropriately either to Treasury Board or to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman, but I will debate that at another time about whether or not the Department of Public Works have a standing authority to rent space. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, renting an apartment for the Premier is unprecedented. This is a new precedent. I would doubt very much if there is a subhead to pay out any taxpayer money that has not been approved by this House, and I doubt very much if the Lieutenant-Governor would issue a warrant, because warrants are only issued in cases of an emergency, and I do not believe shelter for the Premier can be placed in the category of an emergency at this time.

So I am asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to assure this House that no funds will be spent on the rental of space - not office space, not space for a museum; this is an apartment, this is unheard of and it is unprecedented - that taxpayer money will not be spent for an apartment for the Premier until such time as the estimates are passed in this House. And, Mr. Speaker, I might say that it is also wrong for the hon. gentleman to commit himself, for the government to commit themselves to spending in a new Budget that has not even been introduced in this House yet. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) knows

MR. NEARY: that that is unconstitutional and wrong. They cannot commit themselves to spending in next year's estimates. So, Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. gentleman to assure the House that there will be no spending of taxpayer money on this apartment until such time as the matter is resolved before this House.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are two points there. I certainly can assure the House and the people of this Province that no public monies will be spent by this government unless they are properly spent and decided to be properly spent. That does not only go for rental space, it goes for all expenditures from the public purse.

I would like to make one correction to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) statement. He said that we cannot precommit in one year for the next year's Budget. I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we passed an amendment - I believe it was in the last session; it may have been in the session before that - that it does indeed allow government to precommit funds if it is considered desirable and necessary to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Did he not vote for it?

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Cultural, Recreation and Youth. It concerns a programme that they have to encourage communities in this Province to get involved in sports, and it provides financial aid when they become

MR. HISCOCK: involved in championships.

The ladies' broomball team in Cartwright, Labrador has come in second in the past two years in the provincial championships. This year they finished in first place as ladies' broomball champions in this Province, and they have now been invited to a broomball competition for the Atlantic region in Grand Falls, New Brunswick. They have received aid up to this point, but, now that they are going to and can compete in the regional Atlantic finals, they are not receiving any aid from the provincial government. Can the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth explain why they are not receiving any financial aid?

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not accurate to say we do not provide any financial aid to Broomball Newfoundland because we do. We support all sports governing bodies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: We support them substantially, as a matter of fact, but we have no programme to provide assistance to individual teams. They must deal with their sports governing body to whom we provide support. But I might say we also have provided, as a matter of fact, a substantial amount of money to assist the National Ladies' Broomball Tournament which is being held in Corner Brook.

MR. BAIRD: And the Men's.

MR. SIMMS: And the Men's National Broomball Tournament which is being held in Corner Brook during the next month.

So it is not fair to indicate that we do not provide any assistance to Broomball Newfoundland or teams from Broomball Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: He did not say that!

MR. SIMMS: The answer is clearly we do not have an individual programme to support individual teams.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, if the minister had been paying attention, the Province has already helped the Cartwright - Forteau team to compete in the Newfoundland regional broomball team championship, which it won. It came in first place in St. Anthony with other teams in this Province. Now that they have earned the right to represent the Province in the Atlantic finals in Grand Falls, New Brunswick, the Province is no longer providing any financial aid to allow them to go and compete for the Atlantic championship. I would like to know why we are encouraging them to go so far - here is the team that won the championship of this Province - yet we no longer assist them to go to Grand Falls, New Brunswick, for the Atlantic region finals?

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated that I was not listening but I certainly was listening. The fact that they got financial assistance at the outset was because they got it through their sports governing body which individual teams have to deal with. I am aware of all kinds of individual teams in this Province who are participating in various tournaments from all over the country everywhere, Atlantic Provinces, provincial-wide and so on. In fact, my colleague for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) just pointed out to me that the men's slow pitch softball team last year won the right to represent the area at a particular tournament.

MR. SIMMS: and they went out and raised \$20,000 or \$25,000 on their own, and many individual teams do that. But we provide financial assistance to the sports governing bodies; the individual teams must deal with the sports governing bodies to seek further assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HISCOCK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Final supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that they have to go through the sports governing body that is funded by this Province. A community of less than 700 people is not in a position, as the member said about Nain and the Drama Festival, to raise that amount of money. Here, Mr. Speaker, they are raising money and will do their part. All they are asking is for the provincial government to at least come up with 50 per cent and provide some funding. They get them so far and entice them to compete, which they have, and now that they want to go to the Atlantic Regional Championships they cannot do it. And I feel that is unjust to the people not only in Cartwright but any other region that competes and is asked to go on to a national competition.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) I would like to ask a question of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). Mr. Speaker, the question to the President of the Council is that if there is a programme in force that has as requirements for a fisherman to obtain financing that he must be a full-time fisherman and must be a resident

MR. WARREN: of Labrador - this is the inshore fishing gear programme, on page 11 - and the minister is part of a team that is supposed to be lilly white, I would just like to ask the minister how he could go along with fishermen from the Island portion of this Province availing themselves of the money under this programme?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member that this is a lilly white administration and I also want to assure the hon. member that we want to be quite sure that

MR. W. MARSHALL: we are accurate with our answers. I have to confess that I do not know the exact response to know but I will see that it is looked into and we will get a response for it.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, seeing that the minister has agreed to look into the matter, I would just like to advise the minister that it has come to my attention that six fishermen that I know of, five from Carbonear and one from Harbour Grace, have received approval from the minister's department to obtain money under this Inshore Fishing Gear Programme. So I would like to ask the minister if, as he says, they are a lily-white government, let him show how this money is allotted for the Labrador fishermen and not for the Newfoundland fishermen.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I did not hear the hon. gentleman mentioning the nice flag on the book. Has he got one in his lapel? They voted against it, I know, but I think they will agree now as I must agree it looks very nice. Again I will have to take that under advisement. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that just as we are quite concerned that everybody in Newfoundland be treated equally, that people in Labrador be treated equal with the people on the Island portion. So we want really generally speaking that the people on the Island portion be treated the same. I want to understand this, I take notice of the question, but am I

MR. W. MARSHALL: to assume - now it may be because I misinterpret the hon. gentleman - but he is not complaining about fishermen getting assistance from Harbour Grace and Carbonear?

MR. G. WARREN: The programme.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, the programme. You are not complaining about the fishermen in Harbour Grace or St. Mary's or anywhere else around.

MR. WARREN: No, no.

MR. MARSHALL: That is fine.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. L. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to a question posed by my friend, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), which appeared on the Order Paper of March 10, Question No. 10, in four parts. The first question: "What is the population of the caribou herd in Labrador?" Our answer is that the best estimate we have is about 300,000. "What is the population on the Island portion of the province?" The best estimate we have is 35,000. "Has the caribou population increased or decreased in recent years?" The caribou population has increased in recent years. "How many Wildlife Officers are in force protecting the various caribou herds?" Forty - six permanent officers.

MR. WARREN: Not enough.

MR. L. SIMMS: I agree. I would like to have 246.

You give us the money we will do it.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question put on the Order Paper by the hon. the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), Tuesday, March 8th, Question No. 2 and it deals with the offshore. The question was posed to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dawe), who is the minister two ministers to my left, and not the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), who is the minister directly in front of me and one to the left, but not to me, who, as Minister of Labour and Manpower, the

MR. DINN:

question should have been posed to in the first place.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

And, Mr. Speaker, I think

I should go through the questions one at a time. How many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are currently employed on offshore drilling rigs? Well, Mr. Speaker, the number of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently employed is 451. The number of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently employed on supply vessels is 121. Other; includes seismic, onshore service contractors, staff, etc., 372 for a total of 944. The hon. member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) is really picking up on it lately.

MR. SIMMS:

He is a good adder.

A good adder-upper.

MR. DINN:

(c) Since January 1, 1978

it is estimated - this is the answer to how many people worked since January 1, 1978 - it is estimated, and you cannot keep total track of this because people go on a rig and come off a rig and go on another one and then go on and come off and stay off and work on shore, but it is a fair estimate that 3,700 different Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have had exposure working for the oil industry on the East coast.

MR. NEARY:

An average of 600 per

year.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member will remember

that in 1978 there was no one working offshore because the oil companies at that time, with their threat, picked up their rigs and went home. So there was no one in 1978. And if the hon. member now wants to divide, the hon. member for Torngat can do it quite easily,

MR. DINN: and has been following it quite well.

MR. SIMMS: He is a better adder-upper and a better divider.

MR. DINN: These have had experience working for industry for periods of several days to several years. (d) of the hon. member's question on the Order Paper of that day, what positions do Newfoundlanders occupy? I guess he is getting at something there, there is some information the hon. member wants. But (d) Newfoundlanders of Newfoundland and Labrador have occupied such senior positions as

MR. DINN: assistant rig superintendents, toolpushers, drillers, assistant drillers, derrickmen and all the junior positions from thereon down.

MR. SIMMS: Read them all.

MR. DINN: Well, I would read them all, Mr Speaker, but I think that would be wasting the time of the House. The hon. member can have that information if he wants it.

MR. NEARY: You are going to table that anyway, are you not?

MR. DINN: (e) What is the general tenure of employment of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on these rigs and vessels? Mr. Speaker, as per general tenure of employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on these rigs and vessels, the employment has been relatively stable with the exception of seasonal rigs. The hon. member may be aware that we have rigs that are out there on a more or less permanent basis and rigs that come over and drill off the Labrador. Last year we had three drill rigs off Labrador. Even on these drilling units, the ones off Labrador, we have negotiated for ninety of these positions to be permanent. In other words, Newfoundlanders who go on these rigs, when the rig moves to off the Coast of Spain or some other place they keep Newfoundlanders on it and we negotiate on that basis. With the year-round rigs, all Newfoundland and Labrador positions are permanent. In other words, the ones who would be working on the Hibernia field.

The turnover rates of residents of this Province have been very favourable with less than one per cent per month turnover on the year-round rigs. On the seasonal rigs, one rig has reported, rig operators, that the turnover of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on these rigs, the ones that move out of our waters, the ones that work over the 120 day charters

MR. DINN: and ninety charters, etc.,
the turnover rate is about 8.2 per cent as compared to their
worldwide operation which is about 12.7 per cent. So
Newfoundlanders are fairing very well in that area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I table
the information for the hon. member opposite, the information
that he asked for. I note on the Order Paper of that day
that he was not worried about Burin, Ramea, Gaultois. We
went through Question Period today - the same thing,
no questions on the fishery. But I will supply

MR. DINN:

the information on the offshore, apparently he is very interested in that.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question placed on the Order Paper, I think on Tuesday past, by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the cost of the construction of a lodge on the Voisey River - actually it is Frank's Brook which flows into Voisey Bay in Northern Labrador - from fiscal year 1972-1973 to 1975-1976 the total cost was \$194,915. Where did the funds come from to cover the cost of construction? Government funding under the federal/provincial Native Peoples Agreement. And what is the present status of the lodge? Is it privately owned and operated, or is it publicly owned and operated by his Department? referring to my Department. It is being maintained by a caretaker staff. It is not being used commercially. It is maintained or it was maintained by this department until the 31st. of March 1983, and possibly may be turned over to another department of government, I do not know at this point in time, but that will be decided in the budgetary process.

And for the information of all of my colleagues on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who do not know where Voisey Bay is or know what the lodge is like, it was built initially, beginning in 1972-1973, under Native Peoples funding to serve as a training programme for Native Peoples in Labrador who wish to become involved in the operation of sports fishing camps, guiding, ownership of sports fishing camps etc. etc. etc.

And in response to an oral question yesterday from the same hon. gentleman, the gentleman

MR. GOUDIE: representing Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), whether or not the Hudson's Bay Company representatives who are travelling in Coastal Labrador to have a look at the five retail outlets that we operate up there, whether or not they were travelling on a government chartered aircraft, the answer is, yes, Mr. Speaker, They were travelling on a government chartered aircraft, just coincidentally. In many cases the way the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains coincidentally shows up in Labrador when we are travelling to the coast and offer him a ride, we offered the -

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, just occasionally.

Just occasionally.

MR. DINN: Never let that happen again.

MR. GOUDIE: Okay. Representatives of the Hudson's Bay Company travelled along the Coast of Labrador, they returned to Goose Bay last evening. And I should point out as well, Mr. Speaker, if any other group of people or firm or company wishes to have a look at the facilities around the North Coast of Labrador, if government decides to dispose itself of these facilities, then they will be offered the same opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

O O O

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any others?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: To the oral question the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked a little earlier as it relates to the various helicopter bids.

MR. SIMMS: You have the answer already.

MR. DAWE: I have the answers here and I will table them. I might point out, in looking at this, you will remember that the bids went out two ways, one as a package for the five sites allocated and the other is individually.

MR. NEARY: Are you announcing the awarding of the contracts now?

MR. DAWE: No, most certainly not.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Are there any other Answers to Questions to be tabled?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. MCLENNON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 5,636 residents of Central Newfoundland I would like to present the following petition to this hon. House. The petition reads as follows:

"We, the people of the Central Newfoundland area are very concerned over recent layoffs at the Central Newfoundland Regional Health Center. We fear such action could result in reduced health care service at the center, and would be to the detriment of the citizens of Central Newfoundland and, indeed, the entire area served by the institution. We ask the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to respond to these concerns by not implementing cutbacks in the health care field."

Mr. Speaker, before the petition is tabled I would like to go on record as supporting the prayer of the petition. In recent months I have met with representatives of all the unions of the hospital and fully realize their concerns. I also believe that this government realizes the concerns of all

MR. MCLENNON: hospital workers. I firmly believe that this government realizes that the health care is a top priority for all people of this Province and will do all within their power to see that the high standard of health care we now enjoy continues. I now ask that this petition be tabled and directed to the department concerned.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we support the petition presented on behalf of fifty-six hundred and some-odd people in Central Newfoundland who are concerned about the cut back in health care services in that area. I never cease to be amazed, Mr. Speaker, at how hon. gentlemen can present a petition condemning and criticizing the administration, and reprimanding the administration, and still sit there and support that administration. I never cease to be amazed by this. I never cease to be amazed at the hypocrisy -

MR. SIMMS: The prayer did not do that.

MR. NEARY: The prayer certainly did do it, condemned and criticized and reprimanded the

MR. NEARY:

government for cutting back medical health services in the Central Newfoundland area and begged the government not to have any further cutbacks. And, Mr. Speaker, that same hon. gentleman will sit there -

MR. TOBIN:

This is a democratic party.

MR. CALLAN:

This is a brainwashed party.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen

who present petitions will support the very same government who will spend \$1 million or a couple of million dollars of taxpayer money to buy an obsolete tracking station at Shoe Cove. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that in the upcoming budget we are going to see some severe cuts in medical care treatment in this Province, especially in hospital beds. I heard the Administrator of the Health Science Complex, yesterday, being interviewed on radio, saying that if they do not get the money that they have requested this year, they will have to have further cutbacks and closed beds. So I hope the hon. gentleman when the budget comes down, if there are any further cuts in Central Newfoundland, the hon. gentleman will have the courage of his convictions, he just said he supports the petition, that he will stand in his place in this House and condemn the government, condemn the administration which he is supporting, and possibly move over across the House, not necessarily with us, Mr. Speaker, but down where I used to be there in 1978.

MR. BAIRD:

I am close enough to you now.

MR. NEARY:

If the hon. gentleman has the

courage of his convictions that is what he would do, Mr. Speaker, if there are any further cuts in the next fiscal year. They cannot afford any more cuts in Central Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. And I know that hon. members are becoming dis-

MR. NEARY: grunted, the backbenchers on that side of the House are becoming disgruntled.

MR. SIMMS: Not half as disgruntled as the -

MR. NEARY: It reminds me of what I read about the Monroe Administration. The Monroe Administration came into power in this Province -

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order. The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: I fail to see what the history of the Monroe Administration has to do with this petition. I suggest to you, Your Honour, that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and the Leader of the Opposition, is being totally irrelevant and not containing himself to the material allegations contained in the petition.

MR. YOUNG: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with the point of order. I wish to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has to refer to the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. I think the number one priority for our people should be health care service. There should be no tampering or monkeying or cutbacks in the health care services in this Province, shutting down clinics and shutting down hospital beds and laying off hospital staff and nurses when we saw this morning, Mr. Speaker, a blatant example of abuse of taxpayer money just so the Premier can prove a point, wasting \$1 million on an obsolete tracking station in Shoe Cove.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 11, 1983

Tape No. 274

NM - 3

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of approximately 300 residents of the

MR. HEARN:

Colinet, North Harbour, Harricott area. The prayer of the petition:

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for the upgrading and paving of the road between North Harbour and Colinet, from Colinet through Harricott to Mount Carmel and between Colinet and the Salmonier Line". I might add, Your Honour, that the petition is supported by myself. I would also like to add that the area we are talking about is approximately only fifty miles from St. John's. It is an area which consists of completely gravel roads, or perhaps I should say, excuse for roads.

This is not the only area of the district of St. Mary's-The Capes where we have road problems. I pointed out many times last year that we have in our area approximately 150 miles, exactly it is between 140 and 150 miles of dirt road. This immediate area that we are concerned with today that the prayer of the petition covers, the roads in that area are atrocious. They are roads travelled over by school kids each morning. The distance from North Harbour to Mount Carmel is such that when the roads are soft, as happens quite often during the Spring in particular, and we have had many occasions this Winter, we have students who travel that area by bus from Grade 1 up who spend up to an hour and forty minutes on the bus one way. So to think that children should have to spend an hour and forty minutes on the bus getting to school and another hour and forty minutes getting home, children who are six and seven and eight years of age and upwards, it is terrible to think that it is happening in this day and age.

MR. HEARN: In case I am accused of criticizing the government, I would like to point out that in the past ten years in this district 126 miles of pavement have been laid by this government in a district where in the years that preceded the P.C. administration absolutely no pavement was laid, not an inch.

I would also like to make it quite clear that the problems I am discussing here this morning, that will be discussed later on today, are quite familiar to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who has been in the area, covered every inch of the roads concerned, and is quite familiar with them. I look forward to hearing his comments.

I now table the petition,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, whenever there is a petition presented in this hon. House on behalf of residents who are crying out for improved or paved roads, I cannot help but feel sympathetic toward them. Because, as I have said so often before, in my own particular district there are still - and it is more than fifty miles but not much more than fifty miles out of St. John's, but there are approximately forty miles of unpaved roads. Markland, which is another way that the people from North Harbour and so on can get out of St. Mary's-The Capes, they can come down through Markland but, of course, they would gain nothing in the venture. It would be an adventure for them to drive out over the seven miles

MR. CALLAN: of the Markland Road, which is one of the worst roads in the province. The Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Simms) was talking about getting a cabin out there last year. I do not know if he got it or not, but I was hoping that he would succeed so that he would also try and bring some pressure on the Cabinet, on government and on his colleague who is sitting at his left, to try and get an improved and a paved road for the people of Markland.

The people in Hillview and the people in Hodge's Cove and Little Heart's Ease and so on, of course, are other examples of the people in my district who annually, every Summer, are exposed to the continual dust problem and, of course, all year round exposed to the pothole problem -

MR. BRETT: Do you want a bridge by any chance?

MR. CALLAN: If we get any new bridges in the district of Bellevue they will not be RC Brett bridges, they will be UC Callan bridges or Anglican Callan bridges or something.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I hope and I speak sincerely, that the member, that his efforts here today will not fall on deaf ears and I hope, for the benefit of the people in North Harbour, I have a North Harbour in my district as well, down right next to Swift Current in Bellvue, but, I hope that the people in North Harbour and the surrounding areas do get an improved road system and pavement this Summer. I rather doubt it. I will be interested in hearing what the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will have to say, because I might add that within the next couple of weeks, I have been informed at least, that there is a petition being circulated in my district now and that I will be

MR. CALLAN: asked to present it on behalf of my constituents. I think it is particularly in the Hillview area, and, of course, \$500,000 would do the job; a couple of miles of pavement from the TCH. -Hillview is off the TCH and I hope that they will get their pavement, and I will be presenting their petition in the next couple of weeks.

I trust when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) stands that he will support that petition. But, I also hope and pray that when he does support it, he will be saying - "What we will be doing will be paving and improving roads on a priority bases and not on political basis". And, I am sure that the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), who has just left her seat, will be looking for improved road conditions on Twillingate Island and New World Island, where I had the privilege of spending some time, because I know, down there, they have the same problems that we have in St. Mary's- The Capes, in Bellvue and, of course,

MR. CALLAN:

in other - not the strong Tory districts, Mr. Speaker.

They do not have these problems in Grand Falls where they have everything. Of course, the Tory philosophy is -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - and I will tell about the Tory philosophy some other time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN: I support the petition and support the member in his efforts.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to indicate that I indeed support the petition so ably presented by my colleague the member for St. Mary's - the Capes (Mr. Hearn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: I would not like to say that there is a member on this side of the House who has not worked as hard in representing his district, but I certainly would say that there is not a member who has worked any harder -

MR. SIMMS: Right on...

MR. DAWE: - on behalf of the members of his district as the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, if not daily in some cases, the member has contacted me concerning road problems and road conditions in his district. As a matter of fact, on two occasions I went with him through his district, and only as recently as a couple of weeks ago attended a public meeting in North Harbour to discuss just this particular issue. And I look forward to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. DAWE: - later on this morning when I will be able to view a video presentation prepared by the Development Association. And, Mr. Speaker, going back to some comments earlier on today, this is another example of the very worthwhile and quality work that development associations around this Province are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, agreements structured some years ago that have proved very, very successful over the years, such as the development associations, their proven ability to perform much needed work and to garner funding when available from various sources in their community has been very evident. And it is unfortunate that not only in the area of development associations as well as in the areas of fisheries, as well as any other particular resource development that we can mention, that the funding that we deserve as Canadians has not been forthcoming from the federal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, this is very true as well in the road sector. In previous years through agreements through the Department of DREE, this Province was able to take advantage, as other Canadians have through the years, of developing some of its secondary road systems through support from the federal Department of DREE. Since that particular thing has dried up in more ways than one, that DREE has now disappeared, it has put an additional responsibility on the Province to not only try to do the major trunk roads and to keep them in necessary repair, but also to take care of the very many needs. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, any particular area of the

MR. DAWE: Province is more deserving or more overdue for some road improvements than the people represented by this petition today.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: And this Province is trying to the best of its financial ability to meet the obligations to the people of this Province for a very rural and spread out part of the country, and we need the kind of support from the federal government as it relates to the construction of roads as other parts of the country have received through the years.

MR. R. DAWE: We have not attained any kind of a standard comparative to other Canadians and we wish legitimately to do that as equal Canadians in a Canadian society that says we should have that right. Mr. Speaker, we will be doing everything we can with the resources that we have available to meet the prayer of this petition and to address the concerns of the people of North Harbour and the surrounding areas. I look forward to viewing their presentation a little later in the morning and I will be speaking with them further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Another petition?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of 229 residents on the Southside of White Bay who are complaining and concerned about the Newfoundland Hydro hiring policy on the Cat Arm Project. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the prayer of the petition and then I will elaborate on it. I might say that I am supporting the petition wholeheartedly. I have had numerous complaints, my colleagues, my office have been swamped with complaints from residents in the area who were led to believe that they were going to get preference on the Cat Arm Project, that the business people in the area were led to believe that they were going to get the preferential treatment when it came to supplying gasoline and fuel oil etc. and they have been tremendously let down, they are awfully disillusioned, and they are so angry about the hiring practices of the Newfoundland Hydro and this government that they decided to circulate a petition and asked me to present it in the House today, which I feel very honoured and privileged to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: It says, 'We, the undersigned citizens of Westport, do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to investigate on our behalf the hiring practices of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro at the Cat Arm project. We have been informed by contractors at the Cat Arm project site that preference in hiring will be based on where a person lives rather than on his or her qualifications. It seems that people living on the South Side of White Bay, even though in the same electoral district, will not be given an equal hiring opportunity as those living in White Bay North. We feel this is discrimination and we therefore request intervention.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are pretty serious allegations and pretty serious charges. It would seem to me that the South Side of White Bay is being discriminated against because of the way they vote, because of their politics. That is what it seems.

MR. SIMMS: Where is this, in Baie Verte-White Bay?

MR. NEARY: It is in Westport, it is in Sops Arm, Jackson's Arm.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is in Baie Verte-White Bay, is it not?

MR. NEARY: It is in the hon. the member for Baie Vete - White Bay's (Mr. Rideout) district.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Jackson's Arm, Sops Arm and Hampden -

MR. NEARY: and Hampden.

MR. SIMMS: No, that is in Wallace's district, the Humber Valley and that part of it -

MR. NEARY: I see. Well, anyway, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS: They both voted Tory anyway.

MR. NEARY: No, they did not. So, anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman, but these people feel they are being discriminated against and I think they are quite justified in the way they feel. They were led to believe in the beginning that they would get the preference when it came to hiring for this hydro project. I understand also, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of workers on both the Upper Salmon and the Cat Arm project were brought in from the Mainland. And, Mr. Speaker, here is how the contractors get around the local preference regulations: They put together the dykes and so forth in sections in Montreal or on the Mainland, they do all the concrete work and they do all the reinforcing on the Mainland and ship it down on low-beds and on tractor trailers.

MR. SIMMS: That is why we want control over the offshore so we can build concrete platforms here too. It is the same thing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that at a later date. But that is happening, so there is no real employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on these projects. And is it any wonder that these people are disillusioned and discouraged and upset with the government's hiring practices on the Cat Arm project, and angry with Newfoundland Hydro for building up their hopes and

MR. NEARY: expectations and then letting the people down? Two hundred and twenty-nine people signed this petition complaining about this practice. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when I lay the petition on the table of the House -

MR. SIMMS: Does your information tell you if there is anybody from the White Bay South area working on the project?

MR. NEARY: Well, I can only go on the letter that accompanied the petition. Mr. Speaker, I hope when I lay the petition on the table of the House and it is referred to the appropriate department, which I presume is the Minister of Energy (Mr. Windsor), the hon. gentleman will grant the prayer of the petition and have a thorough investigation made into the hiring practices of Newfoundland Hydro as far as the Cat Arm project is concerned.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I know many of the people in the White Bay area. I have visited Westport myself several years ago, a very good community. I do not really understand what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is getting on with. One would think that it is the closest thing to the height of hypocrisy that anyone would hear to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition stand in his place in this House and talk about local preference, when he stood in his place in this House and was against local preference offshore. He asked questions about local preference offshore on the Order Paper of the 8th, and I answered those questions this morning, about the number

MR.DINN: of Newfoundlanders
and what their qualifications were, Mr. Speaker, and
now he is up presenting a petition with respect
to the Hinds Lake operation and the Cat Arm operation
where we do have local preference and we attempt to
hire as many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as we
can on those projects.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Cat Arm project cannot, obviously, look after the unemployment situation of all the people in all of Newfoundland and Labrador. But it has done a great job. I believe they peaked out on the Cat Arm project only last year at somewhere around 800 people working on the Cat Arm project, And, Mr. Speaker, we did the same thing with respect to the Hinds Lake project, where we had local preference, and we had some people from Buchans and some people from all over the Province working on these hydro projects that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro have started in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit dismayed that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would have the gall to stand in his place in this House to present such a petition. I support, obviously, the people of Westport. I was out to Westport, as I said, several years ago when they had no road to their community, the road was nothing more than a cow path, And we agreed at that time, and promised them at that time, that we would do as much as we could to upgrade and pave that road. And the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has been working day and night to see to it that these people get into the main stream of Newfoundland Society, to make sure that the roads are upgraded and that they have proper fire trucks. The hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), I remember, - I believe it was a firemen's ball, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that I attended out there when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and I believe again as Minister of Transportation when they talked about their roads. If I could get every person in Westport and all of these communities working on things like the Cat Arm project, Mr. Speaker, that is the place we would have them working instead of building

MR. DINN: cemetery fences which is demeaning to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dawe), or the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and Energy (Mr. Marshall) in the Province -

MR. MARSHALL: Responsible for Hydro.

MR. DINN: Responsible for Hydro-is working day and night to make sure that people in this Province are employed. Last year we had all of the resource departments put a package together so that we could get people employed at useful jobs. When the federal government announced the NEED programme, we proposed to the federal government on that programme something like \$173 million worth of projects. It is unfortunate that the federal government did not assign the \$27 million on the NEED programme along with our \$3 million for those types of projects that are resource based that are involved in business expansion, useful things for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, they only assigned \$14 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about the \$14 million, I am delighted. And it is the first time that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have been successful in getting the federal government to assign some of its job creation programmes to things that are of a useful nature. And we are working day and night with the Resource Departments to make sure that this money will be spent usefully and reasonably and sensibly in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador so they will have some long-term benefits for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the people of White Bay South, the East and West side of White Bay need not fear,

MR. DINN: this government is vigilant in its efforts to see to it that Newfoundlanders are employed on the Cat Arm project or on the Hinds Lake project, Mr. Speaker, and we would have them working on the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, if we could get some reasonable - reasonable is all we are asking for - reasonableness from the federal government with respect to the transmission of that hydro power to other parts of Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this petition until the minister rose in his place and got on with a lot of nonsense and that forced me to stand in my place. The minister was indicating that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should not have supported this particular petition because in the past he was against local preference policy with respect to the offshroe. Now, Mr. Speaker, because one is against the local preference policy with respect to the offshore is no reason why one should not stand and support this particular petition. As a matter of fact, the reason that one is against the local preference policy anywhere is no indication why one does not support the prayer of this petition. The prayer of this petition is that the government is not following their local preference policy. Even though one does not agree with it, even though one does not agree there should be a local preference policy, if the government have it then they should follow it. If they have a local preference policy in effect on these jobs, it is their right to follow it. Do not bluff the people. Do not con the people. Do not make them believe that they are going to get something which they are not. If you have a local preference policy

MR. LUSH: follow it. I do not happen to subscribe to a local preference policy. I think it is the most divisive policy that ever came into effect. I do not agree with a local preference policy anywhere. I do not agree with a local preference policy on the offshore. I do not agree with a local preference policy on the Cat Arm. I think the jobs on the Cat Arm should be open to Newfoundlanders everywhere, throughout the Province. It is provincial money. And people from my district should be allowed to work there. People from every district should be allowed to work there. It should not be locally restricted. And I think that local preference policies are the most divisive policies ever brought in by a government. And I would like for the people of the Terra Nova district to be allowed to work in every area in this Province and I find they cannot because they are taking on people from this area and that area. It is public dollars and where we are spending public dollars every Newfoundlander should have an equal right to work there. But if the government has the preference policy, if they have it, then they should follow it. If they have it they should follow it and these people from White Bay should be allowed to work there. Because, as I have said, one does not believe in a local preference policy does not mean that he does not support this petition which is saying that the government is not following the local preference policy.

So this nonsense of the minister saying, 'Because you do not support a local preference policy that you cannot support a prayer which is asking the government to follow a programme that they have brought in' is a lot of nonsense. It is a lot of nonsense. The government brought in the local preference policy. If they brought it in, then they should follow it for these people down there

MR. LUSH: in White Bay South. If they have the local preference policy there they should follow it, they should not be bluffing the people, they should not be conning the people, they should not be raising their hopes falsely. They should not be giving them false expectations, Mr. Speaker. But, as I have said, for local preference policies, myself I have no time for them, I think they are devisive. They have got communities devided against communities, brothers almost against brothers, families against families. That is the kind of policies we have, and that is the kinds of things this government has been doing. Of course much worse, the next thing, Mr. Speaker, I suppose - the local preference policy not only does it divide community against community, it is getting down to the stage now, not only have you got to be from a certain community, you have to belong to the Tory Party to get a job. That is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. That is what is going on. That is how arrogant they have become. That is how arrogant they have become in this Province, in order to get a job now you have to be a Tory, and on any project.

MR. NEARY: You have to be a Tory and a big Tory.

MR. TOBIN: Do you like your leader supporting the oil rigs going to Nova Scotia?

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. HISCOCK: Never mind him. Do not listen to him.

MR. TOBIN: Do you like your leader supporting the oil rigs going to Nova Scotia?

MR. LUSH: What has this got to do with this petition? What has this got to do with this petition? I am not going to be distracted by nonsense like that. I am talking about the local preference policy. I am talking about the people

MR. LUSH: from White Bay South who want to get a job on the Cat Arm project, The government told them they were going to get jobs. They told local businessmen that they were going to be given preference for supplying various products there and they are not getting anything.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about the people from White Bay South who are not getting the benefits from this job in the Cat Arm area that they thought they were going to get. They are not getting the benefits that the government told them they were going to get. And, Mr. Speaker, we support the petition and we hope that the government will listen and they will send somebody down there to ensure that the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, is heeded, and that these people will get some jobs out of that project, and that the business people there will get some benefits.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I rise to support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No, you cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: You can only have one from each side.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate the support, but the hon. gentleman cannot do it.

MR. SPEAKER: We have one member from each side to support a petition, besides the mover.

Are there further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order 1, Address in Reply. The debate was adjourned yesterday by the hon. member for Bonavista North who has approximately twenty-four minutes remaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Before adjourning the debate last evening I had made, I think, the following points: Nothing new but points that, as I said before, bear repeating.

Point number one.

MR. CROSS: We know that the Fishery is our number one resource, number two, we also know that the Feds have great jurisdiction over our fishery. I also made the point that we were giving away too much of our fish to foreigners. I also made the point that we have no surplus to our own needs, therefore, we have none to give away. I also made the point that we cannot afford to give away our number one resource.

Picking up where I left off, Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, I want to say just a few things about the fishery pertaining to the district of Bonavista North, and possibly those few facts will verify the point that we are depleting our fishery resource.

Some years ago, Mr. Speaker, a lump roe fishery began in Newfoundland. Beothuck Fish Processors of Valleyfield was the first company to begin processing lump roe. That fishery, in that area of the province, has been depleted in ten short years. Last year the production of lump roe in Bonavista North was less than one-tenth of what it was ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have relatives in the fishery and last year one of my many nephews in Bonavista North fished lump roe. I would also say that ten years ago my father was a fisherman, fishing lump roe. Ten years ago with ten nets, 15,000 pounds of lump roe, ten years later, thirty nets - 3,000 pounds of lump roe. A very lucrative fishery ten years ago but a fishery that has been depleted today.

Mr. Speaker, we fished our herring Spring and Fall in Bonavista Bay. Until last year we caught herring but now that fishery has been banned. We were told by the Feds it is not to be opened anymore until May, 1985 or 1986. Mismanagement, I think, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSS:

Mr. Speaker, another pelagic species; Fishermen, not only in Bonavista North but throughout the bays on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland

MR. CROSS: are catching massive quantities of caplin for their spawn. Any longliner, when the caplin are running, can bring in two or three loads of caplin per day. We will have to watch it, Mr. Speaker, or we will have no caplin. The silliest thing is no caplin no food for the ground fish, no cod, turbot, halibut and so on, No food for the fish, no fish. We will not have a fishery inshore or offshore if that continues.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it does not give me any pleasure to relate these facts, but in another four or five years the two or three boat loads of caplin, longliner loads of caplin, per crew per day will have dwindled to less than a load; they will go looking for the half load. And, Mr. Speaker, it will not give me any pleasure when we have depleted our caplin stocks and the ban coming to say I told you so. I do not want to be a prophet of doom.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that ground fish stocks, especially cod, is increasing. I ask the question, is that the case or is it just that the catching effort has increased. Mr. Speaker, eight to ten years ago longliners were catching as much fish and more from fifty nets than they are doing today with from 150 to 200 nets. The same fish for triple the nets. This is what is happening. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I live very close to the fishery. I have brothers, nephews and cousins who are fishermen.

MR. G. CROSS: My first job when I was a boy of ten was in the fishing boat. I have been close to it ever since. Mr. Speaker, at that young age I fished for cod with my father and it was plentiful, I can tell you, both in numbers and in size. Back in the early '50s ten good cod traps during the trap season would have kept all of the plants on the Northeast Coast in full production for twenty-four hours a day, ten would have sufficed.

Mr. Speaker, we should ask the fisherman, he is the man that knows, he will tell you the story. Again, he is the man that knows through experience, he is the man that has carried out the research and has been experimenting over the years, he knows what pounds of fish he has caught and he knows the number of nets he has had to use from year to year and he will tell you the same thing, he will tell you because he knows.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should have something to say about the seal fishery or the many good sealers from that great historic district of Bonavista North with almost seal blood in their veins. And I represent and I know that the fishermen, the sealer in particular, would not forgive me if I did not have something to say. And, Mr. Speaker, possibly the great sealing captains of the past who have gone to their eternal reward would look down on me with a frown today if I did not mention them. The great sealing captains; the district of Bonavista North produced more sealing captains than any other district in Newfoundland. Men like the Blandfords, the Carters, the Barbours, the Knees, the Kanes and the list goes on, Mr. Speaker, it was from Pool's Island years ago that the ships sailed to the ice flows and many a farewell service was held for the sealers in St. James Church on Pool's

MR. G. CROSS: Island and in old St. Stephens Church, one of the oldest churches in Newfoundland, situated on the Island of Greenspond. Mr. Speaker, we know it has been going on for years. We know that our sealing fishery is threatened, Mr. Speaker, threatened by a crowd of lunatics who think more of the life of a seal than they think of the life of a man.

MR. CROSS: This is evident, I think, Mr. Speaker, when a few weeks ago it was in the news that a letter bomb was delivered to Canada House in London with the threat, 'Ban the import of seals or else'. A fanatic sending a letter bomb to blow the head from a man to protect a seal. So, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. Certainly we are threatened by a crowd of lunatics. And it is a crowd of lunatics or worse who have supplied and are still supplying the lunatics like Paul Watson and all the others, the whole shooting match of them, Mr. Speaker, with money for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, if some of our iron men of the past were now with us, if some of the old sealers, sealing captains that I have referred to this morning were back, there would be blood on the ice, and I am doubtful if the blood would be that of seals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: I believe that we should use every means at our disposal to see that the sealing industry does not perish if for no other reason than to spite these lunatics who look upon Newfoundlanders as barbarians. If it means finding new markets let us find them. If it means setting up processing facilities to manufacture seal skins and seal skin products in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, let us do the job.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about this matter. Mr. Speaker, I have killed a seal with a gaff and I do not feel like a barbarian or I do not feel like a murderer. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I am hardhearted. And any person who would lift a hand to harm a dumb animal, I would be the first to lift my hand to keep them from being cruelly treated.

MR. CROSS:

Mr. Speaker, if we

let the seal fishery die without a fight, we will be
hardly worthy to call ourselves true Newfoundlanders.

I said we should set up the industry to process sealing
products here in Newfoundland. And I say now, Mr. Speaker,
we could not find any better place than in Bonavista North
to set up an industry right there among the decendants
of the Keans and the Knees and the Barbours and the
Blackwoods, the Carters and the Blandfords,

MR. CROSS: and again the list goes on. My father only went to the ice one year. He was not a seal killer but I can guarantee you this, for forty years a fisherman he was a fish killer. So for the fishery and the sealing industry.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states that government will continue to pursue its reasonable position on the offshore. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the question that is asked in the Throne Speech, is it fair - I will enlarge on it a little - that the coastal provinces with resources in and under the sea should be treated any differently from the provinces whose resources are under the land. The answer to that question, no, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair, to be treated any differently smacks of discrimination. It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Government of Canada is found to be the legal owner of our offshore resource. In equity and justice they were all brought into Confederation as resources by Newfoundland when Newfoundland joined Confederation on March 31st, 1949. Two-thirds of the whole East Coast of Canada was brought -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a fine speech. I do not know why there is not a quorum in this House. I do not know where the hon. member's colleagues are, but there is not a quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

QUORUM CALL

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): I have waited the required three minutes. I would ask the Clerk to check for a quorum. There is a quorum present. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when I was interrupted by the quorum call, it does not matter whether or not the federal government, the Government of Canada is found to be the legal owner of our offshore resource. In equity and justice I said that we brought into Canada these resources, that Newfoundland brought the resources with her when she came into Confederation in 1949, and that two-thirds of the whole East Coast of Canada was brought with it. If Newfoundland had not joined Confederation those resources could not belong to Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we had a situation much the same in Canada before 1930. Up until 1930, this has been said before too, neither Saskatchewan, Alberta, or Manitoba owned the natural resources under the soil. These provinces were created from land owned by the Dominion of Canada. The legislation and the law was quite clear, the Government of Canada retained ownership of all the resources in these three provinces. In 1930, because it was felt to be just and equitable under the federal system, the federal government enacted legislation to provide for a transfer of ownership of these mineral resources from the Dominion of Canada to the provinces. If that had not been done, these provinces would not be in the healthy financial position that they are today.

When the boundaries of Ontario and Quebec were enlarged at the beginning of the century by including the large portions of the Northwest Territory and the Arctic regions, the resources were also transferred to these provinces. Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSS: if Newfoundland is to have an equal position in confederation with the other provinces, the action taken in the past must be taken again. Legislation must be passed and the constitution amended, if necessary, to give Newfoundland the resources under Continental Shelf.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative government of 1979 took that position. Not only Newfoundland but all Coastal Provinces were written in September of 1979 by the then Prime Minister, stating the position that Maritime Provinces with their resources under the sea would be treated the same as provinces with their mineral resources under the soil.

Mr. Speaker, that policy will be the policy of the Federal Government when Conservatives again resume power in Ottawa. The Maritime Provinces with their resources under the sea will be put in the exact same position as other provinces. They will then be in a position to make their own way, to stand on their own feet economically.

Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk in this hon. House and elsewhere about being political. I have heard many people say that we are too small a Province to carry any political clout in Ottawa. What can seven members do as against seventy-five from Quebec and some ninety odd from Ontario and so on and so forth?

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland politicians in Ottawa, especially the five Liberal M.P's, have sort of held the balance of power in the Trudeau government. The five members in Mr. Trudeau's government is Mr. Trudeau's majority. One hundred and forty-six minus five is one hundred and forty-one; it takes one hundred and forty-two

MR. CROSS: for a clear majority. The five members are his majority, and if they oppose his attitude toward Newfoundland on the offshore issue, he told them in no uncertain terms. They could have applied more pressure than they have all sorts of pressure, to secure a good deal for Newfoundland on the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, I am labelled as a Progressive Conservative. At this point in our history I would rather be a Liberal. And I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because if I were I could cross the floor of the House on this policy so fast that the members would think I was the Tasmanian devil on the Bugs Bunny show, it would be a blur.

MR. NEARY: You would not be able to go any further than John Crosbie.

MR. MARSHALL: George, we would have you, we would not have any of them.

MR. CROSS: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the Upper Churchill. I believe wholeheartedly that we should use all means at our disposal to see that the

MR. CROSS:

Upper Churchill deal is changed. I will also state that in time it will be changed, long before, Mr. Speaker, the forty years are up and we have to take a cut in revenues received.

Mr. Speaker, who is to blame for such a deal is immaterial. We all agree that it is one of the political blunders of the past. That is no secret; one of the political blunders of the past. A just share of the revenues generated from the Upper Churchill could have made the Province of Newfoundland financially sound. We would not find ourselves in the economic strait jacket that we are in right now if we had gotten a just deal. Mr. Speaker, when that deal was secured Newfoundland was receiving approximately one-third of the revenues that accrued. Today that fraction has shrunk to less than one-tenth. If we were getting now the same share of the revenues we got in the beginning, we would not be in the financial mess that we are in, there would be no deficits to be faced.

Under the present contract the Churchill Falls, a great project, could become a liability rather than an asset. Inflation over the years will erode our profits, the bit we are making, and we will be getting nothing from that great resource, Mr. Speaker. And that is why I think that in time that contract will be changed. It is blatantly unfair and unjust.

Mr. Speaker, we developed our iron ore resources in Labrador in the 1950's. That development saw the little fishing village of Seven Islands grow from a population of 500 to a town of over 30,000

MR. CROSS: people, Mr. Speaker,
30,000 people, more than in Labrador City and Wabush put
together. And that tells us that it was not Newfoundland
that made the gain then. Newfoundland did not make the
gain from the spinoff of the Upper Churchill development.
We developed Churchill Falls power in the 1960's

MR. CROSS: and again we know, we know, we know,
that the Province of Quebec got more than the lion's share.
We will develop our oil resources sometime in the future -

MR. STAGG: And a lying bunch.

MR. CROSS: - and it seems that the federal government
wants total jurisdiction and again the lion's share of the
profits.

MR. STAGG: Give us your candid assessment of the
Opposition there, George.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, my few remarks are just about
over. But I want to conclude by saying that I believe that
one day we will prosper, one day we will find our place in
the sun. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will. We will not be moved.
We will overcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: One day, Mr. Speaker, justice, equity and
fairness will prevail and discrimination and inequality will be
no more.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, praise the Lord!

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that
if we are asked, and we have not been asked, but if we are asked
by the media if we would agree to have the Budget Speech televised
or broadcast next Thursday from the Legislature, that we would
seriously consider granting permission. And I will tell you why,
Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. Because we feel that we have
made our point. We have had a caucus on the matter and we
feel that we have made our point sufficiently well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I could have silence. I did not interrupt the hon. gentlemen when they were speaking, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we do have a request we would seriously consider it in a favourable way.

MR. SIMMS: No, no, the Speaker makes the request obviously.

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker in private session asked approval from either side of the House. What I am saying is if we had a request from the media, if we did, but we have not.

MR. SIMMS: You have to go through the Speaker then.

MR. NEARY: Well, okay. Well, that is fine. Then we would seriously consider -

MR. SIMMS: You are going to shunt the Speaker, are you?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not shunting the Speaker. The Speaker is the one who will have to convey the feelings of both sides of the House.

MR. SIMMS: Tell the Speaker that you are going to agree with televising the Budget.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not talking about the Speaker, I am talking about the media.

MR. SIMMS: The media will cover you. They all hear you.

MR. NEARY: Well, as long as the message filters through I am quite satisfied.

MR. MARSHALL: Are you speaking in the Throne Speech now or is this a different debate?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. ultimate in nastiness is back in his seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You know, one of the best things that the Liberals have going for them in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman. The more often that we can get the hon. gentleman on television or on radio the more the fortunes of the Liberal party improve in this Province. And we are so pleased and we are so tickled to death over here that every day the hon. gentleman comes in with a mean and nasty Ministerial Statement, a mean telex to some federal minister in Ottawa, the meaner the hon. gentleman is, the nastier he is and the more political he is the better we like it. We love it. We have now been sitting in this House for one week and the hon. gentlemen have been deluding themselves. Mr. Speaker, we are sitting here and we are completely flabbergasted, we are amused, highly amused, we are getting a great chuckle out off their strategy. Just listen, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: here is the strategy, and I am sure other members of the House have seen through it the same as we have, and the media, every day they are coming in talking about Shoe Cove, the satellite station or safety on the oil rigs.

MR. SIMMS: You even have the babies crying now.

MR. NEARY: Will somebody bring that baby in so I can kiss it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There is no harm to say, Mr. Speaker, that small things amuse small minds. But, Mr. Speaker, their strategy - we have been here now one week and their strategy is to divert attention at all costs from the real issues in this Province. And what are the real issues, Mr. Speaker? The real issues are the crisis in the fishing industry, record unemployment in this Province, the high cost of electricity, the crisis in the pulp and paper industry, the crisis in the mining industry, the threatening shut-down of fish plants and industries in one-industry towns like

MR. NEARY: Burin, Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, These are the real issues, Mr Speaker. And we have been here one week so far and have we heard a statement from a minister on the real problems in this Province, the real problems facing the ordinary people? No, Sir, we have not. All we have heard is political rhetoric, the typical -

MR. CALLAN: Smoke screens.

MR. NEARY: - smoke screens, red herrings brought in by the administration in the form of Ministerial Statements. They are designed to divert attention from the real issues. They are diversionary tactics, Mr. Speaker. And we are sitting here highly amused. The hon. gentlemen think they are scoring political points with the people. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. We are amazed and amused at hon. gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, the people are waiting, the people are out there waiting to hear what plans the administration have to deal with the horrible mess, the terrible state, of the Newfoundland economy. They are listening and watching every night news casts to hear about the incredible mess that this Province is in financially. Families are waiting to hear plans from the administration about how their young son or daughter is going to find a job, graduates of the university, graduates of the College of Trades and Technology, graduates of the vocational schools, construction workers, fish plant workers, waiting with bated breath, Mr. Speaker, day in and day out to hear what plans this administration have to deal with their problems.

MR. CALLAN: If they only had their time back.

MR. NEARY: If they only had their time back, Mr. Speaker. The administration will soon be a year old

MR. S. NEARY: condemning and criticizing and out waving their arms and their legs and their tongues and playing games, Mr. Speaker, rather than deal with the problems. They are either unable or unwilling to deal with the real problems facing the people of this Province. And so every day when they parade in their telexes and their Ministerial Statements, Mr. Speaker, if they think they are embarrassing the Opposition, I have got news for them. If they think they are fooling the people of this Province, I have got news for them. They are not fooling anybody but themselves. They are on an ego trip. They may feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are gaining political ground, that they are embarrassing Ottawa, that they are embarrassing the Opposition.

MR. G. TOBIN: You should have heard the news cast at 12:30 o'clock in Marystown, what they think of you. I tell you something, it would be no good to pass out twenty dollar bills down there now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour could keep the lap dogs quiet perhaps the hon. gentleman might learn something. I can lead a horse to water, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot make him drink. I cannot help it if the hon. gentleman does not want to learn anything.

So, Mr. Speaker, out there people are angry and disillusioned, there is a negative feeling throughout the Province, people are very angry at this administration and at the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much in our whole history that there has been as much unrest as there is at the present time, and anger by the people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SIMMS: What about '71?

MR. NEARY: The situation today is much worse than '71, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman reminds me.

MR. G. WARREN: At least they were employed in '71.

MR. NEARY: At least they were employed and there were projects on the go and there was some hope, Mr. Speaker. Today people are depressed. People in this Province are discouraged, depressed, disillusioned and angry. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that this building is not surrounded everyday with demonstrators and picketers. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: You are inciting unrest.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. SIMMS: You are inciting unrest.

MR. NEARY: I am not inciting unrest, I am just expressing an opinion. In 1971, the year the hon. gentleman referred to, you could hardly open the door in Confederation Building but there was picketers and demonstrations out in front of this building and out in front of the doors of the various ministers in the government. Why are people so complacent and apathetic today?

MR. NEARY: Why have they been lulled into a sense of complacency? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. Because, Mr. Speaker, an awful lot of people know that they have been had, that they have been taken. And they are not yet prepared to admit it but it is getting there. I can guarantee you the situation is turning around every day. So, Mr. Speaker, day in and day out all we hear in this House is political rhetoric, Ministerial Statements and telexes deliberately designed to distract attention from the real issues, and I do not have to run through the real issues.

So, Mr. Speaker, people have lost faith and lost hope and lost confidence in this administration and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to replace all the words in the motion, seconded by my colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) -

MR. MARSHALL: Did he say he would second it?

MR. NEARY: Yes. The hon. gentleman is quite happy, he does not have to say it.

MR. MARSHALL: No, but you are going to speak for him.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague can speak for himself but he does not have to second it under the rules of this House - all the words in the motion after the word 'that' with the following: "This House regrets that the government have failed to present to the House policies and programmes adequate to meet the social and economic needs of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador". And I would like to send a copy of the amendment up to Your Honour. It is in order?

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is a very silly amendment but it is certainly in order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The Chair can only agree with the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), that the amendment is in order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the amendment does, of course, if the amendment is adopted by this House, if the amendment is passed by this House, of course, it will mean that the House has no confidence in the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only a very slim chance, a very slim possibility that the amendment will pass, but it is a vote of non-confidence in the administration, Mr. Speaker. This amendment indicates no confidence in the administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I doubt, apart from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who seems to be on the hitch these days -

MR. CALLAN: A good fellow 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I commend the hon. gentleman for speaking his mind. It is about time somebody on that side of the House spoke out, expressed his feelings, his views on certain matters.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is well aware, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Energy, is well aware of the consequences. He knows how paranoid the Premier is. He is well aware, He felt the brunt before when he was Minister of Energy, when he was basking in the glory of negotiations in the Energy Portfolio. He felt the brunt, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman felt the brunt of the Premier's hatred and revenge for anybody who gets more publicity than the Premier, and he was forced to resign his portfolio.

Now the hon. gentleman rightly so; because the hon. gentleman is a decent and honourable Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman is trying to jolt the administration back to reality. The hon. gentleman who is a decent Newfoundlander is trying his best in his own inimitable way -

MR. TOBIN: Why did you not say that then?

MR. NEARY: - to try to resolve the impasse by persuading his colleagues to get back to the negotiating people. The hon. gentleman is doing the best he can and I commend him for it. There are an awful lot of people out there who have a great deal of respect for the hon. gentleman's point of view. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is fighting a losing battle.

MR. SIMMS: You hope.

MR. NEARY: Because the Premier and his colleagues will not pay any attention to the hon. gentleman. They are scared of him, they are afraid of him, they respect him, Mr. Speaker, but they are afraid of him, they are worried about him. I will tell you one thing, and I say this for the whole

MR. NEARY: world to hear, and I know it
will never happen, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TOBIN: Tell the country.

MR. NEARY: - and I know that it will never
happen, Mr. Speaker, I know this will never happen.

MR. SIMMS: I hope you are not expecting
(inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have silence. We have seen in the past week and in the past sessions the arrogance of this administration. Mr. Speaker, there are forty-four of them over there and there are only eight of us. It is just like a hockey game. I was talking to a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I demand Your Honour enforce the rules of this House. I want silence, Mr. Speaker, silence from the ignoramuses on the other side.

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

MR. TOBIN: Start another rumor now.

MR. NEARY: This is not a bit funny.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: We have people out there starving and hungry, and the hon. gentlemen over there snickering and laughing and grinning.

MR. TOBIN: Start another rumour now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are two sides in this House and I want the rules enforced as far as speaking in this House is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They can wipe the grins off their faces, because before I am finished, Mr. Speaker, I will wipe the smirks off their faces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They may think coming in here -

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible) for me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do you hear that?

I only wish the galleries were full. I only wish we had television in the House so that the people out there could see, Mr. Speaker, the behaviour and the arrogance of that hon. crowd.

MR. TOBIN: Chicken little started.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is like a hockey game, if you put forty-four players out on the ice on one side and eight on the other, what will happen? They will drown you out. And they will pound on their desks and they will clap their hands and they will try to interrupt you and they will trip and they will shove and they will bully. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am here until Christmas Eve I am going to finish the speech that I started and they can keep interrupting all they want, and they can keep showing their ignorance and their arrogance, and they can keep avoiding the issues. But, Mr. Speaker, one hon. gentleman over there this morning who said that we wanted the House opened to debate the issues is correct. But we do not call the order of business in this House, it is the government who sets the order of business in this House, And the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have been here one week and we have not debated one single issue in this Province is not our fault. We do not lay down the procedure.

MR. DINN: This is the Address in Reply?

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is the Address in Reply and I will deal with the issues. The hon. gentleman need not worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here a whole week and they have not made one statement on the fishery,

MR. NEARY: on the pulp and paper industry, on the mining industry, on the high unemployment, electricity rates or any of the real bread and butter issues in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: Oil rigs going to Nova Scotia, supported by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I asked the lap dog from Bruin to keep quiet. I would suggest that if Your Honour cannot force the hon. gentleman to restrain himself that he be named. The hon. gentleman obviously does not understand how the rules of this House operate.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting near one o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It has been noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

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

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

March 11, 1983

#10

on the order page 22,
MARCH 10 1953

Answers to questions asked by ~~Mr. Warren~~ (Torngat Mountains):

Question: What is the population of the caribou herd in Labrador?

Answer: The best estimate we have is 300,000.

Question: What is the population on the Island portion of the Province?

Answer: The best estimate we have is 35,000.

Question: Has the caribou population increased or decreased in recent years?

Answer: The caribou population has increased in recent years.

Question: How many Wildlife Officers are in force protecting the various caribou herds?

Answer: Forty-six (46) permanent officers.

④

MAR 9 1983

Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) What is the population of the caribou herd in Labrador?
- (b) What is the population on the Island portion of the province?
- (c) Has the caribou population increased or decreased in recent years?
- (d) How many Wildlife Officers are in force protecting the various caribou herds?

Mr. Fife
10/13/83
10/13/83

QUESTION ASKED BY:

MR. GARFIELD WARREN (TORNGAT MOUNTAINS) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- (a) COST OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A LODGE ON THE VOISEY RIVER IN VOISEY BAY IN LABRADOR.
- (b) WHERE DID THE FUNDS COME FROM TO COVER THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION?
- (c) WHAT IS THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE LODGE? IS IT PRIVATELY OWNED AND OPERATED OR IS IT PUBLICLY OWNED AND OPERATED BY HIS DEPARTMENT?

ANSWER:

- (a) COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF VOISEY'S BAY CAMP FROM 1972-73 TO 1975-76 WAS \$194,915.
- (b) GOVERNMENT FUNDING UNDER THE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL NATIVE PEOPLES AGREEMENT.
- (c) JUST BEING MAINTAINED BY CARETAKERS STAFF. IT IS NOT BEING USED COMMERCIALY.
MAINTAINED BY THIS DEPARTMENT UNTIL MARCH 31, 1983, WHEN IT WILL BE TRANSFERRED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

1983-03-10

INFORMATION FOR MINISTER AS PER REQUEST BY MR. NEARY (LaPOILE) TO LAY UPON THE
TABLE OF THE HOUSE

Questions a and b:

Number of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently employed on offshore oil drilling units (includes operator, drilling contractor and service contractor offshore staff that would be on rig at some time or another).	451
Number of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians currently employed on supply vessels.	121
Other (includes seismic, onshore service contractor staff, etc.)	372
	<hr/>
TOTAL	944
	<hr/>

Question c:

Since January 1, 1978, it is estimated that 3700 different Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have had exposure working for the oil industry on the East Coast. These have had experience working for the industry for periods of several days to several years.

Question d:

Newfoundlanders, off Newfoundland and Labrador, have occupied such senior positions as Assistant Rig Superintendents, Toolpushers, Drillers, Assistant Drillers, Derrickmen, and all junior positions. As well, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are occupying other positions such as Sub Sea Engineers, Welders, Electricians and Mechanics, among others.

On supply vessels, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are occupying positions such as Captains, Mates, Chief Engineers, Second and Third Engineers, as well as, Stewards and Deckhands.

Question e:

As per general tenure of employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on these rigs and vessels, the employment has been relatively stable with the exception of seasonal rigs which are in our province's waters for 120 day charters. Even on these drilling units, we have negotiated for 90 of the positions to be permanent. With the year-round rigs, all Newfoundland and Labrador positions are permanent. The turnover rates of residents of this province has been very favorable with less than 1% per month turnover on the year-round rigs.

On the seasonal rigs, one rig has reported that the turnover of Newfoundland and Labrador personnel over the 120 day charter was only 8.2% compared to their worldwide turnover rate of 12.7%.

Question f:

No.

QUESTION ASKED BY:

MR. GARFIELD WARREN (TORNGAT MOUNTAINS) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- (a) COST OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A LODGE ON THE VOISEY RIVER IN VOISEY BAY IN LABRADOR.
- (b) WHERE DID THE FUNDS COME FROM TO COVER THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION?
- (c) WHAT IS THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE LODGE? IS IT PRIVATELY OWNED AND OPERATED OR IS IT PUBLICLY OWNED AND OPERATED BY HIS DEPARTMENT?

ANSWER:

- (a) COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF VOISEY'S BAY CAMP FROM 1972-73 TO 1975-76 WAS \$194,915.
- (b) GOVERNMENT FUNDING UNDER THE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL NATIVE PEOPLES AGREEMENT.
- (c) JUST BEING MAINTAINED BY CARETAKERS STAFF. IT IS NOT BEING USED COMMERCIALY.
MAINTAINED BY THIS DEPARTMENT UNTIL MARCH 31, 1983, WHEN IT WILL BE TRANSFERRED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

APPENDIX I

TENDER RESULTS

	<u>Universal Helicopters</u>	<u>Ocean Air Services</u>	<u>Sealand Helicopters</u>	<u>Viking Helicopters</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
St. Alban's	309,600	358,800	444,000	432,000
Gander	412,800	430,400	579,200	489,600
Deer Lake	309,600	352,800	444,000	367,200
Goose Bay	357,600	-	502,800	576,000
St. John's	357,600	-	444,000	528,000
Package	1,747,200	-	2,361,600	2,392,000

APPENDIX II

TENDER ANALYSIS

Low Bid: Universal Helicopters. \$1,747,200

Note: Universal's bid was the same for the total package as for the separate services.

Second Lowest Bid:

St. Alban's	(Ocean Air Services)	358,800
Gander	(Ocean Air Services)	430,400
Deer Lake	(Ocean Air Services)	352,800
Goose Bay	(Sealand Helicopters)	502,800
St. John's	(Sealand Helicopters)	<u>444,000</u>
		<u>\$2,088,800</u>

Third Lowest Bid:

St. Alban's	(Viking Helicopters)	432,000
Gander	(Viking Helicopters)	489,600
Deer Lake	(Viking Helicopters)	367,200
Goose Bay	(Sealand Helicopters)	502,800
St. John's	(Sealand Helicopters)	<u>444,000</u>
		<u>\$2,235,600</u>

Fourth Lowest Bid: Sealand Helicopters \$2,361,600

Fifth Lowest Bid: Viking Helicopters \$2,392,000