

VOL. 2

NO. 38

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Alyward): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell us if the hon. Premier is going to be in the House this afternoon?

MR. MARSHALL: The Premier should be here presently.

MR. NEARY: Will he be here before the Question Period ends?

MR. MARSHALL: He is expected shortly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting for the hon. gentleman to arrive, perhaps I could toss this at the Government House Leader, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who, no doubt, might be able to provide us with the answer. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the Premier or anybody in the administration have sent off an apology to the delegates who attended the Fishery Council of Canada meeting in St. John's last week who were highly indignant and felt insulted by racist jokes that were told by the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)? His remarks were crude and uncouth and, Mr. Speaker, everybody at the conference was shocked, dismayed, upset and flabbergasted beyond words. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the President of the Council could tell the House if a letter of apology has been sent to the Fishery Council of Canada and if the administration have gotten a list of all the delegates who were at that Fishery Council to send letters of apology to?

Mr. Speaker, we are told

MR. NEARY: there were 600 or more delegates from all over the world in attendance, making it one of the best attended meetings of its kind in a long time.

Mr. Speaker, of particular note, at this conference were some of the largest fish buyers from the United States, our best customers. So I am wondering if the hon. gentleman could tell us if anything has been done about that?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, what a constructive use of the Question Period! What a matter of pressing public importance to ask a question on! I am absolutely delighted to see that the hon. gentleman has recovered physically from the ailment that keep him in his home the past few days, but I note that the hon. gentleman's recovery has been entirely physical, it certainly has not been mental, Mr. Speaker, or he would not ask a question of that nature.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will try the question out on the hon. the Premier. As the hon. the Premier is aware, Newfoundland's image was severely tarnished last week at an incident that occurred at the Fishery Council of Canada meeting here in St. John's when some 600 representatives attended this conference from all over the world when the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) told a scandalous racial joke, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell the House, on behalf of the administration, if the hon. gentleman has sent an apology to the Fishery Council of Canada and has the hon. gentleman gotten a list of the international representatives who were at this Council and sent an apology to the individual members who attended this Council? And will the hon. gentleman also ask the Minister of Fisheries to apologize publicly for these insulting remarks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will take it all under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. the Premier could tell us when we could expect to get the answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is getting the answers from the backbenchers there, Because of the urgency of this matter, Mr. Speaker, and all these people, some of them

MR. NEARY: very prominent fish buyers, left this Province with a bad taste in their mouth, a bad impression of Newfoundland and so forth, and with the anti-seal campaign that has been going on and then to hear these racial jokes told by the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, certainly does not leave a very good impression of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, I wonder, because of the urgency of the matter, could the hon. gentleman put some time on it when he could tell us when we could get the answer in the House?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that a worse image is put on the Province of Newfoundland when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and others opposite from time to time try to score cheap, cheap, low-down political points on particular issues that come before the media or other people in this Province.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even 007, who is a very prominent Tory in the Province, has taken the administration and the minister, to task.

MR. NEARY: "Bigotry is unwelcome," he says, "in any decent society. From time to time," he says, "such bigots find it possible to crawl or slither into positions of power by temporarily camouflaging their true selves. Adolph Hilter was one such example and Benito Mussolini was another example."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now in view of these serious charges and accusations, and in view of the fact that the people from Newfoundland who attended that conference felt pretty miserable, felt pretty bad, and the international and national representatives went away from that conference, with a very bad impression of Newfoundland left by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), is the Premier not going to take immediate steps to issue an apology to that group?

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The trivia of the hon. gentleman. This is an example of what happens to the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Make no wonder the young Liberals want a Leadership Convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 129. You cannot ask questions which "multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point. (d) repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." No one refused to answer. The hon. Premier has responded. Now to save the hon. members of the Opposition from themselves,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I draw this point of order to your attention in the hopes that we can get on to some kind of sensible refrain or order of questions.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): I note that Paragraph 357 does say that questions, written or oral must not "multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point." I bring that to the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we will see if we can get some sanity back in the Premier's answers. I will go back to what the hon. gentleman said earlier, he would take the matter under advisement. I hope that the hon. gentleman is sincere, that he will take the matter under advisement, and will the hon. gentleman assure the House that we will get the answer shortly in this House?

MR. SIMMS: You already did.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have several questions, but the

MR. LUSH:

ministers to whom the questions should be rightly directed are not sitting in their places, so I will direct the question to the Premier. It is related to the present kerfuffle with respect to the drill ship Petrel. We were having some problems with respect to the hiring practices. I wonder if the Premier can indicate to the House whether he or the minister were aware that this particular rig was tied up at Argentia since sometime early Fall with a crew of non-Newfoundlanders? Was the administration aware of this?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to negotiate without taking drastic action to see that more Newfoundlanders were put on that rig and were available to work on that rig when it goes out to do its drilling. We have been into extensive negotiations with the company that operates the rig and we have been trying to negotiate with them. We did not wish to take court action or to cancel permits, which are two of the options that are open to government. We wanted to be able to co-operate with the company and to negotiate the problem. Now, that has been extremely difficult. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and others and myself have been kept fully advised of the situation. We have indicated through our officials to the company that we are not prepared to let the status quo continue, that our local preference regulations are there, they remain in effect, and that they must begin hiring Newfoundlanders who are qualified in the respective jobs that are available on that ship.

Over the last number of days, the negotiations at the official level have continued

PREMIER PECKFORD: and we are in the process now of informing the company that there are at least two courses of action open to us, one is to cancel the permit and, of course, the other is to use the provision of the constitution which Newfoundland was successful in getting as part of the new constitution,

PREMIER PECKFORD: which reads that "Any of the preceding does not preclude any law, programme, or activity that has as its object the amelioration in a province of conditions of individuals in that province are socially or economically disadvantaged, the rate of employment in that province is below the rate of employment in Canada." That is a provision in the new Constitution which Newfoundland was successful and I was successful in helping negotiate at the time of the new Constitution. So we have gone back to the company and indicated that we are not prepared to accept the rules and regulations that they want to use to govern the operation of that drill rig. Sure we were aware that it was there and we have been negotiating with them. We are not going to back down, we are going to insist. One of the problems we have, of course, is that from time to time the Opposition and others in this Province have taken a lukewarm if not an opposite position to ours as it relates to local preference. If we had everybody onside, perhaps we would not be into the problems we are with this company and other companies in this Province. Because when they see a fractured Newfoundland society, some saying, 'Yes, let us have local preference,' others saying, 'You are going too far and you are being confrontational, you are doing this, you are doing that,' then obviously they are able to see an opening, are able to move in and try to make stick something which is inconsistent with what we are trying to do. So I would invite the hon. member and his colleagues to fully support the government in its efforts to ensure that Newfoundlanders are put on that rig.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Terra

Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, what a lot of nonsense the Premier is getting on with, trying to indicate that the member and people on this side object to the local preference policy, What a lot of nonsense, but I will not comment on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is, does this not indicate the poor planning of the government, the fact that the rig has been in our Province since sometime early Fall and up to this point in time we have nothing done? Here is the drilling season started and still nothing resolved.

MR. LUSH:

The Premier says that he has contacted the company. What has been the company's response? And, secondly, does this not indicate poor planning with respect to the hiring procedures that we have had all this time and not been able to resolve up until now?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I find this absolutely incredible. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House from time to time in the last two or three years have attacked this administration for its local preference policy, have attacked us, have tried to accuse us of being confrontational every time we moved to do something. We were told to go and sit down and negotiate an agreement with the federal government which would see no local preference in this Province, our local preference policy going out the window. And the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) can stand in his place and innocently and angelically try to ask a question about local preference where all of his colleagues over there for the last two or three years have been trying to tear down the policy that we have been trying to put in place for the people of this Province. I find it absolutely shameful that the hon. member would try to have his cake and eat it too, and would do it so openly and so blatantly in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, we brought in local preference regulations years ago. Talk about planning! The hon. member stands up, Mr. Speaker, it seems

PREMIER PECKFORD: to me as if the hon. Premier and the government have no planning here.' We have had local preference in effect for the last several years. And it has been the federal government, spurred on by the hon. member and his colleague, who tried to undermine the local preference policy in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let them not try now to get on their hobbyhorse. Let them come out and unequivocally say that the local preference policy that is now in place will also be in place under any negotiated agreement on the offshore, instead of hon. members opposite coming out from time to time, in lukewarm support, and sometimes antagonism, towards the kind of policy that we have on the offshore.

I have heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) from time to time say we are bad Canadians, that we want to get out of Confederation and all the rest of it because we are standing up and asking for fair play on a big resource like the offshore.

The hon. member for Terra Nova should examine his conscience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

MR. NEARY: You have more nerve than a toothache.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for me to examine my conscience, Mr. Speaker. I have a clear conscience and I know precisely where I stand with respect to the local preference policy.

May 11. 1983

Tape No. 2012

PK-3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Where? Where?

MR. HODDER:

None of your business.

MR. LUSH:

I know precisely where I stand,
Mr. Speaker, we have a clear indication today that the local
preference policy is not working. Mr. Speaker, I will get
to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

MR. LUSH: The Premier, of course, is on to the wrong line of what I meant by poor planning. The planning that I referred to was the planning that I was questioning the minister on yesterday about this government list and how everybody has to come to St. John's to register for the offshore. So I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether or not this is part of the problem, where the list that is available to companies is all here in St. John's. I am wondering how detailed this list is, what qualifications are required to be acknowledged on this particular list, whether it has anything to do with language, the language that a person can speak, because we have people in Newfoundland who speak other than English. We have people who speak French, we have people who speak Inuit and the Natives of Labrador speak different languages. So if they have an application in, does the minister have it indicated on the list what language they speak, whether they are fluent in English or whether they are fluent in some other language? Particularly since this is an international thing, do we have these kinds of things on the list, the qualifications and languages indicated as to whether people speak languages other than English?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this, as I say, is incredible. The hon. member came off just now with a tirade again about where he stood, yet he did not say where he stood. He talked about negotiations, whether we left it since early last Fall and why we did not negotiate and get this settled before now. Mr. Speaker, I will have the hon. member know that we negotiated the Pacnorse and we got a crew on there, we negotiated the Pellerin and got a crew on there, we negotiated the

MR. DINN: Neddrill 2 and got a crew on there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: We negotiated the West Venture and SEDCO 706 and the Zapata Uglund and we got crews on there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: We are negotiating the John Shaw and we are negotiating the Bow Drill 2 and we will get crews on there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: We are having a little problem with the Petrel. And, Mr. Speaker, we do not, in our registry have it listed as to whether a fellow speaks Norwegian or French or German or English because they would make it a preference next time that when a Norwegian ship came in here that Newfoundlanders would have to speak Norwegian and if a West German ship came in we would have to speak German.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we do not operate like that here in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: - narrow and parochial. And, Mr. Speaker, did we go to other parts of the Province to get people to register for the offshore? I will have the hon. member know that we have over 11,300 people registered for the offshore, Harvey's Offshore, for the supply vessels for the Petrel went out to the Port au Port Peninsula and advertised, went to Western Labrador and advertised to find out whether they had the

MR. DINN:

qualifications, whether they could speak fluently bilingual French/English and so on, Mr. Speaker, so that we could comply with this rig so that we could get Newfoundlanders on there and so that we could spread it around for the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). What I am getting a little bit sick of in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are people like the hon. member opposite who decry our regulations at every turn and then have the gall to stand up in this House and 'I pose a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower: What is he going to do about the unemployment situation in this Province?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: I am asking the minister, is he telling me that he could not find forty French-speaking Newfoundlanders in Western Newfoundland to man that rig, where we have 90 per cent unemployment? Is he telling me and is he telling the House that he did not ask of those 11,000 people who are waiting whether they were French or English? And is he telling me right now - since I happen to know that on that list of 11,000 there are French-speaking Newfoundlanders who are qualified - is he telling me that he does not know who they are?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, we do know.

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

MR. DINN: For the information of the hon. member opposite, who seems to be a little bit exercised

MR. DINN: and probably should be exercised -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - the problem with respect to the Petrel is this, that we do not go along to a drilling company and say, 'You will hire John Jones.' That happened in the old days when we had a Dr. McGrath or someone else who told people who to hire and when to hire. We do not do that. We say to the drilling company, 'Here is a list of Newfoundlanders. Here is a registry. These are the qualifications they have. We would like for you to hire from that registry. If he is a driller with eight, ten or fifteen years experience, we would like you to hire a Newfoundlander.' Now, Mr. Speaker, to assist us, most of the drilling companies not only comply with our regulations but go out of their way to. Last year they were up in Labrador attempting to get people to work in the offshore Labrador. Harvey's Offshore, who are responsible to supply Canterra in offshore Labrador this year, went to the Port au Port Peninsula and advertised. They did not go out and say, 'John Jones, you are listed in the registry. We have your telephone number. Are you.

MR. DINN:

ready to work?' They could not do that, they have 11,000 in a registry. But what they did do, the same as they do when they are hiring here or hiring in Labrador, because there were some requirements for French, and because they wanted to be conciliatory and try to assist all Newfoundlanders, they advertised out in the Port au Port area in the local newspapers. They advertised in Western Labrador. They did not get a big response, They got some, but they did not get a big response. The response that they did get they attempted to get these people jobs. I do not know what else these companies can or have to do. We certainly do not direct them as to who to hire, nor should we. We supply the information and they hire based on the fact that they have the qualifications to work in the specific job.

MR. HODDER:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Port au Port, a further supplementary.

MR. HODDER:

I listened carefully to what the minister said, is the minister telling me that when the applications were first offered there was no consideration given to the fact that there might be rigs coming into the area whose crews might speak French, since we have a large French speaking population in this Province? And is the minister telling me that - you know, today my phone has not stopped ringing since the minister made his statement on television last night. - is the minister telling me that because of the advertising that was done on the West Coast, one ad in one newspaper, that he considers that to be sufficient? Furthermore can the minister say or can he not whether we have enough

MR. HODDER: French speaking qualified
Newfoundlanders for that rig?

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

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we nearly have
the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) say that he
agrees with the local preference policy. He had not agreed
with it all the way along, but now that he is getting a little bit
of pressure from his constituents for jobs on the offshore,
now he is asking, what the minister is doing about getting
his constituents jobs on the offshore, "Does he not know that
we have some French speaking people in Newfoundland who have
qualifications?" We never ask what religion these people
are, we never asked whether they were French, Norwegian,
Portuguese, or English. We never asked any of these questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: We sent out the application forms,
they filled in the application forms, they stated their
qualifications. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the
hon. member said, the company which was hiring for this
particular area - now we are talking about supply vessels,
not the rig, because the rig would rather hire from Quebec
or from wherever rather than

MR. DINN: Newfoundland. They would rather hire from anywhere but Newfoundland. What they are doing, it appears to me, they are confronting our regulations. Mr. Speaker, we are fairly solid with respect to the regulations. Section 124 is fairly clear and Section 6 of the Constitution is clearer. It enforces Section 124 of our regulations. And, Mr. Speaker, we intend to enforce those regulations. Now, we went out and advertised - we did not, the companies did - to assist the people of this Province, went out to Port au Port and advertised. Now, is one ad enough? Are two ads enough? Are three ads enough? Is advertising enough? I do not know if it is enough, but they certainly attempted to get French speaking Newfoundlanders to work in these supply vessels; they went to Western Labrador and did exactly the same thing. Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who stood in his place in this House and decried local preference, and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who the other day made a speech in this House decrying the local preference regulations, now that there is a little pressure from a few constituents and we have had a conversion. The hon. member should have been converted in 1979 when we tried to do it. He should have been supporting this government in its effort to get Newfoundlanders employed long before now, but all of a sudden he wants to jump on the bandwagon because we are having a little problem with Petrel and Canterra, one company. We did not wait until just last Spring to get into this, we have been negotiating since last year. We have at least thirty people on a permanent basis on the Pacnorse, Pellerin and Neddrill 2 since last year. And they agree that, when they come back this

MR. DINN: year they will hire at least another thirty or forty Newfoundlanders and one or two of the hon. member's constituents may get jobs there. I want the hon. member when he stands up to ask another supplementary question to say, 'I support the Newfoundland preference policy in the offshore.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, for some time now, for the last two years, I suppose, or perhaps for the last three or four years since this list started, I have been directing French Newfoundlanders and telling them whom they should get in touch with in order to get on that list. Now, is the minister telling me that he has a list of Newfoundlanders and he does not know if they are French or English speaking, yet we have a drillship out there that wants forty French speaking Newfoundlanders? Does the minister consider that to be good administrating?

MR. HODDER:

Would the member allow me to have a look at the list and I will tell him by their surnames who are qualified Newfoundlanders.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this is May 1983 and the list has been available since 1979 and it is the first time the hon. member asked to have a look at the list.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: He just happened to wake up in May of 1983, a wide-awakening for the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). He gets a little bit of pressure from his few constituents and he wakes up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: That list is a public list.

We hide it from nobody. The press, the people of the Province, anybody can get a copy of that list. Every company in this Province can have a copy of that list free of charge, free, gratis. And, Mr. Speaker, it is like this, the information that is provided to that registry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: The hon. member does not like the answer. The information provided in that registry is provided - the hon. member might want a registration form himself - but the information provided on that list goes like this, your name, occupation, what occupation you have for offshore, all the different items, and any other information that you may wish to provide. So if a person wished to provide the

MR.DINN: fact that he was French, the fact that he was Norwegian and the fact that he might be of Portuguese ancestry means nothing to me. What I am here to do is attempt to get jobs for Newfoundlanders. If they want to supply the information that they are French speaking Newfoundlanders, that can be put at the bottom of the list under 'Other; French, they can be put at the bottom of the list as Norwegian, they can be put at the bottom of the list as Micmac or Indian. We do not go out and tell them how to fill out a simple little list.

MR.SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR.MARSHALL: A point of order.

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

MR.MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is trying to respond to a question, Mr. Speaker, The hon. gentlemen there opposite might like to substitute their shouting and their yowling for their laughing or exulting at the loss of the court case and the consequences of it. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been asked a question and he is entitled to be able to respond without having to shout over the hon. gentlemen.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!. To that point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we would be highly amused at what is happening on the other side today. If it were not so serious it would be funny. If there is any shouting going on in the House, Mr. Speaker, it is from the Minister of Eabour and Manpower (Mr.Dinn)

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2017

ah-3

MR. NEARY: and the Premier, who seems to be beside himself today, he is rather testy. If I had known he was going to be in such a bad mood today I might not have come in. He is scaring me over there,

MR. NEARY: pointing his finger and shouting and bawling and roaring. Mr. Speaker, there really is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order. There was considerable noise coming from both sides of the House. The time for Question Period is over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. SIMMS: We will get back to it another day.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 51 of the Financial Administration Act, I have to report on the details of guaranteed loans of trade in whole or in part since the last sitting of the House and I table that report.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question number 68, asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Today being Private Members' Day, we are discussing Order 8.

Before I introduce the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), on our last sitting day,

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) raised a point of order concerning the reading of articles and he quoted Standing Order No. 332 from Beauduchesne, Page 117. I have to refer hon. members also to Standing Order 328: "A Member may read extracts from documents, books or other printed publications as part of his speech provided in so doing he does not infringe on any point of order." And the point of order which could be infringed upon would be that the reading of documents are not to refer to any proceedings in the House, and in this case, there was not an infringement on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bellevue has three minutes left.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Three minutes to (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, we saw today one of the obvious reasons why we have no offshore oil agreement. We are speaking here today, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment to this resolution, number 8 on the Order Paper, by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach). And what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, what the amendment to that resolution says is that both levels of government, the provincial and the federal governments, should get back to the negotiating table and

MR. CALLAN: let us have a negotiated settlement to the offshore dispute, let us have a negotiated settlement so that people can get back to work, so that the infrastructure which must come as it pertains to getting ready for offshore oil development, all of these things will naturally follow. But they will not come about, Mr. Speaker, until there is a negotiated settlement between this Province and the Federal Government in Ottawa. Now, it is obvious, as I said last day, what the Premier is doing. Watching the Premier in his display during the Question Period, Mr. Speaker, he displayed what I have been thinking for a long time, that he was wrongly named; he should have been christened 'Mary Pickford' because as everybody knows, Mary Pickford was a great actress and in his daily dealings with everybody, Mr. Speaker, all the Premier does is act, puts on an act. The same Premier who thinks that it is terribly wrong for people to arouse other people's emotions, like, for example, the anti-seal protestors who get millions and millions of dollars contributed to their cause because of the emotional way they conduct their affairs, the Premier condemns that and he condemns anybody else who accomplishes what they are trying to accomplish by emotional tactics. But here we have the very same Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, who last spring purely on emotional issues, purely on emotions won an election. There was no logic to what the man was saying and now we see, over a year later, that there was no truth to what he was saying either. He asked the people for a mandate to negotiate with Ottawa and here we have negotiations broken off. The only man who could possibly negotiate with Ottawa was forced to resign from the Premier's

MR. CALLAN: Cabinet - he just came into the House a minute ago - the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward) Order, please.

MR. CALLAN: I support the amendment to this resolution.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the original motion was brought in by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) I had forgotten for the moment-and that was approximately a week ago, and as far as I recall he put forward the offshore situation very clearly, very succinctly and with great conviction and I would like to congratulate him on doing such a fine job.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, there have been some strange things happen in this debate and before getting into the body of my remarks that I am sure my hon. colleague the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will listen to most avidly -

MR. MORGAN: I am sorry, colleague.

DR. COLLINS: I just like to mention him, For instance, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) went against his own party as far as they have stated their position, when he stood up in this House in this debate. He stated unequivocally that in his view Canada owns the offshore. Now, hon. members opposite any number of times have claimed that they believe that Newfoundland owns the resources of the offshore. They have made that claim any number of times but their actions have not backed up

DR. COLLINS: their claim, But at least in words they have said that yes, we believe Newfoundland owns the offshore resources.

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) last week unequivocally said, "I believe that Canada owns the offshore." So apparently there is some break in the apparent facade across the way, and I think we should note that break and ask the hon. members opposite to clarify their position once again. And we would hope that they would clarify it, not only in words, but also they would clarify it in actions and in declaration and in advice and recommendations to their Liberal colleagues in Ottawa.

Now, there was another peculiar thing happened, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who just sat down, he said last week that the offshore question is purely a legal question. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very strange statement to make. Because their own amendment here says, "BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that both the provincial and federal governments negotiate an agreement such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management resources are recognized." Again is this a break with his colleagues? According to the amendment here his colleagues seem to think that there are moral and historic claims bound up in the question of the offshore, whereas the hon. member for Burin says, No, it is purely a legal question, just settle the legalities and that is the end of it.

So again there seems to be disparity between what one member thinks and what the whole group opposite claim that they support. And, of course, it is just a reflection of the fact that they do not really know, they have not made up their minds in any way. No matter what they

DR. COLLINS: say, and how much they purport in public to support the Newfoundland people in trying to get its just rights offshore, in actual fact they have no settled policy on the thing. They are all over the shop. At any one day of the week they will say one thing and another day of the week they will say something else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in regard to this debate, and the first point that I would like to bring up is that the outside world has a very strange view of Canada. I had the honour and the occasion to meet with a person, a statesperson, from the European Continent recently, and this person was very knowledgeable about how governments work in the world and how federations work and all that sort of thing. And this person very subtly and diplomatically brought up the point that, you know, people in other places have great difficulty in understanding how Canada works.

For instance, it is well known that there is regional disparity in Canada. There are areas of great wealth, and areas of wealth that have been there for many, many years, even generations, and particularly in Central Canada, but then in other areas of Canada, particularly in Eastern Canada--although it was not always in Eastern Canada, there are other areas of Canada too that were very much less than wealthy but, anyway, in Eastern Canada it is well known that there are areas of considerable poverty and of diminished opportunity. And the outside people say we see this here and we wonder why a country like Canada allows that to exist? And, in particular, they have difficulty in understanding this, when in areas where there is relative poverty, very definite relative poverty

DR. COLLINS:

and lack of opportunity for individual advancement, nevertheless there are great possibilities of turning that thing around with just the right approach to things. And they look at Atlantic Canada and they see the great resources down here, especially the offshore resources, and they scratch their heads and they say, "Why is Canada a country which has these great disparities, nevertheless has the way to correct them in areas where the correction is needed, yet their system just does not work to allow that to happen?" And this is said by people who understand the federal system. They understand that Canada is somewhat of a unique country in that certain things are given to the provinces and certain things are given to the central government. And they understand that resource development is given to the provinces. There is nothing strange, weird or wonderful about that. The whole world knows that Canada is made up that way and not all countries are made up that way. In some countries the authority and the jurisdiction to deal with natural resources is controlled centrally, or if it is not controlled centrally at least a central government is so authoritarian and so autocratic that it takes these responsibilities and these jurisdictional prerogatives onto itself. But they know that in Canada that is not the case. Right from the beginning, in the BNA Act, there was this division of responsibilities and jurisdiction, and in the new Canadian constitution, in the Canada Act, that is also brought forward. It is very clear, the high school student who has any knowledge of Canadian history knows that the provinces have the responsibility for developing natural resources in their area. And this is what people outside do not understand. You have poor areas of Canada; in those poor areas you have natural resources; the natural resources

DR. COLLINS: should be developed by those local areas but it does not happen and they say "What is wrong with Canada And, of course, I think that most of us can clearly point out what is wrong with Canada, and it is a recent thing that has happened to Canada. Previously the same things happened. There were poor areas in Western Canada, the provinces were as poor as church mice. They had natural resources out there and the two, one should have offset the other, and at that time the Canadian Federation worked so that that happened, those natural resources were allowed to be developed by those poor provinces out there. The need was there, the resources were there so the authority was given and the arrangements were set up so that the thing could happen. And that is the Canadian way. People can understand that. What they cannot understand is how come in the last ten or fifteen years Canada does not work that way. We have the poor area down here, we have the natural resources down here, why are not the arrangements allowed to let the local area develop the natural resources? Why have things

DR. COLLINS: changed in the last ten or fifteen years? And one can only say that they have changed because of the present administration in control of the federal government. There is no other change. There is a change in attitude of the central administration in this country which will not allow to happen what should happen in Canada and historically what did happen in Canada. Now, how you can rationalize that, of course, is another matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another problem that is connected to this thing and it sort of flows out of it and the problem is this: Who speaks for Canada, and I talk of the central authority in Canada, who speaks for Canada? Or, I suppose, you can put it another way, does Canada speak with a forked tongue? to use the old Indian expression. Does Pierre Trudeau speak for Canada? If so, was he speaking for Canada when he visited our university here and said, 'We want to develop the resources down here in conjunction with you. We want all the benefits to a maximum degree to go to you people down here until you become equal with the rest of Canada.' Is that the person who speaks for Canada? Because if so, he has not delivered on those words. Does Mr. Lalonde speak for Canada? When Mr. Lalonde sat down with the offshore negotiating team well over a year ago now, did he speak for Canada when he said, 'You will get no more than what we gave Nova Scotia in the agreement we have with them' even though, of course, the agreement with Nova Scotia did not relate at all to the sorts of situations off our coast. It was a totally different situation. Historically it was totally different, the nature of the resource was totally different and the benefits that are going to flow from the resource are totally different. But he says, 'No,

DR. COLLINS: you are going to get the same thing'.
Was Mr. Lalonde speaking for Canada? Was Mr. Chretien
speaking for Canada? Because he had a different story
when he sat down sometime later with the hon. President
of the Council (Mr. Marshall), when he was finally enticed
to come to the negotiating table.

DR. COLLINS: Because clearly the Lalonde approach was so ridiculous that it was scoffed at essentially, and, of course, at the same time as he put forward his ridiculous approach he would not respond to the reasonable approach that we put forward not only at the table but we actually published it and circulated it.

Mr. Chretien, on the other hand, sat down and said, 'Alright, I will abandon the Lalonde approach and now we will set up a more reasonable approach.' And was he speaking for Canada when he said that and then when they actually came to putting it in writing he reneged on the whole lot that he discussed with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)? Or, finally, do those officials speak for Canada who apparently took the whole situation away from Mr. Chretien, said, 'No, if Mr. Chretien agrees with that we are either going to ignore him, or he does not know what he is talking about, we are the ones who are going to set up this agreement with you?' And what did they come up with? They came up with a rehashed Lalonde thing that everyone had discounted. So, not only do we have this problem, of it being very difficult to know why the federal government is ruining the Canadian Federation at the present time, we do not even know who to go to to find out who has the authority, shall we say, or who has been given the authority to speak for Canada so we can try and straighten it out. We do not know if the Prime Minister is the person, because if so he says one thing and nothing happens - as a matter of fact, the opposite happens - we do not know if it is Mr. Lalonde, because he comes up with something that was patently ridiculous, we do not know if it is Mr. Chretien who says one thing and even the officials ignore what he says, and we do not know if the officials are running Canada. And, of course,

DR. COLLINS: the officials, God bless them, and no doubt they are good souls, but they are not elected representatives of the people of this Country and they have no business to be running Canada. They should be taking instructions as any good official recognizes he must take, from the elected people, because the elected people are the voice of the electorate. So that is another problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say it in sort of charitable terms when I say that the officials either ignored Mr. Chretien or that they just said he did not know what he was talking about, so they did not pay any attention to him. Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members of this House know we have been engaged in collective bargaining recently and I can say, ~~now that~~ I have had some exposure to it on behalf of government, that if we sat down in collective bargaining and came up with positions that both sides agreed to - both sides agreed to those particular points - they agreed to them and there was a meeting of minds over them, and you put your honour and your word behind them and then when you went and got some people in to actually put in writing what you had agreed to, if then you pulled back from those what would be the attitude there? The attitude would be, 'This is total bad faith.' And this would not be something that you would have to argue, there would be an absolute uproar. If you sat down with a union and said, 'Now, look

DR. COLLINS:

here is what we agree to.

Now, are we all agreed to that?' 'Yes, we are all agreed to that.' 'You stand behind that?' 'Sure, I stand behind that.' 'You put your word to that?' 'Yes, I put my word to it.' 'Alright, now let us call someone in and have him put it down in something that we can sign. Put it down in written form.'- and when that happened, what came back in written form was entirely different from what you agreed. I mean, there would be such an uproar, certainly if government did it, there would be editorials for about fifteen years condemning government. The whole labour movement would be up in arms and we would be ridiculed in the eyes of the world, as we should. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what happened when Mr. Chretien and the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) sat down. They came to a community of thought on how we should resolve the issue offshore. It was verbal, as all these negotiations are verbal. It should have been translated into writing - perhaps the words might be a little bit different and so on and so forth, but nevertheless, the meaning and the substance and all the rest of it should have been transferred into writing exactly as per what was agreed verbally. And, of course, when it did not happen, there was consternation in our camp. We could hardly believe what was going on. We said, 'God bless us! Surely, these people came to an agreement. Here is a minister of the Crown putting the federal government behind certain things he has agreed to. Surely, there is some strange difficulty with communications here.'

So the hon. the President of the Council went back and clarified this. And Mr. Chretien said, 'Oh, yes, what we originally talked about and agreed to is right. I will tell the officials to get on with it and stop fooling the thing up.' And what happened? Again, the

DR. COLLINS: officials came back with exactly the opposite position.

So what recourse did the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) have? Could he go back again and get the same old line from Mr. Chretien? No. No sensible man, no man in his right mind would do that. So what he did was he went back and said, "Now, look here, Jean, put the darned thing in writing so that the officials cannot fool it up. If you put it in writing in your own little hand, they will not fool it up, because we can go and get a handwriting expert to say, 'This is what Jean Chretien has put his hand to.'" And what happened? Mr. Chretien refused to put it in writing. Now, why do you refuse something like that? If you say, 'Yes, we agree' to something and someone else says, 'No, you did not agree to it,' and then you insist you did agree to it, why do you refuse to put it in writing and say, 'Look, here in black and white for everyone to see, is what I agreed to.' Well, why do you not do that? It is very strange, is it not? This is a very strange country, Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there are other very strange things in Canada at the present time, and one of the strange things that I find particularly disturbing is all this talk about Canada lands. What on earth are Canada lands? If you look at the BNA Act that set up our constitution originally, if you go through that, you will not find any comments about Canada lands. If you look at the new constitution that we have, the Canada Act, if you go through that, there is no such thing as Canada lands mentioned in that. Yet the central government in this country is relying for its case on the Canada lands, whatever they are. Now, one can only assume, if you talk of lands, something like that, that sort of means that you own those lands, that you hold them tightly, that no one

DR. COLLINS: else has any claim to them. If I say, my name is Smith and I say this is Smith's house, it means that no one else owns that house, it is mine and no one else can take it away from me. So even though the Constitution of Canada never did or does not now mention Canada lands, the federal government is implying by using that term that we own something that no one else can claim. They have no apparent authority to say that, because if you read the BNA Act and our new Constitution the parts of our setup that have ownership rights are the provinces. They own the lands they occupy and the parts of our country that are not occupied by provinces, it has always been implicit that they were held by the federal government until such time as they would be turned into provinces. And, of course, this happened, say, in Quebec. Quebec had certain Northern parts of this country given to them because by this time the population of Quebec had gotten to such a size, and its government structurally had become sophisticated enough that they could take in other than just the part of Canada which was called - what was it called, Upper Canada? Lower Canada? - I never get these things straight -

MR. SIMMS: Right.

DR. COLLINS: - whichever, anyway. But it was extended to take in these Northern parts into their provincial area of jurisdiction. And this is implicit, I mean, everyone understands that at some point in time the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, when they become populated enough and so on and so forth, that they will turn into provinces. And in the meantime, the Government of Canada, the federal Government of Canada will only hold these in trust, essentially, until such time arrives. In other words, there is

DR. COLLINS: nothing to suggest the Government of Canada itself should own territory and it would hold it tightly and it would be exclusively the Canadian governments and not the provincial governments'. That is not the way that Canada is structured. Nevertheless, this is where the federal government now, out of the blue, has decided to lay claims to the offshore areas, and there is no doubt that these offshore areas are a prolongation of the landmass. Every court of substance, the International Court of Justice, for instance, clearly recognizes the Continental Shelf as prolongations of the landmass and, therefore, those prolongations should be considered the same as the above-water landmass. That is quite clear in international law. But the federal government is changing things without actually changing the Constitution, or is making a claim, apparently, to change things to its own benefit without any constitutional authority in making this statement that there are such things as Canada lands, and by making such a statement implying that the provinces will never own them, the provinces must be excluded from them, the federal government has complete and utter authority over them and that is the end of it. Now that is a unique idea in Canada, as far as I can understand. And I think my understanding of that is pretty correct, I have discussed it with people. And again this is something new that has come into place in the last ten or fifteen years. It is something that came in, coincidentally, with the present administration in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Fogo.

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2025

SD - 3

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, in speaking to this amendment to congratulate the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on a most excellent speech. I was out of the House last Wednesday afternoon when he spoke but he gave a most excellent

MR. TULK: speech, pointing out some of the faults with the case that the government was trying to make, that the government member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) was trying to make, and obviously he brought in what, in my opinion, is a very excellent amendment to that political resolution that had been put forward by the member for Carbonear.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the amended resolution now reads, "BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that both the provincial and federal governments negotiate an agreement such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized." Mr. Speaker, if you look at that amended resolution, look at it very closely, you will see that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has introduced what can only be considered one of the most statesmanlike resolutions ever to be introduced into this House. Because what he has said, Mr. Speaker, is "Let us not play partisan politics with an issue that is so important to Newfoundland." What he has done, also, is bring in one of the platforms of the Liberal Party and lately, since August 1981, lately the provincial government has been saying as well. The hon. member has said that we must negotiate an agreement. Mr. Speaker, there has never been any disagreement on this side of the House with that, and since August 1981 I think the Province at least has been trying to move in as much as they know how, they have been trying to move to that position as well.

Mr. Speaker, before continuing to perhaps praise the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and to point out why this resolution is so important and why all sides of this House should vote for it, I would like to perhaps say why the resolution itself is so important and what it can do for Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in anybody's mind in this House, there is no doubt on either

MR. TULK: side of this House. It is an obvious fact that we have the highest rate of unemployment in Canada and obviously the offshore oil could do a great deal to benefit us. There is no doubt either that we have in this Province the highest cost of living of any of the provinces of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the APEC report which was just put out this month - the Atlantic Province Economic Council are a very important group of people in this Province. They are pretty good economists. They are pretty good barometers of the economy.

MR. BAIRD: Who are they?

MR. TULK: APEC, In that APEC report for April you can see that one of the real concerns that that council has is that while the rest of Canada, and

MR. TULK: indeed while the rest of the Atlantic Provinces are starting to come out of the recession that none of us have enjoyed over the past number of years - we in Canada are starting to come out of that recession but, indeed, the prospects for recovery in Newfoundland are uncertain, they are very uncertain.

So, Mr. Speaker, the effect of that uncertainty if we do not recover from the recession, if we do not recover from the recession in the same way that the rest of the Atlantic Provinces do, it will logically follow -

MR. STAGG: Sit down and let John get up.

MR. TULK: I would not wish to, Mr. Speaker. Because one idiot just spoke, I would not want to hear another one.

Mr. Speaker, while it is fairly certain that the economic recovery is taking place in Canada, it is not at all certain that it is taking place in Newfoundland. That is the basis and the basic point that APEC is trying to make. It is still rather uncertain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before I was interrupted by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) if that is the case then we will see ourselves again falling behind, the gap between us and the rest of Canada will become even wider.

Mr. Speaker, as I said the rate of unemployment in this Province is the highest in Canada and no doubt will, if we keep the present trend going in government that we now have, probably remain one of the highest in Canada itself.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that APEC talks about is educational financing. Mr. Speaker, we know that it is not this government's bent that you educate people so that they can go out and develop the

MR. TULK: resources. I think we had a prime example of it this afternoon. The Premier does not realize that one of the real ways that Newfoundlanders can take advantage of the offshore, and perhaps the only way that they will get full advantage from the offshore, is if the right educational institutions are in place. And they are not in place in this Province. I think you can look and find something like - how many thousands are there? There are a number of thousands of people who are trying to get into the MED course before they can even get on the offshore. But this government has that bent, that you develop the resources and then you develop your education system rather than perhaps the other way around.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, in the Minister of Education's (Ms. Verge) statement recently on student aid in this Province she says we have the best in Canada. Well, whoop-de-do! So we should. And we should have a student aid programme in this Province that is better than any student aid programme in Canada.

MR. STAGG: Relevancy Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) can be quiet and keep a few facts in his mind long enough, I will connect it up for him in a few minutes. I would like for him to be very quiet. Mr. Speaker, we realize on this side of the House, and I think most Newfoundlanders realize, that indeed we must have an even better system of student aid to develop the skills that we are going to need to cope with the technology of offshore and other things around us. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, our students, if you take the cost of living again, our students in Newfoundland have the highest cost of living anywhere in Canada and, therefore, we have to have in terms of real dollars a better student aid programme. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) well knows, if a student is going to university he has the least likelihood of any student in Canada, if he lives in Newfoundland, of getting a job in his own province. So, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) stands up and proudly proclaims that our student aid programme is the best in Canada, is better than anywhere else in Canada, then we say to her that is the way it should be, because we need those young people to do the kinds of things that the Premier was referring to this evening, that they are unable to do.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, as I said, APEC on page 12 of its' report points out the uncertainty of Newfoundland pulling out off the recession that we are all in across this country. It points out that the economies of all Canadian provinces faired poorly in 1982 but activity in the most Easterly province - which obviously is Newfoundland with its dependence on export oriented resource extraction was more sharply reduced. Recession in the industrialized world has left Newfoundland's industries with soft markets for iron ore, fish products and pulp and paper. And in the last statement, prospects for recovery are uncertain.

MR. TULK: It points out, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment figures in Newfoundland at the end of January 1983 stood at 17.3 per cent, consistently the highest in Canada, and representing 38,000 Newfoundlanders out of work, an increase of 22.6 per cent over the previous year.

MR. DINN: An increase of 39 per cent in all of Canada.

MR. TULK: This is an increase of 22.6 per cent over the previous year in Newfoundland.

We are not talking about the rest of Canada, we are saying, if you want us to be relevant, that we need a negotiated settlement on the offshore to bring those figures down for Newfoundland. We need a negotiated settlement and that is what the resolution says and that is why the resolution is a good resolution.

MR. DINN: Are you for local preference on the offshore?

MR. TULK: Open up your mind and realize that Newfoundlanders once given the educational opportunity do not need you or anybody else to protect them.

MR. DINN: They have got the education.

MR. TULK: They can be as competitive as anybody else in this world. Do not put Newfoundlanders down in the way that you are trying to. Do not try to button down their minds. Give them the education and they will compete with anybody, they do not need you.

MR. DINN: There are twice as many with the MED course than we had before.

MR. TULK: They do not need you. You give them the competitive skills and they do not need what the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is trying

MR. TULK: to perpetrate in this Province.
They can compete anywhere in Canada and to say otherwise is stupidity.

MR. DINN: You are a mugwump.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have silence?

MR. TULK: To say anything else is stupidity
and the Minister is well able to handle stupidity -

MR. SPEAKER (McNICHOLAS): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - otherwise he would know that in
Port au Port there are enough French speaking people to
occupy a certain drill rig in this Province. He does not
even know it.

MR. DINN: They only want 29 on it and
there should be seventy or eighty on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: You know nothing and you do not
want to.

MR. NEARY: Ten thousand he said last night
on TV, only two speak French.

MR. TULK: Yes, only two speak French.
What an idiotic statement.

MR. DINN: Only two were hired.

MR. TULK: Oh, you can pick those out but
you cannot pick out the number that can speak French. You
are about as competent as most of your colleagues.

MR. DINN: They would not hire any more.

MR. YOUNG: Any man who does not know about
the unemployed in his district is better off dead.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, what does this report
put out by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council of
Canada say about the importance of the offshore? That is
what this resolution is about. That is why the member for

MR. TULK: Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)
has brought in a resolution which says that this House -

MR. DAWE: He did not bring in a resolution,
it is an amendment, boy.

MR. TULK: - not the government - an amended
resolution. It is not partisan politics as was trying
to be played by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

MR. TULK: it is a resolution which says that it is so important to Newfoundland that this whole House should go on record as supporting it. But what does the APEC report say? It points out, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly that unless we sign an offshore agreement in this Province we are fast going down the tubes. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going down the tubes because of the confrontationalist attitude of this government, make no mistake about that. Mr. Speaker, it may be too late for us already, we may see a situation in this Province where Hibernia will not be feasible to be developed. The Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister without portfolio responsible for the offshore (Mr. Marshall), longer than eight words, knows that. He knows that. He knows that the price of oil in the OPEC countries could drop to the extent that Hibernia would be no longer feasible and yet he does not even have a development plan in place. We are falling behind Nova Scotia, APEC points that out. And I suppose they are anti-Newfoundland, they are anti-Canadian, they are anti-Peckford, they are anti-everything if they happen to point that out. That is the truth.

MR. DINN: What are you for?

MR. TULK: I am for what this resolution says, a negotiated settlement to the offshore, and the quicker the telephone operator from Pleasantville gets that through his head the quicker this Province will be off to a good start. We need a negotiated settlement. The only thing that he can do, the only thing that he has ever been proved capable of doing is plugging in a few telephone lines and he should stay at it. Otherwise, he is out of his league.

MR. DINN: When the people throw you out you will never get a job.

MR. TULK:

Oh, my, my, my! Oh, my, my!
Go out and plug in a few lines.

MR. BUTT:

They would have you carrying water, my
son. They would not make a water boy out of you.

MR. TULK:

No. Are you finished?

MR. DINN:

I am waiting for your position
on the offshore.

MR. TULK:

Are you finished or are you now
ready to go out and plug in a few lines?

MR. DINN:

Oh, I can do that too.

MR. TULK:

Go on. That is all you ever
could do.

MR. DINN:

What can you do?

MR. TULK:

You have the highest rate of
unemployment in this Province and you are over there yapping
off.

MR. DINN:

And you are against it.

MR. TULK:

You are over there yapping
off like a child.

MR. NEARY:

Everyone is against something except
you.

MR. TULK:

Yes, and you are for absolutely
nothing.

MR. NEARY:

All he can say is, 'You are against somet

MR. TULK:

Yes, against it.

MR. DINN:

You have never stated a position
in life, now you have a chance to state a position for
employing Newfoundlanders, what is your position?

MR. TULK:

I just stated the position, 'Let
us have a negotiated settlement on the offshore so that we
can put Newfoundlanders to work.' Alright? Not like your
government.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be interrupted by the rabbit tracks on the other side of the House, or the telephone operators.

MR. DINN: State a position for a change. Stand up.

MR. TULK: Can you flick him out, Mr. Speaker, or do something with him. Because all he is any good for is to interrupt. Can we have quiet?

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as I was saying, does not say that this is the position of the Liberal Party versus the PC Party, it does not say that it is the Province versus the federal government. What this resolution says, and let it be quite clear, is that all fifty-two members of the House tell both the

MR. TULK: provincial government, of which many of the people on the other side are not part of, the government, tell this government and tell the federal government that indeed we must get back to the bargaining table, and that we must negotiate a settlement on the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, there is no political rhetoric, no partisan politics in that at all. It is an excellent amendment, unlike the original resolution which is completely partisan and, I might say, wrong in some of its assumptions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) again, because he did all of this in spite of the fact that contrary to what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said we know who was sitting in the hotel in Montreal. We know who broke off the negotiations. We know what happened. We know who is responsible for putting Newfoundland's offshore resources in the courts. We know what happened there. We know it is perhaps now going to lose the greatest chance that ever Newfoundland had. We know the confrontation attitude of the government. We know that, Mr. Speaker, and even some of the members on the other side, including the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and other members on that side if rumours are correct, are saying the same thing. We know that this government have to have a fight. It had to have a fight with teachers - it does not matter whether its teachers, Micmac Indians, nurses, Nova Scotians, Quebecers, or the federal government or even, I suspect, among themselves -

MR. STAGG: The Liberals.

MR. TULK: - the Premier of this Province has to have a fight. And, as I said, we know about that famous hotel seat. The minister, I believe, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall) responsible for the offshore

MR. TULK: would certainly have had an agreement - I believe he would have, he and Jean were getting along just great when all at once Martin pulls the plug.

We know about that childish day of mourning that went on over there last year. We know all about that. And we know one other thing, and that is that the Premier of this Province has to try and win a federal election on an offshore issue. Politics to him is more important than Newfoundland. We know that, Mr. Speaker. We know all of that. But my friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, No, we will accept all of that and instead of playing partisan politics we on this side of the House will say Newfoundland first. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate him because it is an excellent amendment, and I am sure there is no way that anybody who has a conscience and is concerned about Newfoundland can vote against it, and I challenge every member on the other side to do the same.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Transportation.

The hon. Minister for

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately

MR. DAWE:

I was not able to be in the House when the original motion was introduced; however, I have had an opportunity to look at the resolution and I fully agree with the original resolution put forward by the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

Right at the beginning, I would like to go on record as saying that I think that the amendment to the original resolution as put forward by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is completely irrelevant. I think we have already discussed that particular issue or the essential contents of the amendment, and that particular motion was passed on a previous Private Members' Day, so it seems to me to be a completely redundant amendment and one which, because it has already been voted on originally, I will certainly be voting against, and voting for the original resolution.

I have sat in this House since 1979, I think, through successive Leaders of the Opposition, through successive albeit dwindling members of the Opposition. I have listened essentially to the same kind of mouthwash regurgitated over and over and over again, the kind of sentiment that led this Province into the kind of economic chaos that we are continually paying for at the present time, the kind of mismanagement of resources instead of, as this administration proposes, management of resources. It has caused this Province, through an attitude of going to the federal government with your tin cup and your pencils, carrying along an organ grinder and a couple of monkeys with you and begging for the few crumbs that Ottawa condescended to place upon our plates from time to time.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1949 - I was not a particularly old individual at the time, but I can remember very well kneeling down at a chair in our

MR. DAWE: kitchen with my mother helping me to spell the word 'Canada' and very briefly trying to explain to me the importance and the benefits that being not only a Newfoundlander but a Canadian would mean to me and would perhaps mean to my children. As I grew older, Mr. Speaker, under the impact of what she was trying to say at that time, I began to realize that in fact it was very important and it was beneficial to be a Canadian

MR. DAWE: and I sincerely consider that to be a fact today. However, there are a number of things that have changed, not with the concept of what it means to be a Canadian -nothing wrong with the concept of trying to lessen the gap between the have and the have not provinces, of developing a sense of equality not only equality of the soul but also equality economically and independently across this country.- What has changed, Mr. Speaker, is an attitude that is being put forward by a particular administration in Central Canada, headed up by the hon. Peter Waterhole and other individuals in the Federal Cabinet who have determined that they are the ones who have the answers to Canadian performance, they are the ones who have the answer to what Canada should mean, they are the ones who in all their documentation in dealing with line departments now refer to Canada by regions and ignore the word 'province'. In their documentation as they deal with the federal/provincial mineral strategy.. it does not say federal/provincial mineral strategy, it says regional mineral strategy. And this also transcends into other departments as well, where they continually ignore the fact that the provinces are a legislative authority in this country and they are the ones who can determine, "whether a particular region of Canada is to receive economic benefits."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no question, as the original resolution points out, that Newfoundland brought the offshore, the Continental Shelf, into Confederation. There is no one can doubt that. There is no court of law, there is no constitutional expert in Canada which will refute the fact that had Newfoundland not joined Confederation, and had, perhaps, gone its own route, or, as the former, former Leader of the Opposition advocated at the time, in 1948, that we join with the United States in an economic union

MR. DAWE: he flew over the city of St. John's dragging a banner behind him advocating economic union with the United States. Perhaps if we had done that - no question, not perhaps at all - no question if we had taken either of those two other options then the offshore, the benefits from the offshore, the opportunity to derive economic income that would result in an opportunity for this Province to develop other resources. Members in the Opposition just about each time they get on their feet, talk about the single-issue election of last April, the April before last. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador knew that it was not a single issue. They realized, and the results bear this out, they realized that the election was not a single issue. The issue of the offshore and the importance that a sensible and equitable agreement would mean to this Province would translate itself into other resource sectors, into an opportunity to improve our social programmes, our educational programmes. It would enable this Province an opportunity to further develop, albeit, that we are making significant financial contributions to our fishing industry, but even more so it would allow us the economic freedom to be able to determine and promote some of the things in other resources that this Province sees as being beneficial. So it was not a single issue, Mr. Speaker, it was an issue that meant to all other sectors of our economy, to all other sectors of our social activity the chance for this Province to be what in 1949 my mother tried to explain to me, being able to crawl up to the Canadian standard. Well, Mr. Speaker, almost thirty-four years later the per capita income in Newfoundland and Labrador is a whopping 3 per cent higher than it was in 1949.

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2034

SD - 2

MR. DAWE: Compared to other Canadians,
compared to other Canadian provinces as individuals
in this Province compared to other

MR. DAWE:

individuals and other provinces across this country, then we are only a marginal 3 per cent above what we were in 1949. And what were we in 1949, Mr. Speaker, were we at 90 per cent of the Canadian average? Indeed not, we were an abysmal 49 per cent on a per capita earned income basis with the rest of the country.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. DAWE:

In 1983, we are hovering in the magnificent area of about 52 per cent. It really does not speak well for what has happened to this Province in the Canadian nation. The promise of our becoming equal to other Canadians in our social services, in our educational opportunities, in our health care and in the ability to be able to infuse a lot of capital dollars into other resource areas if the Province saw the need, has not come about. Something has gone wrong. I think history - and for those members opposite who like to ignore the past and deal in some theoretical world and never come down to the crunch - the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has asked repeatedly what is the position of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and he continues to waffle, he continues to batter about, never getting to the issue, never talking directly to the issue.

MR. DINN:

mugwump.

Sitting on the fence. He is a

MR. DAWE:

Sitting on the fence.

MR. DINN:

fence - he is a mugwump.

His mug is on one side of the

MR. DAWE:

Is 'mugwump' unparliamentary?

MR. STAGG:

No, definitely not.

MR. DINN:

fence and his wump is on the other.

MR. DAWE: I would agree with the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is a mugwump, because he is definitely incapable of making a decision. All members of the Opposition are incapable of making a decision. The only member of the Opposition that I have seen - and this is on a particular issue, Mr. Speaker, - who was consistent with a point of view that he put forward at one point and subsequently under pressure did not change at another point, was the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: I refer back to the flag issue. When other members of the hon. member's party decided to do their waffling routine, undaunted by pressure from within and without, the member for Port au Port stood his guns. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that he has been consistent in doing that, and he has fallen back into the mire of waffling and into a category of mugwumps.

MR. DAWE: The issue of the offshore and whether we should sit down and negotiate an agreement I think goes without argument. Everyone in this Province, everyone on this side of the House, everyone I am sure, albeit they would hate to see it happen, wishes to have an agreement. In order for the development of our offshore resources to go ahead, it is agreed that there has to be a political settlement, a political agreement. The question, Mr. Speaker, is one of degree. It is very simple to adopt the old Liberal philosophy of trotting off to the federal regime with your tin cup and pencils.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. DAWE: - and accepting whatever they will offer you, albeit that it may be less than cost that you paid for the pencil, to say nothing about the receptacle that you carried them in, but that is not what we want, Mr. Speaker. That is not what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador want. They indicated that very, very forcefully just a few short months ago. There are those who would like to cause them to weaken, there are some who just those few months ago supported the administration, supported the Premier, supported the members on this side of the House, who said, yes, go to it, get an agreement that is fair to Newfoundlanders, that is fair to Canadians, an agreement that this Province can live by, no more Upper Churchills, no more agreements that see the resources of this Province given away. There are some, Mr. Speaker, who are weakening under pressure but, Mr. Speaker, the principle is still the same, the principle that this administration and the people on this side of the House will be supporting and continue to support, and that principle, Mr. Speaker, is an agreement that is laid out in some detail, an agreement that was agreed upon by the Federal minister and by the provincial minister, but then waffled on by the

May 11, 1983

Tape 2036

PK - 2

MR. DAWE: federal government. They would not put in writing , Mr. Chretien or Mr. Christian, whatever you want to call him, would not put in writing-whatever was said to him, Mr. Speaker, whatever influence, whatever outside pressure was

MR. DAWE: placed on Mr. Chretien to change his mind, we can only suspect. Perhaps Mr. Chretien was only acting throughout the whole process. Perhaps it was well planned. Perhaps he knew exactly what he was doing. Perhaps he knew that if he spoke positively enough to the Newfoundland people, perhaps if he just made little hints to the press, perhaps the hype, the excitement, the anticipation of an agreement would be so great that the Newfoundland Government would bend, would be forced because of public pressure to enter into an agreement that it knew very well was not the kind of agreement that was best for this Province, that we would be forced to sign an agreement that was contrary to the principles that we put forward, that were put forward to the people of this Province, that they voiced an opinion on. And those are the principles, Mr. Speaker, that will allow this Province a substantial and meaningful and equal say in a management of a resource that is morally and legitimately and historically ours.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident, the members on this side of the House are quite capable of speaking for themselves, but I feel quite confident in saying that I would be voicing the opinions of each and every member on this side of the House, and the very, very vast majority of Newfoundlanders if I said that we do not want to sign an agreement for agreement's sake. The nonsense that is being put forward that somehow Nova Scotia, because they signed a bad deal, is further ahead in offshore development and in exploration and in economic benefit than this Province, that the -

MR. NEARY: What nonsense!

MR. DAWE: It is certainly nonsense. It is absolute tripe. There is more drilling going on off the Coast of Newfoundland now than ever before. The stores in Halifax, in Nova Scotia, through the malls and through the

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2037

NM - 2

MR. DAWE: various establishments that
you go through are closing up daily, going bankrupt. The
international economic community has decided, through various
financial insitutions who do ratings, that the Nova Scotian
Government have not managed their affairs

MR. DAWE:

well and have downgraded them accordingly. On the other hand, it spoke very positively about the way that this Province through a good Tory administration has managed the affairs, and we have a consistent credit rating. And there is also, Mr. Speaker, in the economic community well-founded opinions that this Province has a very bright and active future.

Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, people of this Province want an opportunity to be equal Canadians, they want an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of employment, the self-esteem, the appreciation of oneself, of being able to contribute to raising a family, contribute economically to the community, contribute economically and productively to the Province and subsequently to Canada. The people in this Province want that opportunity. My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that if we do not reach a legitimate, honest and fair settlement on the offshore we will be forced into further generations that will have no more opportunity, unless they travel to other parts of Canada, unless they travel to parts of North America to work, to raise a family, to be productive citizens in this Province. There is, Mr. Speaker, an insidious erosion of self respect when the only thing one has to look forward to is going from an LIP project, a NEED project for six weeks or ten weeks or twenty weeks because, Mr. Speaker, the weeks are important because you have to have enough stamps so that your next stage of development through the year is to go on UIC and, hopefully, that you will not have to go to the third stage for very long, and that is social services.

Are we subject to that? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) brought into this House a couple of booklets and he said

MR. DAWE: there were a lot of them gathering dust, and I can see why. But he wondered if any hon. members wished to have some copies of them. One of them was a small booklet, and I am sorry I do not have a copy of it with me, but one page in that booklet talked about the benefits of Confederation and it showed a mailbox and it showed a senior citizen standing up with a smiling face looking at his cheque; it showed a little boy, a child, happy they received a cheque in the mail, the baby bonus, and it showed another individual, obviously someone who was receiving UIC benefits. Mr. Speaker, those things are valuable, they are important and it is a responsibility of

MR. DAWE:

society to make sure that those who are less fortunate have an opportunity to work, have an opportunity to be productive.

Mr. Speaker, if this Province does not take the opportunities that are before it now, if this Province does not forcefully, in a very dedicated way put forward the legitimate concerns of this Province, of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to develop the resources to provide an opportunity for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to be productive Canadians, then, Mr. Speaker, I would very sadly say that I am a Canadian. But, Mr. Speaker, if we can convince through being dedicated, through being straightforward that we only want for this Province what is the birthright of Canadians - an equal opportunity, an opportunity to develop our resources for the benefit of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and subsequently Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the amendment and for the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments on the speech that the member just made. The member talked about all he hears from this side is regurgitation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the regurgitation, of course, is contingent upon the intake and the intake has been so gaseous and poisonous that that is what one can expect, of course, regurgitation.

It is the intake that produces the regurgitation, and all we have gotten in this hon. House for the past two years is gaseous and repetitive items and discussions from the other side. So, Mr. Speaker, obviously one can

MR. LUSH: only expect regurgitation after that. It is they who decide the intake, it is they who decide what members over here have to respond to. And, Mr. Speaker, a clear indication of that is to look at the numbers of motions, private members' motions on the the Order Paper and as I count them I get sixteen private members' resolutions, sixteen - seven of them by members on this side and nine by members from the government side - nine and seven make sixteen.

MR. TULK: You mean you have it figured out, you did not know how to count to 389 last week.

MR. LUSH: The significant point, Mr. Speaker - the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) does not know how to count to forty-seven. Eighteen vocational instructors laid off last year and twenty-nine this year that makes forty-seven, the minister says it is thirty-five. Eighteen and twenty-nine make forty-seven.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) hired out?

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. TULK: Eighteen and twenty-nine are what?

MR. LUSH: Eighteen and twenty-nine are forty-seven.

MR. TULK: In hers?

MR. LUSH: Thirty-five.

MR. TULK: They call that Tory arithmetic.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, out of the sixteen resolutions, nine are

MR. LUSH: submitted by government members and out of that nine, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the content, to notice which agency or which level of government all of these are directed towards, the nine.

MR. TULK: Let me guess.

MR. LUSH: How many of these do we think are directly directed against the federal government - out of the nine?

MR. TULK: Eight.

MR. LUSH: The member is right on. It is eight. As a matter of fact, the ninth is aimed indirectly at the federal government but out of the nine eight are aimed directly at the federal government. And, as I say, the ninth is aimed rather indirectly because it is the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and he is talking about the park there, of course, which is a federal project, so, I guess, although he does not mention the federal government, he is encouraging more spending there on that park, to enhance that park and, of course, he does not say it has to be federal money. May be he does not know that the money for that park has to come from the federal government. But anyway eight out of nine are aimed directly at the federal government and, Mr. Speaker, that should illustrate the complete motivation of this government. In an attempt to get the heat off themselves, in an attempt to try and take away public attention from their own lack of performance, from their own failure, they get all of these private member's resolutions, at least on Wednesdays, and try to get the heat off, and hopefully that will fall over into some other days of the week, Mr. Speaker, to get the public

MR. LUSH: attention away from their lack of performance. No doubt that is the game. But, Mr. Speaker, this amendment puts this resolution in its proper perspective. It does not ask that the provincial government be responsible for getting negotiations going, it does not ask that the federal government alone be responsible for getting negotiations going, but it asks for both, Mr. Speaker, and that puts it in its proper perspective. Nothing partisan about this, Mr. Speaker, nothing small about this, nothing parochial about this, nothing narrow about this, Mr. Speaker, but a statesman-like resolution, a resolution that recognizes how we operate in Canada, the federal level of government and the provincial level of government. That is where it is, Mr. Speaker, and anybody who does not recognize this, anybody who fails to come to grips with this is just simply playing partisan politics with this resolution. That is all they are doing, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland recognize it for what it is. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth and the truth hurts of course. So, Mr. Speaker, talk about regurgitation, the minister should be the last to talk about regurgitation. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have talked about the negotiations here, why they have not succeeded. Mr. Speaker, it is strange but just about everything this government have put their hands to has failed, blown up in their faces. Just about everything they have attempted to do, Mr. Speaker, has ended up in utter failure and that is what has happened to the negotiations on the offshore. I will come back to that a little later. I have dealt with the regurgitation issue.

MR. TULK: Can they think of any successes they have had?

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2040

ah-3

MR. LUSH: None at all. If I could think of any -- well, this is a clear indication of how successful they have been. Just about every member on the other side when he gets up to speak, he revels in the past.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if your present record was so bad, if anybody's present record was so bad, they would have to do that, to revel in the past. That is the only thing they can do, is to talk about the past.

MR. TULK: How far back do they go?

MR. LUSH: Well, they take selected periods, selected periods of the past. They leave out the period of the former premier. They do not include that in their past. That is left out. But they go back to selected periods, either to condemn or to praise. But the present and the future is left out and well they might. Because the future of this government is a thing of the past.

MR. TULK: What about the recent past? Do they talk about that?

MR. LUSH: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talked about people on this side again incapable of making a decision and of waffling. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that can be said about this side, that we have been absolutely consistent on all of the major issues of this Province, On the offshore, we have been absolutely consistent. We have not waived, not one iota. We have been consistent on the local preference policy. Absolutely consistent. We have been consistent with every issue related to the offshore. We have said it has got to be a negotiated settlement. We said that from day one. We say it today.

MR. TULK: What were they saying a couple of years ago? Complete ownership, control, otherwise give me nothing.

MR. LUSH: Complete ownership, that is the way it was. And then they came up with some sort of a -

MR. TULK: In August 1981 they stole ours.

I said that, where they made the switch

MR. LUSH: They also then said that it could be

MR. LUSH: settled by the courts of the land, and then it could be settled by legislation. They listed three or four options but the one that they believed in was the negotiated settlement sometime thereafter. They waffled from the offshore, or the ownership, and then they came back to the negotiated settlement. Now goodness knows where they are. Goodness knows where they are now, Mr. Speaker. And the bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker, this is one thing that you cannot accuse this side of and that is being indecisive. We are very, very decisive. We have known where we stood on the offshore from day one, we know where we stand with the local preference policy, we know where we stand.

MR. TULK: The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) changed that because he knew what had to happen. He knew there had to be negotiations.

MR. LUSH: That is right. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened on the offshore, of course, is that hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to turn it into a political football. That is what has happened. They tried to turn it into a political football to get all the political advantage, to get all of the Brownie points that they could possibly get out of it and then they got themselves backed into a corner knowing that the people were fed up with it, they were saturated with it, and hon. gentlemen did not know which way to turn. They got themselves backed in a corner. And you talk about indecisive, Mr. Speaker, they are so indecisive now, they have got themselves backed into such a position they are afraid to make a decision. They are afraid to make a decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one thing can be said about past Liberal Governments, they were never afraid to make a decision. Some of them might have been bad but, Mr. Speaker, they made decisions. They were not indecisive.

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2041

NM - 3

MR. BAIRD:

Now they are wishing their cake dough.

MR. LUSH:

The hon. gentleman opposite reminds me of a situation where a young student, several hundred years ago, asked Plato whether he should marry, and Plato told him -

MR. BAIRD:

Plato or Pluto?

MR. LUSH:

- whether he married or not he would regret it.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the position I think that hon. gentlemen are in now with

MR. LUSH: the offshore. Whichever way they go now they will regret it. They have themselves backed into a corner. They tried to make such a political football out of it, now they do not know which way to turn. They gave up themselves and they gave it to the courts. Now they are waiting on that. And while that is going on, Mr. Speaker, they are just now posturing and every little issue they can grab on to like the local preference policy -

MR. BAIRD: Do you agree with it or do you not?

MR. LUSH: Do I agree with it? Does the hon. gentleman want me to say what I have said about it? I say I stand on the local preference policy where I stood the first time ever it was brought up. I disagree with it in its form as enunciated by this government. I disagree with it.

MR. NEARY: A't-a-boy!

MR. LUSH: And I am not getting on anybody's bandwagon. The Premier - talking about getting on his bandwagon - getting on his bandwagon when everybody else is getting off? No way!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: He is not going to catch the member for Terra Nova doing that! I did not get on the bandwagon when everybody else was getting on.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: - and for sure I am not going to get on it now when everyone else is getting off.

Mr. Speaker, everybody in the Terra Nova district knows where I stand on the local preference policy. All the people down in my district working in Fort McMurray and working in other places throughout Canada know what this local preference policy did to them. They know what ill-feelings it created, what bitterness it

MR. LUSH: created, what conflict it created, when they were working on the mainland.

My policy always, Mr. Speaker, was every province has a local preference policy, but we did not go around nailing it on the doors of all Canadians, we did not go around posting it up and saying to other Canadians, 'You are not welcome down here.' We did not try to get it enshrined in the constitution. It is an understanding, Mr. Speaker, by all provinces, naturally, that your own people get a choice but, Mr. Speaker, the idea of this was an insidious political thing, trying to give Newfoundlanders the impression that they would get a job on the offshore because they were Newfoundlanders. What we should have been doing, Mr. Speaker, was training our people -

MR. TULK: Exactly.

MR. LUSH: - training them so that they would qualify by right. And, as the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, if our Newfoundlanders were trained, they would have gotten the jobs because there are no better workers in the world. But let us not go about bluffing them and hoodwinking them into thinking this local preference policy is going to give them jobs. The thing again was a total failure, a total failure from the beginning of the set-up when the minister drew up this list. And we found out today how ridiculous that list was, how inadequate it was, when there was not even a provision there to state what languages you speak. Imagine! You cannot fill in an application anywhere today unless you have a -

AN HON. MEMBER: Certainly there was, it says, Other.

MR. LUSH: Yes, 'other', put in your political affiliation there too. What shortsightedness! - here in this Province where we have people speaking different languages. Our neighbours in Labrador, Inuit people, is there any provision

May 11, 1983

Tape 2042

EC - 3

MR. LUSH: for them? I suppose they could not even fill out an application in English. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) might be able to deal with that.

MR. LUSH: I expect there are people in Labrador who could not fill out an application in English, could not even read it, because they do not understand the English language. We have every reason to have that kind of provision there, to ask which language our people speak. But that was left out, Mr. Speaker, and that shows a lack of sense. That is where that local preference policy failed from the beginning: You had to come here to St. John's to get your name on the list, you had to come here to get interviewed, so everything surrounding this local preference policy was just nonsense. It was doomed to failure from the beginning because, Mr. Speaker, the basic assumption undergirding the policy was that you get a job because you are a Newfoundlander, and that is wrong. We get a job because we are skilled and trained Newfoundlanders. That is what this government should have been attending to, but what are they now doing when we should be training for the great oil boom? They are laying off forty-seven vocational instructors, that is what they have done. That is what they have done in the past twelve months, laid off forty-seven. As a matter of fact, fifty is a more accurate figure, because there are three positions through attrition that are not being filled, so we have lost fifty positions.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the preparation for the oil boom. What is it going to be, Mr. Speaker, is one big bang, one big bang for the unemployed of this Province. It is going to blow up in the government's face. One big explosion, one big bang for the unemployed people of this Province, people who are not given the opportunity to train.

MR. LUSH: Local preference policy, this list that you must come to St. John's to get your name on, where they do not even ask the proper question, they do not even try to find out what your language is.

MR. DINN: You do not have to come to St. John's.

MR. LUSH: Well, if you changed it, you changed it only recently. You must come to St. John's to get interviewed.

MR. DINN: All you need is a 32 cent stamp to send it in.

MR. LUSH: You know what Newfoundlanders think of that, sending in your name. If there is one group of people know the frustration of sending your somewhere it is Newfoundlanders. And they know right where it goes, Mr. Speaker, when you send in your name. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of doing it through the regional Manpower Offices, which is what we should be doing, advertising those jobs -

MR. DINN: Applications are in every one of those Manpower offices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: When Pedrel - is it Pedrel?

MR. DINN: P-e-t-r-e-l.

MR. LUSH: When Petrel advertised in Western Newfoundland, did they advertise they were looking for people who could speak French or did you just put a general advertisement in?

MR. DINN: They did not advertise.

MR. LUSH: They did not.

MR. DINN: That is the problem. Harvey's Offshore, who are operating the supply vessels to the Petrel, did go out there and advertise for French speaking people who had qualification to work in the offshore.

MR. LUSH: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the local preference policy was ill-conceived because it was not built on the right foundation. It was not given the right structure from the beginning. It was not built on the right foundation, namely to train our people, and then to make the jobs available right throughout this Province so people in St. Anthony could go to their Manpower Centre there, people in Grand Falls could go to the Manpower Centre there, people in the Terra Nova district could go to Gander or Clarenville and they cannot do that. They can go to their Manpower Centres to get their name on this rather inadequate list that the minister has, this list of 11,000 names. I do not know what this list intends to find out about our workers, I do not know.

MR. DIJN: Whatever information they want to put on it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, then you have to come to St. John's to get your name on the list, you have to come to St. John's to get interviewed, and now you have to come to St. John's to get this MED course, you have to come to St. John's to get on that. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something strange about this MED course. There is something strange about that. The minister said in the House the other day that the government have 22 per cent of the say on who gets accepted into this MED course, federal Manpower fills 33 per cent, and 45 per cent for the companies. And I have a young man who has been looking for a job, or trying to get into the MED school for months and he is getting the runaround. He goes to the companies and they say they cannot do anything. And this young man is trained, a skilled worker, worked in the Beaufort Sea, but he cannot get in because the company will not recommend him.

MR. DINN: Cannot Canada Manpower get him in?

MR. LUSH: He does not qualify under Manpower. He does not qualify. So anyway he gets the runaround, Mr. Speaker. That is it, he gets the runaround.

So, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to preference policy, there is nobody on this side but believes that we should have every Newfoundlander out there we can get there, but let us not give it lip service. Let us set the structure up properly. Let us not try to hoodwink and be hypocritical. Let us set the structure up there properly. Let us not give lip service to all of this nonsense. Let us set the training programmes up in our schools. Let us put the MED programmes right throughout this Province. Let us disperse and expand the hiring practices through our Manpower Centres, force the companies to go out to Gander and to Goose Bay and all parts of this Island to do their interviewing. That is what the minister should be doing, not allow a company to set up its interviews here in St. John's, force them to go out around this Province so that the people - talk about equality! - so that the people of this Province will get equality, will get a fair crack at those jobs.

MR. DINN: That is the second step. The first thing you have to do is get them out of hiring French - France, German - Germany. You have to get them here first before you can get them out around the Province. That is the problem with the Petrel: One hundred and seventy-two crew members and they want to hire twenty-nine, that is it.

MR. LUSH: Twenty-nine what?

MR. DINN: Canadians, if they speak French. We think that is not proper, not right.

MR. LUSH: I agree with the minister as well. I do not think it is proper. But the

MR. LUSH:

point of the matter is I still believe that if the recruitment programme were done properly that we can find these French speaking people.

MR. DINN:

They will not hire them. Twenty-nine maximum they said.

MR. LUSH:

Why will they not hire them?

MR. DINN:

Because they do not want them, they say. Twenty-nine maximum. Look, I can show you a letter they sent me. 'We want twenty-nine and no more, the rest will be French from France.'

MR. LUSH:

But, Mr. Speaker, that again shows the failure of this government. There is something wrong. It shows the failure of this government, Mr. Speaker, If I were the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) I tell you there would be more than twenty-nine Newfoundlanders there. They do not know how to negotiate, they do not know how to deal with people, Mr. Speaker, because they have tried to make a political issue out of things. They were not intellectually honest about what they were doing when they set up this local preference policy, they were not intellectually honest when they started negotiating and that is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. This government have failed in everything they have put their hands to. They have been an abysmal failure but, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to this motion puts this whole issue about offshore negotiations in its proper perspective. It lays no blame on the provincial government, it lays no blame on the federal government, it blames them both equally. And we say, 'Get to work. We got to have a negotiated settlement, the settlement is out there, we must find it, but we cannot find it, Mr. Speaker, as long as we are away from the bargaining table. The settlement is out there and somebody

MR. LUSH: must find it, I cannot find it, no member on this side can find it, if we could we would have had it found. The responsibility lies with the government, Mr. Speaker, and this motion puts the thing in its total perspective, that both governments get down and negotiate so we can get the economy of this Province moving, so that we can create jobs for our people, Mr. Speaker, and so that we can put the business community at ease, so we can create some confidence in the economy of this Province. That is what we got to do, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I got up to speak in this debate because the hon. member opposite is speaking without accurate knowledge of what the facts are with respect to the hiring policy offshore, specifically the Petrel. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know this, that normally speaking on a drill rig, where there are in the case of the Petrel 172 positions, we would like to get somewhere around 60 per cent of those positions, especially since we got people qualified to do these jobs. About 60 per cent, that is the norm. Every other company that comes into Newfoundland waters, negotiates, sits down, they have a look at our registry and they say, 'Well, we do not want to upset the rig by replacing the tool pusher, we would not like to replace captains or officers, but we would like to hire about 60 per cent of Newfoundlanders because we know that they have the qualifications to do the jobs for which we want to hire them. And not only that it is cheaper to have Newfoundlanders on the rigs, because if they come in here with French people from France, every twenty-

MR. DINN: one days they have to ship them into Torbay, out to Gander, back to Paris and after twenty-one days ship them back here. So it it cheaper, number one, and our people can do the job and are as qualified if not more qualified than the people they have now. Mr. Speaker, it was 1979 that the first rig operating in Newfoundland waters came under Newfoundland regulations. And I tell hon. members this little tidbit of information, that for sixteen years before 1979 - now that through a great part of

MR. DINN: the former, former administration, which was a Liberal Government, and it went through part of a Progressive Conservative Government - but in 1979 we said, "Look, they have been drilling out here for sixteen years, we should have some people working on those rigs. After all, they are exploring for, attempting to find our resource and then will want to develop our resource and if we do not get in on the ground floor we will never get a job offshore. They will explore. They will get into development. They will whip it out of the ground, take off from here and we will have nothing, would not even know whether it was there or gone or not."

So, Mr. Speaker, as a government we decided that we have to do something about that, and we did: We brought in some offshore regulations. They are not stringent regulations. There is nobody takes the president of an oil company or a drilling company in this country and beats him over the head with a stick. We just simply say to them, "Here is a registry. In that registry are names of people, what their qualifications are, where they have worked before in the offshore." I remember on the Discoverer Seven Seas, which was the first drillship that came under our regulations, was completely crewed by people from the Phillipines. And we have nothing against people from the Phillipines but we said, "Okay, we have local preference, we have an affirmative action programme for the offshore," we said to the company. "Now you have to operate under our regulations, have a look at our registry, have a look at our people, come in and have a chat with them, and take them out." We did not insist that they take 100 people or 200 people for that particular drill rig. By the way, the Discoverer Seven Seas drilled the deepest well in the world at the time, over 5,246 feet into the ground. That is after they got down through the 300 or 500-odd feet of water.

MR. DINN: I recall now, I had a little picture of the Discoverer Seven Seas and it seems to me, it is in my memory, it was written on the back. But anyway that is about a mile deep and I do not know what the deepest one is now, but it was the deepest one at the time.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we showed them our registry and, lo and behold, without any pressure to hire Newfoundlanders, but because they wanted to comply with our regulations, they replaced 98 of the Fillipinos with 122 Newfoundlanders. And the reason there were more Newfoundlanders was because they went at that time from a one month schedule, or a twenty-eight day schedule, to a twenty-one day schedule and they hired 122 Newfoundlanders, of whom about 10 of them were trainees, people who had never worked on rigs before, but they were willing to take them out because they determined that they would be in Newfoundland waters for some time and they wanted to see how a person who had never operated on a rig before would react to working for the first time on a rig.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that first rig we had 122. Now we have Canterra Energy Limited, the company that will operate the Petrel, who will have the capability on that rig of employing 172 people and we say to them, "Here is our registry," as we do with every company. And I say to hon. members we have negotiated the Pacnorse. As a matter of fact, the Pacnorse, Pellerin and the Neddrill 2, three rigs operated off the Labrador Coast last year, each of the rigs took 30 Newfoundlanders on a permanent basis, so that 90

MR. DINN:

Newfoundlanders went to other ports, other offshore areas and will come back this year. And when they come in here this year we will have from sixty to seventy to eighty people working on each of those rigs, the thirty permanent plus those they will hire voluntarily almost; I mean, they do not even question what happens with respect to hiring Newfoundlanders because they are qualified. And, I tell the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), we have a lot of qualified Newfoundlanders who are capable of working in the offshore. Very rarely is there a case where a company will come in and say, 'We are not going to hire Newfoundlanders,' or 'We have this condition' or 'that condition' or try to impede progress.

In the case of the Petrel, which last year operated in the Davis Strait, it happens to have two Newfoundlanders working on it. They were hired through Montreal and got a job in the Davis Strait. We did not push that because we considered it to be outside our waters. This year they are operating in the Labrador Sea and we say to them, 'Well, Canterra, you know, every company has been in now. We would like to have a chat with you about our local preference policy, our affirmative action policy, and here is our registry,' as we did with all other companies. And, as I said to the hon. member, the Neddrill, the West Venture, the SEDCO 706, the Zapata Uglund have never been a problem. All the supply vessels are manned by Newfoundlanders and crewed by Newfoundlanders. But this one company, for some reason, said to us, 'No, this is a French rig. Now, we will hire a few Newfoundlanders who can speak French.' And we said, 'Well, we have Newfoundlanders who are qualified in the offshore and, as a matter of fact, if you want, we will

MR. DINN: assist you in trying to find where they are and who they are.' 'No, we are not interested in that. We are a French rig.' 'Well, how many are you willing to hire? You know, you have 172. The normal compliment for a rig is about 60 per cent to 70 per cent. How many are you willing to go, one hundred?' 'No.' 'Fifty or sixty?' 'Well, we have a few problems here: Number one, all the people on this rig speak French.' I said, 'Well, there are certain areas where you do not need French-speaking people, with radios you do not need French-speaking people. A lot of the people you have are bilingual and they can translate, and the radio man is going to be communicating with a guy onshore who is English.'

MR. LUSH: The people are bilingual, are they?

MR. DINN: Some of them on the rig, yes. Some of them on the rig are bilingual. So I said, 'Let us be reasonable.' I do not say this now, I am talking about my officials, trying to be reasonable and negotiate and showing them the registry. And they said, 'Yes, well, we will hire twenty-nine, that is the most we can do for you.' Not only is there the problem that they are saying to us they have to speak French, number one, but if we agreed with that, we would have the Norwegian rig people coming in here saying we have to speak Norwegian and we would have the German rig people coming in saying we have to speak German.

MR. DINN: That is the problem now. You have to think about what is happening here.

MR. TULK: There is a difference.

MR. DINN: There is not much of a difference. There are certain positions that we can fill and there are certain positions that we cannot fill and I am quite aware of that. As a matter of fact, the officials negotiated with Harvey's, because there would be communications from the supply vessels back and forth with the rig and we realize that French is an asset. As a matter of fact Harvey's did advertise and tried to find people. Now, I enquired about that because I said, 'Look, we have French pockets in Newfoundland, we have people in Newfoundland who can speak French, we have people who have qualifications. I mean, do not just give up and throw up your hands, let us see if we can do this quietly. You can catch more people with honey than you can with vinegar. Go out to Port au Port. I will tell the hon. gentleman, a person whom he knows in my department, the Director of Employment - and I will not mention his name - there is no need in mentioning the gentleman's name, has been out to Port au Port going around checking the registry and he is aware of what is going on in Port au Port. I think the hon. member will recognize that my Director of Employment knows a little bit about the Port au Port Peninsula and knows the people on the Port au Port Peninsula and knows the names in the registry, and he has been out there trying to get people with the qualifications required to get them on this rig.

MR. DINN: Besides that, since last October when we started to talk about the drilling season for this year, we negotiated with all these companies, and we only had one real problem and that was the Petrel. So in an effort to get this straightened away reasonably and sensibly without too much fuss, we attempted to do this with the Director of Employment and others helping out. Harvey's Offshore, for example, came in and talked to us.

MR. TULK: When did you start these negotiations?

MR. DINN: We started last October with the negotiations for the drilling season this year. With the Petrel, the one that we had a problem with, number one, we could not agree that twenty-nine was a sufficient number of Newfoundlanders to have on a rig of 172.

MR. TULK: When did the Director of Employment go out to Port au Port?

MR. DINN: The Director of Employment has been out in the hon. member's area. I do not know when. This gentleman is a busy gentleman. He is on joint consultative committees, he is Director of Employment, he is dealing with offshore companies and he has been out to Port au Port. I do not know how long he has been out there, how many times he went, how many people he talked to, but I can assure hon. members opposite that he has been out there attempting to do as much as he can to get people who can speak French and have qualifications for the offshore to get jobs. Now besides that, in talking to Harvey's Offshore, who are employing people on the supply vessels, I said, 'Now, look, you may have

MR. DINN: a problem here, but you may be able to hire some French speaking Newfoundlanders with qualifications. The best places that we know about where there are pockets of French speaking people in Newfoundland and, for example the Port au Port area and Western Labrador. Advertise there when you are hiring.

These are places where there are some French speaking people in Newfoundland. And they did. I do not know how successful they were.

I did not push them out to Port au Port, I did not demand that they go to Port au Port. That is not the way you operate. Number one, you give them the registry of qualifications, you assist companies, you do not badger them all the time. And not only that, you know, that is not my thing anyway, I do not like going around pushing people around in that respect. So they advertised out there and they got a low response. Now the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) may or may not agree or disagree with that, but all I can say to him is that he can check with Harvey's Offshore. I have no intention of badgering Harvey's Offshore to do -

MR. HODDER: Do you know when the ad went in the paper?

MR. DINN: No, but I can find out for the hon. member. I will be only to pleased to find that out and what papers it went into and so on. But I know that they did do it and they got a low response. That is only one of the problems in getting people who can speak French and have qualifications. The other problem is that a company coming in here and saying, 'You are only going to have twenty-nine on the rig,' and we know that that is just ridiculous. You could have fifty people on that

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2048

ah-4

MR. DINN: rig who would have nothing to do with safety operations or anything else, workers in the mess hall and people just having to do with the administration of the rigs. They could put fifty on it, they would not have to

MR. DINN: sweat at all, roustabouts and roughnecks. They are not involved in safety on the rig, they are not on the drilling platform. These people work their way up to the drilling platform. It takes a little while for them to work their way through the system. They are basically going around deck and they are painting a little bit here and fixing up a little bit there, basically maintenance on the rig and that kind of thing.

So we did not think it unreasonable out of 172 that we would get 50 or 60 per cent. That is what the people who come in to look at our registry normally do. When they come in and say, 'Twenty-nine, and they had better speak French and that is it, and we are not talking any more,' it kind of ruffles your feathers a little bit. Not only are they going against the regulations, which they may want to test, but they are going against the Canadian constitution which gives us the right to bring in the regulations we have. The Premier negotiated last year and got that put into the constitution. It is just the attitude of the company. Not just because it is French, but if they are let away with this, a Norwegian crew would come here next year and say, 'Look, if you have twenty-nine Norwegians or Newfoundlanders who speak Norwegian, we will hire them, but if you have not, tough bananas, you know, we will keep our own crew.' That is just abhorrent to me, when, as hon. members know, I have to stand up in this House day after day and answer for the 20.3 per cent unemployment problem in this Province. I might inform hon. members that last week, I believe, when I stood up in this House and said that we

MR. DINN: had the possibility of ten to eleven rigs and I named off most of the rigs, I did not name rigs that BP Canada might have had on the Northeast Coast since BP Canada is not drilling this year. They are not drilling, I believe, because it was approved too late by the feds. That is my belief, because they had negotiated, they had talked about crewing, they had done everything with respect to gearing up to start drilling this year. But I will tell hon. members that we are now negotiating, for example, for the John Shaw and Bow Drill II, which is one we had not expected in our area this year, that is expected to come in later this year. So we still have about ten rigs, whether they are semi-submersible or drillships themselves, in the waters this year.

I will tell you that amounts, under just normal crewing complement-offshore supply vessels, onshore directly related - that amounts to about 3,200 jobs and Newfoundlanders will have 2,000 or more of them. There was twisting of arms, just the companies coming in, looking at the registries, looking at the information that is available, and putting ads in papers and hiring.

Now I know the hon. member has gotten a lot of calls today from constituents in Port au Port. Anything that I can do for the hon. member with respect to getting them on the rigs, if they are not registered, I will get registry forms for the hon. gentleman, if they want assistance in filling out the forms I will send a member from my Employment Division out to Port au Port to do whatever needs to be done, because I believe we have French speaking Newfoundlanders who are qualified in the offshore.

That is not the problem. The problem is a company that comes in here and says, as a condition

MR. DINN: of employment (1) you have to speak French, and also that our of 172, they say from their big pedestal, 'We will hire maybe twenty-nine. If they speak French well enough and they have the qualifications, maybe we will hire twenty-nine.' We say that is a little bit unfair.

Hon. members never heard me get upset with any oil company or drilling company up to this point in time with respect to the offshore, not one. But I say you have to draw a line somewhere. I say that this is where you draw the line.

MR. DINN: The Canadian Constitution gives us the capability of having affirmative action offshore, we take that affirmative action in the Offshore Petroleum Regulations, it is all in place. And I say that when they say to us, (a) French, (b) twenty-nine out of 172, we say, 'That is not right, you will comply with our regulations.' There are options, and I tell hon. members what the options are: 'Number one, you are breaking our law. Under that law you can lose your lease or permit; number two, you are breaking the Canadian Constitution and we would not be too long at all in whipping you into court and getting an injunction against you on that basis. We just think it is not right. If you want to come in here and work and get money from companies to do that work, and you want to explore and possibly develop our resource, we expect a fair and equitable share of that exploration and/or development.'

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the resolution as amended, and I would like to address a few comments through Your Honour to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

Mr. Speaker, one of the calls that I received this morning was from a French Newfoundlander who had received a Bachelor of Arts degree at St. Anne's University. Now, St. Anne's University, as all hon. members should know, is a French speaking university and he is the first French Newfoundlander I know of who has actually gone through and received a degree in French. As you know, Mr. Speaker, for some time the French language in Port au Port was in decline, but in the last eight or ten years we have

MR. HODDER: young Newfoundlanders from the district of Port au Port who are finding positions in the federal civil service because of their ability to be able to speak French as well as English and they are finding positions at the university. And many of those French Newfoundlanders, bilingual Newfoundlanders, have gone back to the area and more and more are coming back to the area and there is a revival of the French language.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of communities in the West Coast where the majority of the families speak French in their homes rather than English, and most Newfoundlanders in those areas understand French if they do not speak French. In Stephenville and the Kippens-Port au Port areas, which are not noted as French communities, you will find very vibrant and active French associations and a large number of people who speak French. Now, something has gone astray in my estimation. I would like to point out as well that unemployment is high because of the nature of the area, the lack of harbours and the fact that we have had a number of shutdowns on the Port au Port Peninsula. Sea Mining quarry in Aguathuna shut down sometime in the early 1970s, the limestone quarry shut down by DOSCO sometime prior to the 1970s, and an awful lot of the people in the area worked in Stephenville on the base which closed down. This sort of employment has not come back and each successive mill that we have had there has hired fewer and fewer people. Mr. Speaker, I have trouble getting people to believe the unemployment rate in the area. I told a member of the press the statistics and the eyes opened as if to say, 'I do not believe you.' I am not talking about anybody here, I am talking about a member of the press on the West Coast.

May 11, 1983

Tape No. 2050

MJ - 3

MR. HODDER:

I have said to members opposite and I have said it here in the House of Assembly that this Winter the Manpower office in Stephenville said that they thought that there was about 90 per cent unemployment in the Port au Port area. Now the figures are done for

MR. HODDER: a large area but that was a very informed guess, and my experiences of this Winter coincides with that. That is not to say they are not skilled. Scratch almost anyone out there and they are a pipefitter or a welder, an awful lot of these people have worked in the oilfields in Fort McMurray in Alberta. I would say a great deal of the French speaking people in the area are waiting to do the MED course which is a bottleneck right across the Province.

Mr. Speaker, when the minister says that they are getting a fair chance at getting jobs in the offshore, there are very few French speaking people from Western Newfoundland working on the offshore right now. But I can tell the minister that there is something wrong when he says that they had a low response. I, myself, heard about a week and a half ago that there would be an ad placed in a paper. I asked the paper to call me when it was placed there. I did not get a call but I cannot say it was not placed there. If the ministers officials were out there they must have been out there very recently, because I myself informed the French association and the Manpower Outreach Worker Programme and Canada Manpower in the area that this might be happening. I did not know the details of it but I had had a tip that there was a French drillship coming and that there might be people hired. I, myself, talked to people who were very interested.

Now, I do not know what qualifications that the government or the people on the drillship are looking for, but I do know that we have cooks, I do know that we have welders, I do

MR. HODDER: know that we have French speaking people in just about every trade. They may not have the MED course but I know that these people are there because I suppose some 60 per cent of my calls are job related.

MR. TULK: Why did they not use you as a resource, to find out what is going on out there?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member cannot because he does not know whether the people are speaking French or not.

MR. DINN: Would the hon. member permit me for a second?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. DINN: Now, with respect to the MED course, under normal circumstances with a good operator— and Canterra in my opinion is not— what the companies do is when they get a complement of people they pay for forty-five right away and get on that course and they get priority if they have jobs to go to. So if Canterra were willing to do what Harvey's did with co-operation from everybody if they got, say, fifty people from the Port au Port Peninsula or from Western Labrador or French speaking Newfoundlanders, they could put them through the course. It is my opinion that they are just not willing to do it and that is the problem. And they would have priority right away.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the minister and I would say to him that again something has slipped up, something is wrong. The people are there. I say, as I said in Question Period today that I am quite sure that on the minister's list there are

MR. HODDER: people who are not working.
Now there are some French Newfoundlanders working both on the supply ships and on the rigs. But I would say to the minister that it was very bad planning. Let us look at negotiations. The minister said, 'We negotiate with those rigs'. He says, 'We catch a little more sometimes with honey than with vinegar'. I agree. But, Mr. Speaker, when a situation like that arises, where you have a French speaking Newfoundlander or a Norwegian speaking Newfoundlander, would the minister not agree that once you negotiate your quantity of Newfoundlanders then you can say, 'Well, if you are a French speaking ship how about going for ten more?'. I mean, the minister's hand would be strengthened if he had the knowledge of the language of the French Newfoundlanders.

MR. DINN:

Yes

MR. HODDER: I want to say something else, Mr. Speaker. We have in Bay St. George something called the Bay St. George Community College. The hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) used to be chairman of the board of that college.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: And the hon. member, before I got into politics and even before, I suppose, he got into politics, worked to get that institution off the ground. We both worked. I will not go into the details but we certainly had an input into that institution.

MR. STAGG: True.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it is situated in one of the largest and highest unemployment areas in the Province. The West Coast figures are consistently higher than the rest of Newfoundland. And what is the concept of a community college all about if it is not there to train the people in the community so that they can find jobs in any field? And, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, there is not one course being offered in the Bay St. George -

MR. STAGG: Talking about my district again.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the hon. member's district because the Bay St. George Community College spans Bay St. George. It is called Bay St. George Community College.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. HODDER: It just happens to be located in the central part. It could be located in my district, it could be located anywhere but it just happens to be in the center of the hon. member's district. But, Mr. Speaker, there is not one course being offered in that college that would qualify people - and when I hear the minister talk about certain types of jobs, like the people who paint and the people who do this or that on the French ship that we

MR. HODDER: are talking about, and when you realize that we have people who speak French, who are qualified - you know, one of the people who called me this morning had, as I said before, an arts degree in French, we have welders who speak French, we have all sorts of trades and skills all over the area.

MR. STAGG: M. le president, il ne parle pas francais. Il est unilingue, mais il represente un district francophone. Il parle anglaise seulement.

MR. HODDER: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) speaks very good kindergarten French.

Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained, and the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), when he was the Speaker of the House, was the only person who listened to me, that a member of the House of Assembly should have the right, as do members of the House of Commons in Ottawa, to learn the language, particularly if he happens to represent an area where there are French-speaking people. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth was the Speaker of the House, he initiated a course for members of the House which was attended by members of both sides of the House. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I attended every class but I did not become proficient in the language. But I would now ask through Your Honour that I be sent this Summer for an immersion course because, Mr. Speaker, obviously, a person who represents a French-speaking district should be bilingual. The problem is that whenever there is a course being offered in St. John's, I am outside, and when there is a course being offered in that area, I am back in St. John's, so I have not been able to connect. Now, the hon. member was fortunate enough to come from a school where they taught French. I was unfortunate, being in an area in

May 11, 1983

Tape 2052

EC - 3

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland where they taught Latin; so I am very proficient in Latin, as the hon. member knows, and he is not very proficient in French.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, whether it be Norwegian, whether it be French, whether it be Inuit, Mr. Speaker, I think it was a gross miscalculation for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to have 11,000 applications from across this Province with no indication of whether they are French, Norwegian, Spanish, There are all sorts of people who speak different languages. It certainly shows a lack of understanding of the people who live in this Province and it certainly shows that the French area of the Province was forgotten.

MR. TULK: Are you talking about the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has a lack of understanding?

MR. HODDER: No, I am talking about the government, the minister, the Premier, and the Cabinet. The member for Stephenville has very little decision-making power in this government.

MR. TULK: He has none. He is a toddler trying to get into the Cabinet.

MR. HODDER: He wanted to get into the Cabinet and he wanted to get in so bad that the Premier said, "No, we cannot let him in the Cabinet but to keep him happy we will make him a parliamentary assistant." And so now he has been flying around to New York and British Columbia. We have not seen him in the House this year hardly, and when he comes in he just come in to heckle and he hardly ever speaks.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member that he come into the House, that he take part in debate in the House, and I certainly would like his support rather than his heckling. I would like his support to see that we do have the proper offshore courses in the Bay St. George Community College and that French Newfoundlanders do get a chance, because they do have a skill that many Newfoundlanders

MR. HODDER: do not have.

MR. STAGG: They are a unique resource.

MR. HODDER: They are a unique resource to this Province. I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I think the situation must be resolved. I do not know how the minister now will be able to find out, but we have a situation where we have enough Newfoundlanders already on the list and do not know who they are. I would ask the minister if he would go back to the area and find people, This should never happen again.

MR. STAGG: I will volunteer to put the hon. member through an immersion programme.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have not even gotten into my speech yet.

But, Mr. Speaker, as far as the resolution is concerned, this administration was elected to negotiate. There is no doubt that was the overriding issue in the last provincial election. The Newfoundland people "We will give our Premier, this administration, the wherewithal, we will give him our support in negotiations with Ottawa." And these negotiations have not come to pass. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, all that the people of Newfoundland are asking at this present time is to sit down and negotiate,

MR. HODDER: and all we hear is rhetoric. But we know who walked away from the negotiations. We know who walked away from the negotiations. We have the highest unemployment in Canada. We have a resource off our shores that will always be there, as members have pointed out, but it may be longer and longer and longer away, the longer we refuse to negotiate.

MR. STAGG: Two more years.

MR. HODDER: Oh, the member opposite would say, 'What will happen in two more years?'.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!
The clock being twenty minutes of the hour, it is my duty to recognize the hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I should begin where I concluded last Wednesday. I do not know if I should say concluded, when I was stopped from ending my brief remarks by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), who at that time refused to let his colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) give me sufficient time, which was another couple of minutes, to clue up my remarks. After that the member for Torngat made an amendment to my resolution. At that time I was not sure that the member for Torngat Mountains believed that he should make such an amendment. And today I am sure that is borne out by his absence as well as by the absence of his colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who seconded the amendment.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all refer back to a clear understanding

MR. PEACH: that last year on April 6, this government did receive an overwhelming mandate in this Province to negotiate an offshore agreement. It was not a mandate to negotiate at any price and to sell it down the drain. It was a direction to attempt to reach an honourable agreement beneficial to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and to Canada as a whole. So, Mr. Speaker, we should be very clear that this was the mandate that we did receive and we should make sure that we honour that mandate.

I would have to ask members opposite to consider what is so unreasonable, as they say, with this government's position on the offshore. I would ask them to consider for themselves what could possibly be wrong with such positions that this government has put forth. Mr. Speaker, why should we not have the right to determine how this resource which we brought into Confederation is to be resolved. There should be nobody, Mr. Speaker, who could openly and honestly deny that right of ours, and particularly when we agree to bind ourselves to be reasonable and to recognize the national interest. Who can deny, Mr. Speaker, the young people of this Province the right to see 75 per cent of the revenues this resource dedicated to enabling them to look forward to the day when their incomes will equal the average income of young Canadians living in other parts of this country? Mr. Speaker, I ask the same members opposite, have not we the same right to aspire to reducing taxation rates to the level of average Canadians?

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the amendment that was brought in last Wednesday by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. PEACH: And I am not sure why he would bring in such an amendment except that to do so was a way in which he and his members opposite could hide behind the ills of our federal government, behind the ills of the federal machine in Ottawa, to be puppets for Mr. Rompkey and his other federal friends in the federal regime. In fact, I suppose we should look at it in the way that it was probably a point of their adhering to the whims of their leader, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), whose leadership, we all realize now, is being attacked and being challenged by some of the upcoming French associated sector of the Liberal Youth Organization, I am not quite sure of the pronunciation of the name, but I am sure the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) would be familiar with the name that he quite often applies to the French sector of our population,

Mr. Speaker, we have asked the federal government to put some very clear points in writing, I would like to take a minute of my time to refer briefly to some of them. I will pick out the ones that members opposite could understand best, one of them being that the Joint Management board will be equal in one and all of its senses, with its own administrative staff employed by the board and under its full and exclusive direction and control; that there will be an objective means of determination of national energy self-sufficiency and security of supply provided in the agreement by a mutually agreed independent body which renders final and binding decisions. I think, Mr. Speaker, the part of being a mutually agreeable independent body is a very important point and one that we should remember.

Another point is that there be a fair and equitable sharing of Crown rights; that there be a cost-shared industrial and financial incentives

MR. PEACH: programme to begin immediately upon the signing of the agreement and that minor legislation would be enacted by Parliament and the Newfoundland Legislature which would reflect a true partnership and the best of both federal and provincial resource management legislation including our public hearing process, the fiscal regime, the revenue sharing agreement and the constitution of the board and that the legislation could not be changed except by mutual consent; that the offshore would be considered to be within the Province for the purpose of the application of the Province's social laws and taxation laws of general application; and, as well, that the agreement be permanent by entrenching its fundamental aspects into the constitution. What, Mr. Speaker, is so unreasonable about putting those things in writing?

To make brief reference to some points that have been made with regard to the offshore agreement, I refer to a few brief references from the written media. I refer to The Ottawa Citizen of December, 1982, which says in its headlines: 'Tentative agreement reached in Newfoundland offshore dispute.' Just to quote a short portion of it: 'Energy Minister, Jean Chretien announced Wednesday he and his provincial counterpart, William Marshall, have reached a tentative agreement on the management of Newfoundland's rich offshore resources. The agreement, if approved by the ministers' respective governments, will clear the way for development of the massive Hibernia oilfields off the Grand Banks and the sharing of revenues from it,

MR. PEACH:

Chretien estimated it would be ten days before it was clear whether the new position would lead to a settlement. 'If the formula was acceptable deputies would begin drafting the formal language of an agreement at any time and it is worthy of note if the compromise were not acceptable we can wait for the courts,' Chretien said.

Then, Mr. Speaker, to refer to one of our local papers, The Daily News, in December of 1982 which I quote from, 'Mr. Marshall said his government would like to settle the dispute by negotiation rather than pressing ahead with the legal actions over the control of the offshore resources, chiefly oil in Newfoundland's case and Ottawa has virtually ruled out the possibility of surrendering federal jurisdiction over offshore resources so the Province is pushing for a joint management and a meaningful revenue sharing agreement.' And to further go on, 'Mr. Chretien said agreements reached with Nova Scotia, Alberta and Saskatchewan are not exactly the same, leaving open the possibility of an accord to take account of Newfoundland's position. 'The market for oil is better than demand for gas,' Mr. Chretien said, 'at the time, and in Nova Scotia we are dealing with natural gas, so far in Newfoundland we are dealing with oil. It is not the same product at all, it is not the same mode of development, and it is not the same type of market.''

As well, Mr. Speaker, about that same time we find that our Prime Minister said, Mr. Trudeau says that he saw no major problems with the proposed offshore pact. However, we realize that this did not come about and to make a short quote from The Daily News of January 1983, 'Chretien has been flexible on the management issue and so has the Province. That means

MR. PEACH: any Newfoundland deal will be unlike a rigid arrangement reached last year with Nova Scotia. Instead Newfoundland will likely be ultimately responsible in certain areas and the central government in others. 'They recognize they are a part of Canada', a federal spokesman at the time said in his reference.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the other part of the offshore dispute in which Ottawa did what is referred to quite often as a flip flop. And we find that after the Marshall-Chretien offshore discussions we were somewhat heartened and encouraged to realize that an agreement was near. However, we found that when officials from both sides sat down to write an agreement we were dismayed by the federal government changing its mind

MR. PEACH: and it had returned to its previous position which rejected joint management, and meaningful revenue sharing. So it is very easy and clear, Mr. Speaker, to see where the negotiations broke off.

Mr. Speaker, to go back to last Wednesday and the amendment that was put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and I quote Hansard in which he said, I move an amendment to the motion seconded by the hon. colleague for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) that we delete all the words after the first 'WHEREAS', which means that they agree with the first WHEREAS that Newfoundland has a moral and historic claim to the resources of our Continental Shelf. But in deleting the rest of the WHEREASES, which reads, 'It is an undeniable fact that Newfoundland brought those resources into Canada by its entry into Confederation', they do not agree with that. They do not agree that that is part of what we did bring into Confederation.

The next WHEREAS reads, 'We entered into negotiations on the verbal understanding that the federal government was willing to consider an offshore agreement for Newfoundland which would be better than the Nova Scotia agreement', they do not believe that that should be so. "AND WHEREAS the federal government has adopted the unacceptable position that Newfoundland must accept an agreement that is no better than and in some respects worse than the Nova Scotia agreement".

"AND WHEREAS the clear and public position of Newfoundland is that the Province must share in a meaningful way the management responsibilities and the revenues associated with the offshore", they do not agree with that. They do not agree, Mr. Speaker, that we should share in any meaningful

MR. PEACH: way in management or revenue sharing.

"AND WHEREAS the social economic justice and the chance for Newfoundland to become an equal province of Canada dictates that the position of the federal government is morally wrong and unacceptable to the vast majority of people in this Province", by deleting that WHEREAS they indicate their position very clearly that they do not agree that we should have an equal position to other provinces in Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure today in closing the discussion and debate on this particular resolution ending up with the last part of it which reads: "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that the Government of Canada enter into an agreement with this Province such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized and the full contents of the resolution with all of the WHEREASES as was read last Wednesday". So, I look forward to the members on this side of the House voting against the amendment and of course voting in favour of the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said amendment? All in favour 'Aye'. Contrary, 'Nay'. The 'Nays' have it.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the main motion? All in favour 'Aye'. Contrary 'Nay'. The 'Ayes' have it. Motion carried.

It being six o'clock on Wednesday this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 10, 1983

May 11, 1983

Tabled 10 May '8

ORDERS OF THE DAY 18/83 APRIL 13, 1983

Question 99

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The names of all Directors and consultants who have received fees and paid expenses from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982 and why these amounts were paid.

ANSWER

Newfoundland Liquor Corporation
Directors Fees and Expenses
Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1982

Name

Frederick Russell	Attendance of Directors Meetings	\$ 605.00
Dorothy Robbins	Attendance of Directors Meetings	505.00
Charles White	Attendance of Directors Meetings	430.00
Meals		<u>1,140.12</u>
		<u>\$2,680.12</u>

Newfoundland Liquor Corporation
Consultants Fees
Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1982

Dr. Langford	Wine Consultant	\$3,000.00
B. & M. Services	Research and preparation for sketches for branch #2 on Elizabeth Avenue East	525.00
Elaine Squires	Interior design at branch #2 on Elizabeth Avenue East	<u>25.00</u>
		<u>\$2,550.00</u>

Tall

ORDERS OF THE DAY 24/83 APRIL 21, 1983

QUESTION 113

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Details of the amount of money his Department has taken in on a monthly basis as a result of the Retail Sales Tax for the years 1980 and 1981.

ANSWER

Retail Sales Tax Receipts for 1980 and 1981 are attached.

Tabled 10 May '83

REPLY TO QUESTION 113
ORDERS OF THE DAY
21 APRIL 1983
RETAIL SALES TAX RECEIPTS

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
January	21,865,441	23,501,666
February	14,733,708	16,866,804
March	15,291,478	20,816,826
April	16,612,572	19,312,664
May	19,717,881	20,711,736
June	19,278,601	21,620,470
July	20,526,478	16,012,151
August	24,250,813	26,237,374
September	20,051,636	22,130,833
October	21,387,236	21,542,232
November	20,647,703	21,123,946
December	<u>22,081,357</u>	<u>19,740,531</u>
	<u>236,444,904</u>	<u>249,849,233</u>

Talled 10 May

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 84 ASKED THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF
TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE ON ORDER PAPER
OF APRIL 12, 1983.

Wayne Clarke, Special Assistant to Minister, transferred
March 31, 1981, from Department of Tourism, Recreation &
Culture.

Salary \$30,351. per annum.

Tabled 10 May '83

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 15 ASKED THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR TERRA NOVA ON ORDER PAPER OF MARCH 11, 1983.

- (a) No maintenance projects carried out on any roads in the district of Terra Nova this past construction season.
- (b) Projects carried out by maintenance forces in 1982:-

<u>Project</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
1) Ditching and repairs Lance Cove, Bell Island	\$ 20,000
2) Paving in Conception Bay South Area	23,000
3) Brookside Road Improvements	50,000
4) Churchill Road Improvements	120,000
5) Bus Stop TCH - Howley Road	10,000
6) Upgrading in the Town of Melrose	5,000
7) Repairs Indian Meal Line	37,000
8) Upgrade Mud Lake Road	15,000
9) Upgrade roads on Random Island, Britannia and Lance Cove	30,000
10) Recapping Frenchman's Cove	94,600
11) Upgrading Alyward's Road, Ferryland	15,000
12) Church Road in Sweet Bay	9,500
13) Repairs to road in Shoe Cove	20,000
14) Reconstruct O'Neils Road	20,000
15) Paving in Old Perlican	10,000
16) Greenhans Point Bayview, Twillingate	2,000
17) Improvement to access road, TCH Salmonier Line	10,000
18) Construct road at Harry's Harbour	4,500
19) Road construction at Twillingate	2,500
TOTAL	\$ 498,100

- (c) Projects carried out by individuals or contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982:-

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>COST</u>
F.J. Constr.	South Brook Bridge near St. Georges	\$ 236,600
Jones Constr.	TCH from Fort Motel towards Foxtrap Access Road	360,000
	TCH from Flat Bay Brook towards Fishells Brook km 772 - km 780	1,423,850
McNamara	Plum Point towards Roddickton	850,000

(c) Projects carried out by individuals or contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
McNamara	Construction Corner Brook Ind. Pk. Access Road Ext.	\$ 2,050,000
McNamara	TCH from Exploits River to Bishop Falls 8.6 km	761,550
Penney Blacktop	TCH between km 59.1 to 60.6 near Brian's Pond	229,141
Shorts Constr.	Road from Mary's Hbr. to Lodge Bay in Labrador 9 km	475,000
Viking	Quebec Border - Pinware	2,939,437
Western	TCH Fishells River to Barachois Bk km 788 - km 802	4,349,717
Western	TCH from 8 km west of Flat Bay Bk to Fishells Bk km 780 - km 788	2,015,229
Western	TCH from Carbbes River to North Branch Underpass km 809.3 - km 834.5	1,900,000
Western	Stephenville Industrial Access Rd from Main Gut Bridge to Inter. with Route 460	1,398,383
Adams Aggregates	Supply and stockpile Indian Cove Pit	59,632
Adams Aggregates	Supply and application granular material & Calcium Chloride	70,000
Adams Aggregates	Upgrading section of Route 410 Ming's Bight Rd	443,883
Adams Aggregates	Upgrading and repaving 2.2 km (approx.) of Route 340 TCH Inter. - Lewisporte	321,444
Adams Aggregates	Paving approx. 5 km roads in Harbour Mille area	302,048

(c) Projects carried out by individuals or contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Allied Chemical	Calcium chloride for roads in number of communities	\$ 521,008
Avalon Constr.	Ferry Terminal Wharf at Shoal Arm	400,000
B. & M. Paving	Patching east of Grand Falls	141,979
Babb Constr.	Carbonear By-pass from High St. North Inter. towards Valley Rd.	188,500
Babb Constr.	New Harbour - Tilton (Reconstr.)	183,900
Babb Constr.	Upgrading approx. 3 km of Route 413, Burlington Road	378,100
Cadillac Constr.	Improvements to site drainage system and expansion joint pilot project at CN Viaduct	52,800
Cannon Constr.	Reconstruction Witless Bay Line Route 13	265,748
CCM Constr.	Grand Bank Brook Bridge	195,925
Woodrow Chaulk	Supply and stockpiling granular material at Deer Lake	18,000
Churchill Constr.	Construction of Upper Brook Bridge	538,387
City Paving	Paving Old Marine Drive	260,814
Clayco Constr.	Repairs to Upper River Bridge Nicholsville	201,392
D. & A. Constr.	Upgrading of 3.3 km Route 363 Mose Ambrose and English Harbour West Arm	413,238
D. & A. Constr.	Access road to New Ferry Wharf at Shoal Arm	243,085
East Coast Hydroseeding	Hydroseeding of slopes at Jersey'side	1,870
Eastern Road Builders	Supply and stockpiling of granular material	19,550

(c) Projects carried out by individuals or contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Gid Sacrey Ltd.	Ferry Terminal Wharf and Assoc. works at Burgeo	\$ 532,900
Gid Sacrey Ltd.	Construction of ferry terminal wharf at Suley Ann's Cove	452,239
Leo Giovannini	Construction of short detour of a local road in Lawn	197,700
Goobie Rentals	Upgrading road from Gander Bay to Boyd's Cove	133,826
Harold Whittle Painting	Blastcleaning, painting and misc. repair to Sir Ambrose Shea Lift Bridge	206,603
Harry Cooper	Upgrading section of road in Cottlesville - Moreton's Hbr.	335,775
Headland Constr.	Upgrading section of road from Happy Valley to Churchill Falls	80,494
H.J. O'Connell	Upgrading of Javelin Road and Duley Lake Road	426,181
H.J. O'Connell	Reconstr. & Paving Inter. of Wabush Airport Road with Lab. City - Wabush Road	177,259
H.J. O'Connell	Reconstr. & Paving of the Inter. Wabush Airport Road with the Lab. City - Wabush Road	150,000
H.J. O'Connell	Supply and installation of a Bi-level car ramp Esker	59,650
Hynes Constr.	Supply and installation of break-water Cribwork at Placentia	419,402
Hynes Constr.	Paving through Ship Harbour	197,973
Hynes Constr.	Extension to ferry terminal wharf Farewell	454,177
Kinsella's Expert Landscaping	Sodding of slopes Logy Bay Road	7,413.93
L. & R. Communications	Constr. of radio building towers and antennae Burgeo Road	229,156

(c) Projects carried out by individuals and contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Licon Limited	Supply and stockpiling granulars at Amherst Cove	\$ 11,990
Lundrigans Ltd.	Three Ton Brook Bridge	237,719
Lundrigans Ltd.	Construction of Grand Codroy River Bridge	450,000
Lundrigans Ltd.	Paving several roads in the St. Georges District	209,300
Lundrigans Ltd.	Lomond River Bridge	379,550
Lundrigans Ltd.	Supply and stockpile granular material for four locations in District #4	184,150
Lundrigans Ltd.	Re-surfacing 9 sections of Route 450 between Mt. Morriah and Frenchman's Cove	94,599
Lundrigans Ltd.	Re-surfacing 9 sections of Route 450 between Mt. Morriah and Frenchman's Cove	214,900
Lundrigans Ltd.	Upgrading and paving O'Connell Drive in Corner Brook	800,000
Lundrigans Ltd.	Paving section of Route 440 from Huges Brook Bridge towards Summerside	219,429
Lundrigans Ltd.	Upgrading Route 411 Westport Rd	486,500
Lundrigans Ltd.	Robinsons River Bridge and Approaches and associated works	1,292,487
McCurdy Constr. & Equip. Ltd.	Supply and stockpile granular material at Indian Cove and Blackhead Pit	85,309
McCurdy Constr. & Equip. Ltd.	Supply and stockpile granular material at Port Rexton Campsite	33,000
McNamara Corp.	Grading of Route 382 on Pilley's Island	1,051,923

(c) Projects carried out by individuals and contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Modern Paving	Paving at Cape Broyle and Burnt Cove.	\$ 57,915
Modern Paving	Upgrading of Beachy Cove Rd	263,220
Modern Paving	Repairs to St. John's Harbour Arterial	39,500
Modern Paving	Recapping Conception Bay Hwy.	185,601
Modern Paving	Paving section of Lance Cove Road and three side roads	197,000
Nova Constr.	Construction of Green's Pond Causeway	2,200,000
Pelley Enterprises Ltd.	Ferry terminal wharf Long Island	454,600
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Paving 5 km of Tilton Barrens Road and reconstr. and paving 6.25 km of New Hbr. Road	585,900
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Supply and application of chip seal surface treatment on Salmonier Line and Burin Placentia Hwy.	531,375
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Repaving Roaches Line 4 km	375,184
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Paving from Hickman's Hbr. Inter. towards Petley and Other roads in Lower Lance Cove area	468,432
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Upgrading and paving 1.3 km road at Dover together with 0.5 km of St. Vincents Road	186,030
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Paving section of Route 235 from Birchy Cove to Bonavista	597,767
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Grading and paving Locklmond Block Road	515,653

(c) Projects carried out by individuals and contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Penney Blacktop Ltd.	Ferry terminal loading ramp at Ramea	\$ 166,310
Penney Paving Ltd.	Reconstr. and paving of Inter. at Twillingate	26,309
Penney Paving Ltd.	Patching, repair and re-surfacing of pavement west of Grand Falls	102,246
Penney Paving Ltd.	Paving two sections of Northern Arm to Point of Bay and Phillips Head to Point of Bay	318,077
Penney Paving Ltd.	Repaving of 1.14 km section of Route 370 in Buchans together with road improvements and paving for the Town	563,604
Penney Roadbuilders	Upgrading of 1.8 km of Route 391 Jackson's Cove Road	205,743
Penney Roadbuilders	Upgrading section of road to Terrenceville	370,312
Clifford Sheaves Constr. Ltd.	Supply and stockpiling of granular material at Cape Ray	33,600
Shorts Constr. Ltd.	Grading from Hampden Inter. towards Sop's Arm	1,022,514
Suburban Constr.	Reconstr. Commonwealth Ave. Mount Pearl	292,650
Sun Constr. Ltd.	Reconstr. of Kelligrews River Bridge	199,924
Trident Constr. Ltd.	North Arm River Bridge	177,900
Trident Constr. Ltd.	Commonwealth Ave. Bridge Ext.	119,013
Trident Constr. Ltd.	Ferry terminal wharf at Man O' War Cove, Rigo Island	543,400
Trident Constr. Ltd.	Constr. of Portugal Cove South Bridge	231,884

(c) Projects carried out by individuals or contractors and the costs of each project that started in 1982 (cont'd)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Twillingate Constr.	Constr. of access road at Stag Hbr. to new wharf at Man O'War Cove	\$ 408,339
Viking Constr.	Supply and stockpile granular base course material between Pinware and Red Bay	95,000
Weirs Constr. Ltd.	Stockpiling Grade 3 at Eastport	10,944
Weirs Constr. Ltd.	Stockpiling at Black Brook	17,380
Weirs Constr. Ltd.	Stockpiling at Bay L'Argent	21,600
Weirs Constr. Ltd.	Stockpiling at Lewisporte sub-depot	21,750
Wells & Park Constr. Co.	Supply and placement of armour stone on a section of Route 421	303,851
Western Constr.	Reconstr. of a section of Route 420 south of Sop's Arm	731,610
Western Constr.	Granular material at Abraham's Cove Depot	73,218
Western Constr.	Grading of south approach to the proposed bridge across Grand Codroy River	365,294

Tabled 10 May '83

REPLY TO QUESTION ASKED THE HONOURABLE PREMIER RE WATCHMEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER OF BELLEVUE ON MAY 9, 1983.

In order to fully appreciate the funding situation with respect to the Watchman positions it is necessary to understand the manner in which the Salary Details document is put together.

On pages 88 & 89 of the Salary Details document are listed all permanent approved positions for the budget activity entitled "Support Services". There are five operational groupings included in this area with permanent positions and related annual salary costs as follows:

<u>Operational Grouping</u>	<u>No. of Positions</u>	<u>Annual Cost</u>
Building & Grounds Maintenance	27	\$ 424,602
Security	53	748,289
Purchasing & Control	10	163,466
Stockroom Operations	56	887,213
Inspection Station/Scale Operations	35	<u>549,670</u>
		<u>\$2,773,240</u>

The listing in the Salary Details attempts to show the permanent approved staff complement with the related annual cost if those positions were all filled on a twelve month basis.

At the end of the list for "Support Services" on page 89, the provisions for temporary employees and overtime, being \$250,000 and \$117,000 respectively, are also shown. Thus, if all permanent positions were filled for the full year, requirement for "Support Services" would be as follows:

Permanent Positions	\$2,773,240
Temporary Employees	250,000
Overtime	<u>117,000</u>
	<u>\$3,140,240</u>

However, if one looks at the very end of the section for "Support Services" on page 89, an item called "New positions, reclassification etc." appears with a negative amount i.e. a reduction, of \$630,240. This brings the budgeted provision for "Support Services" down to \$2,510,000 which is, in fact, the amount that appears in the Expenditure and Revenue Details document on page 128 as the salary component for "Support Services".

This reduction of \$630,240 represents the net of several items including the provision for step increases, reclassifications, new positions (if any) and perhaps most importantly in this case, savings due to vacancies. The great bulk of this number is obviously attributable to the vacancy savings that will accrue as a result of Government's decision to declare these positions redundant. There are, however, a significant number of other positions in this area which are currently vacant and will probably remain that way throughout the coming year and these will also contribute to the "offset" of \$630,240 shown in the Salary Details.

It should be noted that the vast majority of salary groupings listed in the Salary Details document have these negative "offsets" at the end and in all cases these reflect estimated savings due to vacant positions. The Salary Details document is meant to show, at a given point in time, the approved staff complement of Government departments and the associated salary costs, however, in determining the amounts that will actually go into the Estimates Government obviously takes account of projected savings due to the vacancy factor.

XI - TRANSPORTATION (Cont'd)

<u>Subhead</u>	<u>Approved Positions</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Salary 1983/84</u>
11.2.1 - Administrative & Support Services (Cont'd)			
		<u>Administration (Cont'd)</u>	
		<u>Technical Support (Cont'd)</u>	
		Other Earnings	4,000
		Overtime	20,000
		New positions, reclassifications, etc.	(100,454)
	<u>95</u>	Total (Administration)	<u>2,021,000</u>
		<u>Support Services</u>	
		<u>Building & Grounds Maintenance</u>	
	2	Highway Yard Foreman	36,276
	3	Carpenter II	59,563
	4	Carpenter I	74,715
	16	Labourer I	225,718
	1	Cook I	14,789
	<u>1</u>	Cook Helper	<u>13,541</u>
	<u>27</u>		<u>424,602</u>
		<u>Security</u>	
	<u>53</u>	Watchman	<u>748,289</u>
		<u>Purchasing & Control</u>	
	1	Department Programme Co-ordinator	23,168
	2	Buyer II	42,587
	1	Clerk IV	16,335
	2	Clerk III	28,914
	2	Clerk II	25,984
	1	Clerk-Stenographer II	14,065
	<u>1</u>	Clerk-Typist I	<u>12,413</u>
	<u>10</u>		<u>163,466</u>
		<u>Stockroom Operations</u>	
	4	District Highway Store Supervisor	81,493
	4	Storekeeper II	69,640
	19	Storekeeper I	301,549
	8	Stockhandler	116,320
	1	Labourer II	14,540
	4	Labourer I	56,908
	9	Parts Procurement Clerk	137,895

TRANSPORTATION (Cont'd)

<u>Subhead</u>	<u>Pos.</u>	<u>Position Title</u>	
11.2.1 - Administrative & Support Services (Cont'd)			
		<u>Support Services (Cont'd)</u>	
		<u>Stockroom Operations (Cont'd)</u>	
	1	Equipment Operator III	
	5	Equipment Operator I	
	<u>1</u>	Highway Yard Foreman	<u>1</u>
	<u>56</u>		<u>1</u>
		<u>Inspection Station/Scale Operations</u>	
	<u>35</u>	Highway Scale Operator	<u>1</u>
		Sub-total (Support Services)	2,7
		Temporary Employees	2
		Overtime	1
		New positions, reclassifications, etc.	(6
	<u>181</u>	Total (Support Services)	<u>2,5</u>
		<u>Traffic Engineering</u>	
	1	Highway Traffic Engineer	
	1	Highway Traffic Technician II	
	3	Highway Traffic Technician I	
	1	Draftsman I	
		Overtime	
		New positions, reclassifications, etc.	(
	<u>6</u>		<u>1</u>
		<u>Services to Other Governments, Departments & Agencies</u>	
		Other Employees	4
	<u>282</u>	Total 11.2.1	<u>5,0.</u>

XI — TRANSPORTATION

	<u>Estimates 1983-84</u>	<u>Revised 1982-83</u>	<u>Budget 1982-83</u>
	\$	\$	\$
11.1 EXECUTIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICES			
.2 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (Cont'd)			
03. POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING			
01. Salaries	127,700	99,000	140,000
03. Transportation and Communications	14,400	14,400	15,400
04. Supplies	600	600	600
05. Professional Services	227,300	80,000	260,000
07. Property, Furnishings and Equipment	-	-	1,000
10. Grants and Subsidies	<u>121,000</u>	<u>112,600</u>	<u>112,600</u>
Gross Current Expenditure	<u>491,000</u>	<u>306,600</u>	<u>529,600</u>
01. Revenue - Federal	<u>(175,000)</u>	<u>(15,000)</u>	<u>(150,000)</u>
Net Current Expenditure	<u>316,000</u>	<u>291,600</u>	<u>379,600</u>
Total: Policy Development and Planning	<u>316,000</u>	<u>291,600</u>	<u>379,600</u>
TOTAL: GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	<u>2,627,400</u>	<u>2,502,800</u>	<u>2,731,500</u>
TOTAL: EXECUTIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICES	<u>2,751,900</u>	<u>2,622,000</u>	<u>2,857,500</u>
11.2 MAINTENANCE			
.1 ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICES			
01. ADMINISTRATION			
01. Salaries	2,021,000	1,897,400	2,010,000
03. Transportation and Communications	72,000	70,000	75,000
04. Supplies	86,000	85,000	85,000
05. Professional Services	106,000	80,000	200,000
10. Grants and Subsidies	35,000	30,000	50,000
	<u>2,320,000</u>	<u>2,162,400</u>	<u>2,430,000</u>
19. Voted in Other Departments:			
Utility Services	826,500	746,600	673,900
Building Services	29,700	29,700	36,100
General and Program Maintenance	252,500	292,600	305,500
Air Services	14,000	25,200	25,800
	<u>1,122,700</u>	<u>1,094,100</u>	<u>1,041,300</u>
Total Current Expenditure	<u>3,442,700</u>	<u>3,256,500</u>	<u>3,471,300</u>
Total: Administration	<u>3,442,700</u>	<u>3,256,500</u>	<u>3,471,300</u>
02. SUPPORT SERVICES			
01. Salaries	2,510,000	2,670,700	2,987,100
03. Transportation and Communications	160,000	160,500	160,500
04. Supplies	220,000	171,900	188,900
06. Purchased Services	10,000	3,500	23,500
Total Current Expenditure	<u>2,900,000</u>	<u>3,006,600</u>	<u>3,360,000</u>
Total: Support Services	<u>2,900,000</u>	<u>3,006,600</u>	<u>3,360,000</u>

Tabled 16 May '82

Question # 40
Order Paper - March 21

In the Honourable House of Assembly

Question: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

List of names and salaries of Executive Assistants, Parliamentary Assistants and Public Relations Specialists appointed to the Minister's staff for the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982.

Answer: Honourable Norman E. Doyle (Minister Responsible for Communications):

There were no appointments of persons in the classifications identified by the Honourable Member in any of the fiscal years beginning in 1979, 1980, 1981 or 1982.

A Special Assistant to the Minister, Mr. Joseph Myers, was appointed during the 1982-'83 fiscal year during which period he was paid \$20,011.06

Tabled 10 May '83

Question # 34
Order Paper - March 17 - 1983

In the Honourable House of Assembly

Question: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

All letters, telegrams and other correspondence complaining about certain programming or Pay TV in this Province.

What action has been taken on these complaints?

Answer: Honourable Norman E. Doyle (Minister Responsible for Communications):

The Minister's office has received a variety of correspondence regarding Pay TV and, in order to respond to the question asked by the Honourable Member for Eagle River, The Honourable Member is requested to identify specifically the programs to which his question refers and the time period for which he is requesting copies of correspondence.

Tabled 10/8

In the Honourable House of Assembly

Question: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The cost of renovations to Minister's office in the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982.

Answer: The Honourable Norman E. Doyle, Minister Responsible for Communications:

As the Honourable Member will be aware, the responsibility for communications matters originally resided with the Minister of Transportation and Communications who had no separate office from which to discharge his responsibilities in the Communications field. Since my appointment as Minister Responsible for Communications, there have been no renovations made to the offices assigned to me.

Answer to Question No. 26 by the Honourable the Member for Torngat Mountains to the Honourable the Minister of Social Services - Order Paper No. 8, dated March 17, 1983.

Details of the number of Social Assistance recipients since September 1, 1982 who have had the amount of their Assistance either reduced or taken away as a result of new economy regulations brought in by his Department.

From the total caseload of 20,500, 10% had their allowances slightly reduced (by \$35.00 in most cases).

In most of these cases \$25.00 will be restored on May 1, 1983 by the 6% increase.

Of the 20,500 cases, there were 11 who were receiving a small supplement to other income and were suspended.

Talled 10 May '8

QUESTION: No. 86
ORDER PAPER: 17/83 - APRIL 12, 1983

QUESTION: MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

TO PROVIDE A LIST OF ALL RENOVATIONS MADE TO THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE PREMIER, MT. SCIO HOUSE, DURING THE FISCAL YEARS 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83 INCLUDING:

- (A) THE CONTRACTORS EMPLOYED;
- (B) THE DATE TENDERS WERE CALLED;
- (C) THE COST OF MATERIALS;
- (D) THE SUB-CONTRACTORS EMPLOYED;
- (E) THE REASON FOR THE RENOVATIONS, ON AN ITEMIZED BASIS.

ANSWER: MT. SCIO HOUSE WAS REDECORATED AND SOME ALTERATIONS MADE DURING THE 1979-80 FISCAL YEAR. THE ANSWER, TOGETHER WITH DETAILS OF THE CHARGES, WERE TABLED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY IN 1979 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 17, ORDER PAPER 9/79 ASKED BY MR. NEARY (LAPOILE)

NO ALTERATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE RESIDENCE SINCE THAT DATE.

Talked 10 May '83

QUESTION NO. 91

ORDER PAPER 17/83 - APRIL 12, 1983

QUESTION: MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- (1) LIST THE NUMBER OF TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT POSITIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ADVERTISED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION SINCE NOVEMBER 18, 1982.
- (2) HOW MANY OF THESE TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT POSITIONS HAVE BEEN FILLED BY THE COMMISSION?
- (3) LIST THE SALARIES ATTACHED TO THESE POSITIONS.

ANSWER (1) THIRTY-TWO
(2) THIRTY-TWO

(3)

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>SALARY</u>
AUDIT MANAGER (4 POSITIONS)	AUDITOR GENERAL	\$ 31,776. - 40,470.
TAX CONSULTANT	FINANCE	38,500.
REGISTRAR III	FINANCE	18,067. - 20,076.
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH REGIONAL MANAGER (2 POSIT.)	HEALTH	23,744. - 30,244.
ASSISTANT LOTTERIES LICENSING OFFICER	JUSTICE	18,905. - 21,381.
CHIEF LOTTERIES LICENSING OFFICER	JUSTICE	24,931 - 31,756.
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER (8 POSITIONS)	JUSTICE (H.M.P.)	16,450.

....2

INDUSTRIAL HYGIENIST	LABOUR & MANPOWER	25,749. - 29,1
OFFSHORE HEALTH & SAFETY INSPECTOR	LABOUR & MANPOWER	21,369. - 24,2
OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENE ANALYST	LABOUR & MANPOWER	23,227. - 26,3
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN III	MINES & ENERGY	14,118. - 15,6
LIQUOR ESTABLISHMENT INSPECTOR (2 POSITIONS)	NFLD. LIQUOR LICENSING BOARD	15,287. - 17,0
LIBRARIAN III	NFLD. PUBLIC LIBRARIES BOARD	22,634. - 28,8
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN II	" " "	13,298. - 14,5
LIBRARIAN III	" " "	22,634 - 28,8
LIBRARY TECHNICIAN III	" " "	14,965. - 16,61
CLERK TYPIST I	" " "	11,710. - 12,30
PLANT MAINTENANCE SUPERINTENDENT II	PUBLIC WORKS & SERVICES	9.94 - 11.48 / HO
SPECIAL HOMES ADMIN. OFFICER	SOCIAL SERVICES	23,497. - 27,09
CHILD MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST	SOCIAL SERVICES	21,794. - 23,39

QUESTION NO. 110

ORDER PAPER: 22/83 - APRIL 19/83

QUESTION: MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK
THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC
WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE
TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING
INFORMATION:

THE COST OF RENOVATIONS TO MINISTER'S
OFFICES IN THE FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980,
1981 AND 1982.

ANSWER: 1979-80 - \$0
1980-81 - \$4,500.00
1981-82 - \$0
1982-83 - \$0

Tracked 12 May '83

QUESTION NO. 95

ORDER PAPER: 18/83

APRIL 13, 1983

QUESTION:

MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

THE DETAILS OF THE COST OF PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTING THE CHRISTMAS CARDS SENT BY THE MINISTER IN DECEMBER 1982.

ANSWER:

ALL CHRISTMAS CARDS PRINTED AND DISTRIBUTED BY ME DURING DECEMBER 1982 WERE DONE AT MY PERSONAL EXPENSE.

Tabled 18 May '83

QUESTION No. 96

ORDER PAPER 18/83 - APRIL 13, 1983

QUESTION:

MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER). - TO ASK
THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF PUBLIC
WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE
TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING
INFORMATION.

THE COST OF RENTAL SPACE BY
GOVERNMENT IN BUILDINGS OTHER THAN
THOSE OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF
THE CITY OF ST. JOHN'S.

ANSWER:

\$3,070,000.00

QUESTION NO. 97

ORDER PAPER - 18-83 - APRIL 13, 1983

QUESTION:

MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION
A LIST OF ALL EXPENSES INCURRED FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PREMIER INCLUDING:

- (A) SALARIES PAID BY ANY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY FOR ANY SECURITY PERSONNEL;
- (B) THE COST OF CHAIN LINK FENCE AROUND THE PREMIER'S RESIDENCE, MOUNT SCIO HOUSE, AND THE COST OF ELECTRONIC GATES
 - (I) INITIAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION,
 - (II) COST OF MAINTENANCE AND ELECTRICITY FOR THE FENCE AND SURROUNDING LIGHTS.
- (C) COST OF GUARD DOGS;
- (D) COST OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT OR BURGLAR ALARMS OF ANY KIND;
- (E) WEAPONS KEPT ON THE GOUNDS OF MOUNT SCIO HOUSE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PREMIER AND THE COST.

LISTING ALL OF THE ABOVE UNDER EXPENSES INCURRED IN THE FISCAL YEARS 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83.

ANSWER:

THIS QUESTION WAS ANSWERED IN THIS EXACT FORM LAST YEAR FROM ORDER PAPER #8/82, TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1982. (MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER))

Answer to Question #79 on the Order Paper of Mar. 29th., 1983:

QUESTION:

Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) How many applications for reclassification has the Classification Appeals Board received for the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982?
- (b) How many applications were successful in securing reclassification?
- (c) List of positions which were reclassified and the cost to the Treasury as a result of individuals moving from one employment category to another.

ANSWER:

In 1979 two Intergovernment Affairs Officers I (PL 13) appealed their classifications to the Classification Appeals Board. The Board having heard the appeals determined that these officers should be classified at the Intergovernment Affairs Officers II (PL 15) level.

In accordance with the procedures established by Treasury Board these Officers were placed at the appropriate step in the PL 15 pay scale then applying.

There have been no further appeals to the Classification Appeals Board by members of the staff of the Secretariat. Indeed, these have been the only appeals since the Secretariat was established.

Answer to Question # 127 on the Order Paper of
April 28th., 1983:

QUESTION:

Mr. Neary, Leader of the Opposition (La Poile)-
to ask the Honourable the Premier to lay upon the
Table of the House the following information:

Has the Provincial Government had any studies
or surveys done since 1978 to determine whether
the Province could survive financially and economically
if Newfoundland and Labrador were to become a
Sovereign State?

ANSWER:

No.

QUESTION No. 68

ORDER PAPER 13/83 - MARCH 25, 1983

QUESTION: MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT ON ALL ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED BY HIS DEPARTMENT IN ALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN THIS PROVINCE SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1982.

ANSWER: THE MAJORITY OF WORK ON A COMPUTERIZED ENERGY MONITORING SYSTEM WAS COMPLETED IN 1982. THIS PROGRAM IS NOW VIRTUALLY COMPLETE AND WILL ALLOW THE MEASUREMENT OF ENERGY USE IN EACH AND EVERY GOVERNMENT FACILITY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS. THIS SYSTEM WILL ALSO ENSURE THAT FACILITIES NOT UTILIZING ENERGY WITHIN PRESCRIBED LEVELS ARE IDENTIFIED QUICKLY, PERMITTING NECESSARY ACTION. THE SYSTEM WILL ALSO ENABLE THE MEASUREMENT OF ANY ENERGY USAGE REDUCTIONS AS A RESULT OF OPERATIONS CHANGES AND/OR RETROFITS.

GUIDELINES FOR THE DESIGN OF NEW BUILDINGS AND FOR THE OPERATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES HAVE BEEN DRAFTED. A NUMBER OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE GUIDELINES HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED UNOFFICIALLY WHILE THE ENTIRE DRAFT IS BEING REVIEWED FOR FINAL DEPARTMENTAL ACCEPTANCE.

THE ENERGY AUDIT PROGRAM FOR MAJOR BUILDINGS WAS BROUGHT TO THE 85% COMPLETION POINT.

PHASE I OF THE ENERGY RETROFIT PROGRAM WAS INAUGURATED. THIS INVOLVED 23 MAJOR GOVERNMENT FACILITIES 10,000 FT.²

AND OVER, AND COMPRISED 80 DIFFERENT PROJECTS.
(BLDGS. INCLUDED IN PHASE I ARE SHOWN BELOW)
SOME OF THE MORE COMMON RETROFITS INCLUDE AUTO-
MATIC NIGHT SETBACK, AUTOMATIC ELECTTIC DEMAND
CONTROL, UPGRADING HEATING AND CONTROL SYSTEMS.
THE COST OF PHASE I RETROFITS WILL BE APPROXIMATELY
\$300,000.00 WHICH, WHEN COMPLETED, WILL RESULT IN
ANNUAL SAVINGS OF \$500,000.00. THIS REPRESENTS
A PAYBACK PERIOD OF LESS THAN TWO YEARS.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE
PHASE II RETROFIT PROGRAM WAS COMPLETED. IT IS
ANTICIPATED THAT THE PHASE II RETROFIT WILL COST
\$1.6 MILLION DOLLARS AND PRODUCE AN ANNUAL SAVINGS
OF \$660,000.00. THIS REPRESENTS A PAYBACK PERIOD
OF 2.4 YEARS.

ARTS & CULTURE CENTRE CORNER BROOK	HOYLES HOME ST. JOHN'S	BUILDING 904 PLEASANTVILLE
ARTS & CULTURE CENTRE, GANDER.	FISHERIES COLLEGE, ST. JOHN'S	DIST. VOCATIONAL GANDER.
ARTS & CULTURE CENTRE ST. JOHN'S.	DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL SEAL COVE	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL BAIE VERTE.	CONFEDERATION BUILDING ST. JOHN'S	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, CARBONEAR.	COURT HOUSE ST. JOHN'S	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL CORNER BROOK	HOWLEY BUILDING, ST. JOHN'S	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL BELL ISLAND	KING GEORGE V. INSTITUTE ST. JOHN'S.	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, GRAND FALLS	SIR RICHARD SQUIRES BUILDING, CORNER BROOK	
DIST. VOCATIONAL SCHOOL HAPPY VALLEY.	BUILDING No. 86, GOOSE BAY	
ADULT CORRECTIONAL CENTRE STEPHENVILLE.	BUILDING 907 PLEASANTVILLE	